

Department claimed was a Soviet gift with a special arrangement for microfilming military secrets. In the letters Julius and Ethel Rosenberg wrote to each other, they come through as Jewish and American heroes and patriots, who defied a gnostic and satanic Establishment by refusing to deny their innocence even at the cost of their lives.

The Rosenberg case was a massive media trial manipulated to the effect of providing patsies. The first half of the Sharlitt book deals with the intricacies of court battle and appeal, the deviousness of Attorney General, prosecutor, several judges, and how the wrong law was deliberately chosen by the Justice Department to assure that the Rosenbergs could be killed. A Stay of Execution, issued by Justice Douglas three days before the Rosenbergs' death by electrocution, was vacated most irregularly by the Supreme Court. President Eisenhower allowed them to be murdered.

## Ayn Rand: national security risk

by Ana Maria Papert

---

### Judgment Day, My Years with Ayn Rand

by Nathaniel Branden

A Marc Jaffe Book/Houghton Mifflin, Boston, 1989  
436 pages, illustrated, hardbound, \$21.95

---

Aside from the "soap-opera" side of the book, which could fit into another TV series like "Dallas," with all its pornography, immorality, nonsense, and paganism, Nathaniel Branden's book *Judgment Day, My Years with Ayn Rand*, does give a very interesting insight into the minds of some of those who have shaped the policies of the last two administrations. Many officials in the two Reagan administrations, and now in the Bush administration, have been and are devout followers of the Russian writer Alice Rosenbaum, better known as Ayn Rand.

In fact, Reagan and Rand might have met in Hollywood. Rand "had come to Hollywood, hoping to find work writing scripts," but according to Branden's story, by some "stroke of good fortune" she fell into a conversation with Cecil B. De Mille, who gave her her first job and helped her get around.

Alan Greenspan, chairman of the U.S. Federal Reserve Board, was, during many years, one of her most dedicated followers and admirers.

When Greenspan joined "The Collective," the inner circle that met every Saturday with Ayn Rand for more than a decade to discuss the infamous *Atlas Shrugged* and other topics, Greenspan was "not a free enterpriser but a Keynesian . . . [and] he was also a logical positivist, which meant that he was adamant about his inability to know anything with certainty," says Branden. Then he quotes Greenspan saying: "I think I exist . . . but I can't be certain. In fact, I can't be certain that anything exists." Greenspan was 26 years old at the time.

The fact that the head of the Federal Reserve has been a follower of someone who believes "that a human being is an end in himself, not a means to the ends of others, which means he has a right to exist for his own sake, neither sacrificing himself to others nor others to himself," could represent a national security risk. This is the kind of thinking that has existed under the insane economic policies of the past years and that has brought the United States to the worst economic depression in its history.

Ayn Rand was a follower of Aristotle and a passionate hater of Plato. She could not stand hearing Beethoven's music nor admire a painting by Rembrandt. Her favorite music was "tiddlywink" music, such as "It's a Long Way to Tipperary."

Rand thought "that virtually every evil ascribed to *laissez-faire* capitalism is in fact the result not of *laissez-faire* but of government intervention, government control, the betrayal of *laissez-faire*. . . . Remember, capitalism means *laissez-faire*, not government controls—hands off—a totally free market." This kind of "capitalism" is for Rand "the only moral system."

President John F. Kennedy was killed after Rand gave a speech "The Fascist New Frontier," at Ford Hall Forum, in which she drew parallels between the ideology of fascism and that contained in the speeches of John F. Kennedy, emphasizing her view that both demand personal "sacrifice" on the "altar of public good." She obviously hated Kennedy's famous words, "Ask not what your country can do for you, but rather ask what you can do for your country." Random House refused to publish her speech and the contract with Rand was broken.

On the military, Greenspan's idol thought that "military conscription contradicts the basic principle of a free society: a man's right to his own life. It's sickening how many conservatives favor the draft, while pretending to be champions of freedom. The bastards."

### Denying God

The role of man on Earth, as made in the living image of God, the Creator, is completely destroyed. Rand says, "I became an atheist at 13 . . . for two reasons. First because there were no rational grounds for believing in God. And second, and terribly important to me, because God was held to be the greatest entity in the universe, that made man

inferior—and I resented the idea that man was inferior to anything. . . . If you were to put a title over everything I have written, or ever will write, it would be, ‘To the Glory of Man.’

of Manichaenism in her outlook—not the literal Gnostic religion first preached by Mani, of course, but rather the tendency to see good and evil as essentially separate and opposed principles, and to interpret all human experience in terms of their confrontation.”

This Gnostic philosophy inundated the campuses in the United States in the 1960s. Many students read several times each of Rand’s books and participated in the courses on “Objectivism” which was the name given to this so-called “philosophy.” These courses, were given in more than 80 cities by the late 1960s and tapes were sent to soldiers in Vietnam.

Branden founded the Nathaniel Branden Institute which was responsible for the spread of these ideas. A newsletter, called *The Objectivist* was published regularly, and distributed by subscription and in other ways so that this ideology could be spread rapidly, especially among the younger generation.

Today, the third largest political party in the United States, the Libertarian Party, is based on Ayn Rand’s philosophy, and in recent years it has become a major influence on the thinking of sections of the Republican Party.

A March 24, 1965 *Wall Street Journal* review of the just-published collection of Rand’s writings said, “And it is normally a matter of two decades before the young take over the seats of power in the name of what they learned to believe 20 years ago.” Today, after 20 years have passed, this philosophy has infiltrated the government of the United States.

## Europe, ‘heart’ of tomorrow’s world?

by P. Colombo et E. Grenier

---

### **Lignes d’horizon**

by Jacques Attali

Fayard, Paris, 1990

216 pages, paperbound, 75 francs

---

If the 20th century will have been characterized by Europe’s decline, America’s triumph, and Soviet might, then the 21st century will be the century of Europe and Japan, or more

precisely that of the two great economic and technological zones at the center of which are Western Europe and Japan. This is the driving idea of the recently published study by Jacques Attali, *Lignes d’horizon* (“Horizon Lines”).

We don’t know whether this book by a man often characterized as French President François Mitterrand’s controversial “idea man,” will soon be available in the English language, but the citizens and elites of America would do well to ponder some of its lessons with respect to the decline of the United States.

Expressing a thinking that is both French and Europeanist, but not Euro-centric, *Lignes d’horizon* is a serious attempt to “rethink the world” at a time when modern history is being shaken by events. Written while revolutions, most of them peaceful, were bringing down totalitarian regimes of Eastern Europe which one could have thought were forever frozen in the Stalinist glacié, Jacques Attali’s essay tries to define a universal mission for Europe. One obvious fact seems to say he is right: The history of Europe is not world history, yet the sudden acceleration of contemporary history is taking place in Europe and in relationship to Europe. The international order built up after the Second World War is rapidly dissolving, without an alternative “structure” or order having been put in place.

Frozen in place by the Cold War and the Berlin Wall, and by the incontestable, although contested domination by the United States and the U.S.S.R., the history of Europe suddenly finds itself set free. The Soviet rollback shall inevitably be accompanied by an American rollback tinged with isolationism and centered in the Western Hemisphere. It is in the unaccustomed role of spectator and not actor that the United States witnesses the emergence of the new Europe, which will find itself without a tutor and perhaps without a protector. Aware of her own strength, Europe no longer wants to be controlled, even the dissimulated control that is brought about when one is under someone else’s protection. The decline and fall of communism does not mean “the end of history,” as per the shallow but celebrated Hegelian saying of Francis Fukuyama, who thereby voiced the viewpoint of the spectator. Rather it means the rediscovery of history. The sterile and entirely relative stability of the blocs gives way to the creative instability of new freedoms, which of course will have to be given structure. These ideas give some measure of the intellectual gulf that is inexorably widening between America and the Europe being reborn. If Europe does not seize this historic occasion, then powerful centrifugal forces will engender crisis and crisis, thereby splitting up Europe rather than unifying it.

When Jacques Attali writes that “if Western Europe is able to associate the East to its future, it can lay claim to the title of heart of the world economy, and can become the world’s most populous, rich, and creative area,” he is announcing the end of the American Century—not as easy to foresee as the visible fall of Russian predominance. He is not