

Will Ayn Rand Disciple Greenspan Repudiate Genocidalist Brook?

The ongoing speaking tour by Yaron Brook, head of the Ayn Rand Institute, in which he calls for the mass murder of hundreds of thousands of Muslims as a means of “fighting extremism,” has raised the question of where the most prominent disciple of Ayn Rand in the United States stands on this issue. That disciple is Alan Greenspan, former head of the Federal Reserve, and the man increasingly excoriated internationally as responsible for the most destructive set of financial bubbles in history. Will Greenspan repudiate the openly genocidal calls of his fellow Ayn Randist, Yaron Brook?

Lyndon LaRouche has urged that associates of Greenspan, or others, ask him that question. Unfortunately, given the murderous nature of Ayn Rand’s philosophy, which Greenspan has embraced for his entire career, at least since 1952, a repudiation is highly unlikely.

Who Was Ayn Rand?

Ayn Rand, born of an aristocratic family in St. Petersburg in 1905, fled Lenin’s Russia in 1926 at age 21, and landed in Hollywood as a script reader for Cecil B. DeMille. For the next 25 years, she read, and then wrote, Hollywood and Broadway scripts for RKO, MGM, and Warner Brothers, all based on an infantile abreaction to communism, in which her heroes glorified their selfish desires as the triumph of the individual. Her fame is based heavily on a series of four novels, which glorify the destructive, anarchic individual, and which have been used to create a cult around her person.

Rand’s 1957 novel *Atlas Shrugged* presents a detailed blueprint for slowly and silently tearing down the industrial plant and infrastructure of the United States, in favor of a “post-industrial” society. The railroads must be ripped up, she wrote, and every machine made to fail. “Plane crashes, oil tank explosions, blast-furnace break-outs, high-tension wire electrocutions, subway cave-ins” were to be carefully engineered over a period of decades. Finally, “when we would see the lights of New York go out, we would know that our job was done.”

So ready were Rand’s disciples to tear everything down, that even Wall Street free-marketeers were alarmed. “It became evident to me that they were a cult,” former *Barron’s* editor Robert Bleiberg told *Worth* magazine in 1995. Of all of them, the most serious was Alan Greenspan, whom Rand herself called “The Undertaker” for the deadly earnestness

with which he embraced her plans.

Rand made of this what she called a philosophy, a straight plagiarization of Aristotle’s *Nicomachean Ethics*, in which man is just another animal, a creature of pleasure or pain. Thus, his “moral” duty is to seek his personal pleasure without regard for society, leading Rand to write such tracts as *The Virtue of Selfishness*. St. Paul’s credo of agapic love of humanity was the dirtiest of lies, she wrote.

“A is A. . . . Facts are facts,” she repeated after Aristotle, “and the only task of man’s consciousness is to *perceive* reality, not to *create* or invent it.” Man merely receives sensory perceptions from the “objective” outside world, as do the other animals. “Reason” Rand defined as merely “the faculty that identifies and integrates the material provided by man’s senses.” Man has no immortal soul and creates no abstract ideas, Rand taught, so her followers are ardent atheists. Man only learns to better process the incoming sensory data packets of sight, hearing, and smell, like some flesh and blood computer, which information is used to better satisfy his “self-interest”—his desire for food, sex, and power. This outlook Rand dubbed “Objectivism.”

The Rand Cult

Moving to New York in 1951, Rand gathered a group who sarcastically called themselves “The Collective,” because of their intense anti-government philosophy. Meeting every Saturday night for 10 years in Rand’s Manhattan apartment, as Michael Lewis reported in the May 1995 issue of *Worth* magazine, the group included Rand and her Hollywood husband Frank O’Connor; their friends Nathaniel and Barbara Branden; Barbara’s childhood friend, artist Joan Mitchell, who married and brought in Greenspan in 1952; Leonard Peikoff, who later ran the Ayn Rand Institute; Harry Kalberman, who is still Greenspan’s stock broker, and his wife Elaine; and Allan Blumenthal, a psychiatrist who would marry Mitchell after she and Greenspan had their marriage annulled in 1953.

With the aid of the emotional appeal of her semi-erotic novels and scripts, which she had the group read aloud as each was being written, Rand produced a brainwashing environment to rival the later San Francisco Hippies of the 1960s. “After a few months,” Lewis reports, “it seemed logical for Rand and Branden to announce to their spouses that they planned to have an affair, just because it served

their self interest.”

. . . In *Atlas Shrugged*, Rand chronicles in more than 800 pages, the secret life of Francisco D’Anconia, heir to the D’Anconia Copper fortune, which in the novel controls the world’s copper mines, ships, and foundries—without which no electrical wire can be produced. D’Anconia early in the book joins John Galt, a physicist who won’t have his work stolen by mediocrities, in a plan to shut down the U.S. economy to take it over.

As a copper producer, “I saw the government regulations passed to cripple me, because I was successful, to help my competitors because they were failures. . . . I saw my energy was being poured down a sewer,” D’Anconia says. “And then I saw the whole industrial establishment of the world, with all of its magnificent machinery, its thousand-ton furnaces, its transatlantic cables, its blazing electric signs, its wealth—all of it run by any unshaved humanitarian in any basement beer joint.

Ayn Rand’s Assault On the General Welfare

From early on in her career, Rand was promoted by the same financier networks that had opposed Roosevelt and the principles of the New Deal. By showering her with media coverage, and through the popularization of her novel, “The Fountainhead,” she became a principal “intellectual” spokesperson for the idea that the New Deal and its support of the principle of the General Welfare had created a “collectivist,” “statist” society, akin to Marxist communism and Hitler or Mussolini’s fascism. The new “welfare state,” she argued, sapped the real power of the American economy, *the selfishness of the greedy individualist*, which, she lied, was the root of all progress. What she called American industrial capitalism was based on this, which “liberals” led by FDR were hell bent on destroying.

Rand specifically targeted the intellectuals on college campuses who might have leanings toward “New Deal collectivism,” calling for an all-out assault on anyone who believes that the state, or anyone else, has an obligation to help the poor or underprivileged. “Altruism,” the insane Rand claims, “is the negation of morality.”

What disgusted her about the conduct of the New Left in the period of its agitation for civil rights and against the war in Vietnam was not merely its often irrational tactics, but the fact that the motivation of those young persons and others was the belief that they had a special responsibility to help those who could not help themselves. Rand and her minions set themselves up as the opposition to much of the civil rights movement, which she attacked for creating “moral confusion,” and the anti-war movement, which she branded as a Marxist-collectivist plot, aided and abetted by weak-minded intellectuals, and worse.

As early as 1965, in a widely disseminated essay, “The Cashing-In: The Student Rebellion,” she urged students to go after anyone on campus who supported “altruistic collectivism,” to demand that professors that might give

solace to “rebels” be fired, defending this not as a “witch-hunt” but a necessary purge. “While most altruist theorists proclaim the common good as their justification, [and] advocate self-sacrificial service to the ‘community,’ they keep silent about the exact nature of, or identity of the recipients of their sacrifice,” which she claims to be the “guild socialists” or the “Marxist collectivists.” Even peaceful civil disobedience was to be abhorred and punished severely because it represented an assault on the paramount rights of private property, and on the “individual’s” right to be left alone to ignore all but his own self-interest.

In a June 1970 essay, “The Chickens’ Homecoming,” Rand claims that the weak-kneed intellectuals of the campuses and their student “rebels” have no right to argue against the right of America to defend its self-interest on “moral” grounds. You must speak of strategies objectively, no matter how many people are slaughtered; in a precursor of today’s bloodthirsty rants from Rand disciple Brooks and others for even more brutal bombings and genocidal assaults on the “enemy,” Rand writes: “If someone squeaks that the bombing of villages is a ‘moral’ issue, let him remember that the villages are the enemy’s strongholds in Vietnam.”

In that same essay, she again calls for a repudiation and purge of the intellectuals and others who are responsible for the fact that while “the American people were never given a chance to vote on the question of whether they wanted to adopt socialism, yet virtually the entire program of the Communist Manifesto has been enacted into law in this country.”

In the title essay of Rand’s widely circulated 1971 book (more than 3 million copies sold) “The New Left: The Anti-Industrial Revolution,” she calls for a “philosophical revolution . . . in the name of the first of our Founding Fathers: Aristotle. This means the supremacy of reason, with its consequences: individualism, freedom, progress, civilization. What political system would it lead to? An untried one: full, laissez-faire capitalism. . . .” Clearly her minions still want to bring this about. We would have a more appropriate name for it: fascism.—*L. Wolfe*

“John found the way,” D’Anconia said of Galt. “He stepped to the window and pointed at the skyscrapers of the city. He said that we had to extinguish the lights of the world, and when we would see the lights of New York go out, we would know that our job was done.” Galt told D’Anconia that he would have to destroy his father’s company. Without copper for wire, the world economy would fall apart. “Just think of the railroads,” said another of their conspirators. “They’ll reach the stage where no day will pass without a major wreck, and the same will be happening in every other industry, wherever machines are used—the machines which they thought could replace our minds. Plane crashes, oil tank explosions, blast-furnace break-outs, high-tension wire electrocutions, subway cave-ins. . . . When the rails are cut, the city of New York will starve in two days. . . . Their factories will stop, then their furnaces and their radios.”

Galt simply quits and sets up a secret alternate economy in a Colorado valley. His final act, after bankrupting the company with his jet-set antics, is to dynamite every copper mine on the planet.

The Individual Against Society

In her novel *The Fountainhead*, Rand reflects a similar approach. Rand’s protagonist Howard Roark, an architect, designs a housing project, but after it has been operating, he decides that “bureaucrats” have compromised it. In an act of anarchistic-nihilistic rage—which Rand presents as courage—Roark blows up the housing project. Roark is arrested; in the trial scene, he proclaims:

“The only good which men can do to one another and the only statement of their proper relationship is—Hands off.

“Now observe the results of a society built upon individualism. This, our country. The noblest country in the history of men. The country of greatest achievement, greatest prosperity, greatest freedom. This country was not based on selfless service, sacrifice, renunciation or any precept of altruism. It was based on man’s right to the pursuit of happiness. His own happiness. Not anyone else’s. . . .”

Politically, Rand expressed this radical individualist (one should say fascist) philosophy by taking part in the Trumanism witchhunts against Hollywood, by voluntary testimony before the House UnAmerican Activities Committee against targets in Hollywood.

Rand and the British Gold Standard

Rand, of course, not only fancied herself a novelist and philosopher, but also an economist. Thus, after Nixon removed the dollar from gold in 1971, inflation was raging out of control, and “in Rand’s Saturday evening sessions, inflation was as great a threat to freedom as alcohol was to virginity,” as Lewis neatly summarized it.

Every dollar in Rand’s new world must be backed by gold, as it was in the 19th-Century British gold standard, because no man or government is to be trusted to create any paper

credit whatsoever, and money is an object to be possessed, not a means to a social end.

Gold, the Objectivists believe, as a real object (“A is A”) in the physical world, is the only true store of value—not the creative mental powers of a human being. Since no Randian does anything except for his own self-interest, every action by an individual must be paid for, if not in gold, then in a currency backed one-to-one by gold. That way, there can be no inflation, and the few geniuses who have really earned their money, will never see the value of their money, with which they equate the value of their selves, reduced by inflation. In the last sentence of *Atlas Shrugged*, the hero Galt, instead of the sign of the cross, traces in the air the sign of a gold-backed dollar.

In Ayn Rand’s *Capitalism: The Unknown Ideal* (New York: Signet Paperback Books, 1967), Greenspan was the author of Chapter 6, “Gold and Economic Freedom.” “An almost hysterical antagonism toward the gold standard is one issue which unites statist of all persuasions,” he wrote, in a detailed praise of the 19th-Century British gold standard. “They seem to sense that gold and economic freedom are inseparable, that the gold standard is an instrument of laissez-faire and that each implies and requires the other. . . . The abandonment of the gold standard made it possible for the welfare statist to use the banking system as a means to an unlimited expansion of credit.

“In the absence of the gold standard, there is no way to protect savings from confiscation through inflation. There is no safe store of value,” Greenspan concluded. “This is the shabby secret of the welfare statist’s tirades against gold. Deficit spending is simply a scheme for the ‘hidden’ confiscation of wealth. Gold stands in the way of this insidious process, as a protector of property rights.”

With this philosophy, on the morning of Nixon’s resignation in 1974, Greenspan became Chairman of President Ford’s new Council of Economic Advisers. Subsequently, he was appointed a member of Ronald Reagan’s Economic Policy Advisory Board and Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, and then appointed Fed Chairman on Aug. 11, 1987 by circles close to Vice-President George H.W. Bush.

Rand died in 1982, so she never saw her disciple Greenspan rise to the position of power at the Fed, where he could put into effect her policies of destruction. As per her wishes, a shroud was placed on her coffin bearing the dollar sign. Her portrait hangs in a place of honor at the Cato Institute offices in Washington, D.C. And the institute named for her is now proposing mass murder against those they see as challengers to their system of capitalist greed, while seeking to recruit youth to support their fascist views.

Will Alan Greenspan repudiate Yaron Brook?

This article draws extensively from Kathy Wolfe, “Greenspan and the Cult of Ayn Rand: Don’t Reappoint ‘the Undertaker,’” EIR, Oct. 29, 1999.