

REVIEW ESSAY

Mr Galt Goes to Washington

D. N. Byrne

Ayn Rand Nation: The Hidden Struggle for America's Soul by Gary Weiss. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2013. 320 pages.

100 Voices: An Oral History of Ayn Rand by Scott McConnell (compiler and editor). New York: Penguin New American Library, 2011. 656 pages.

ABSTRACT ★ Two recently published oral histories highlight the long-term trend concerning the mainstreaming of Objectivism, the political and economic ideas of the libertarian conservative writer and ideologue, Ayn Rand. Scott McConnell's sympathetic interview collection focuses on supporters and acquaintances from Rand's active period in the 1960s and 1970s. These supporters and acquaintances include former Australian Prime Minister, Malcolm Fraser, who provides McConnell with his considered views concerning Rand. Gary Weiss's critical interview collection focusses on her more recent supporters, with one displeased and insightful interviewee to be found in both collections. Weiss's collection reveals the role played by Objectivists in galvanizing the focus of the populist Tea Party movement. Both oral histories reveal the role played by the media and popular culture in mainstreaming Rand's views. The review ends by comparing Randolph Stow's socially responsive individualism as described in his novel *Tourmaline* with Rand's transactional individualism as described in *Atlas Shrugged*.

TWO ORAL HISTORIES, Gary Weiss's *Ayn Rand Nation: The Hidden Struggle for America's Soul*, and Scott McConnell's *100 Voices: An Oral History of Ayn Rand*, highlight two contrasting conceptions of the individual. The first is the transactional conception; the second the socially responsive. The central theme of these two collections of interviews concerns the popularizing, indeed, the mainstreaming-of the politico-economic ideas of the libertarian conservative Ayn Rand. This attention-worthy tendency has been largely obscured by the controversies which have surrounded the 2016 United States presidential election. This essay begins with a brief comparison of Rand's transactional conception of the individual as portrayed in her novel *Atlas Shrugged* with Randolph Stow's socially responsive conception of the individual as portrayed in his novel, *Tourmaline*.¹ The ensuing analyses of Scott McConnell's and Gary Weiss's oral histories highlight the different implications each conception has for public policy.

This analysis is rounded off by a conclusion which highlights the challenges to public policy posed by the mainstreaming of Rand's transactional individualism, which is to say, her radical capitalism. For Objectivists, the individual is solely responsible for his or her fate; individual market relations define society. For their critics, market relations should be confined to the economy, with each individual defining in his or her own terms, the content of his or her own social relations. For Weiss, evidence of the mainstreaming of Rand's Objectivism lies in the way the public held the government rather than the financial sector responsible for the Global Financial Crisis of 2007—2008.

Two Conceptions of the Individual

In squaring off one oral history against another, McConnell's against Weiss's, I begin by contrasting Ayn Rand's *Atlas Shrugged* (1957), with another novel of comparable subject matter, if not renown, Randolph Stow's *Tourmaline* (1963). This approach is designed to illustrate the concepts of transactional individualism and socially responsive individualism and to give my analysis and critique a sense of balance. Rand's novels allowed her to give the abstract ideas of conservative libertarian economics and politics, the theory of transactional individualism, living

forms and thus enhance their persuasive power. Indeed, the novel form was Rand's primary means for communicating her libertarian ideology. Trope for trope, Randolph Stow in *Tourmaline* explores a different conception of individualism, a socially responsive vision with greater concision and poetry. I contrast Rand's account of the individual's struggle for worldly domination with Stow's account of the individual's struggle for worldly harmony; her idea of individual acquisition with his idea of cooperation; and her idea of selfishness with his idea of benevolence. My claim is that the novel form thus gave both writers the imaginative space to shape a world and the relationships of the individuals within. Dialogue and deeds express the writers' conceptions.

The publication of Ayn Rand's two major novels, *The Fountainhead*, in 1943, and *Atlas Shrugged*, in 1957, aroused controversy among Western cultural elites. The individual, according to Rand, had no obligations to others beyond a purely transactional one, one that involved some sort of commercial exchange. Moreover, the state had no role in society beyond the maintenance of defense, internal law and order and the enforcement of contracts. Rand's creed of the "virtue of selfishness" confronted millennia of moral thought, which taught that the individual does indeed have moral responsibilities to his or her relatives, neighbors and strangers, and that the rich have moral responsibilities to the poor. Despite the commentariat's outrage, Rand's ideas fell on fertile ground in the broader reaches of society, especially among young adults.² Indeed, in 1998, Modern Library readers voted in Rand's four novels (including first and second, *Atlas Shrugged* and *The Fountainhead*, with *Anthem* and *We the Living* coming seventh and eighth) to their list of "100 Best Novels."³

Since the GFC, Rand's social thought has acquired a role beyond that of merely informing the expanding horizons typically of young adults. Many voters and commentators now see her political ideas as theoretical lodestones in the interpretation of modern society's fundamental political norms and institutions; they have become the informing principle of some of those who create and implement public policy. Her advocates include US President Donald J. Trump and past and present members of his cabinet; former chairman of the US Federal Reserve Bank, Dr Alan Greenspan; Clarence Thomas, associate justice of the Supreme Court of the United States; US Senators Rand Paul and Ted Cruz; and

Congressmen Ron Paul and Paul Ryan.⁴ Additional acolytes include the Silicon Valley entrepreneur Peter Thiel, as well as Hollywood actors including Brad Pitt, Angelina Jolie, and Amber Heard. Other acolytes include the Canadian rock band, Rush, and the former Australian Federal Senator, David Leyonhjelm.⁵

This growth in the appeal of Rand's ideas among influential figures can explain in part their unexpected willingness to blame government for the recurrent crises in financial markets—only progressives have critiqued her ideology for fostering a climate of financial concupiscence. The resulting policies of fiscal austerity and the absence of firmer regulatory management of the financial markets have had problematic consequences for many vulnerable people—at a time when inequalities of wealth and income have reached problematic extremes.⁶

In contrast to Ayn Rand's unabashed enthusiasm for an individualistic oligarchical capitalism, a more socially responsive form of individualism inspires Randolph Stow's novel *Tourmaline*. In *Tourmaline*, the townsfolk find their individual fulfillment beyond mere transactional arrangements, through their mutual rehabilitation of the diviner and their cooperative mining of the gold which he found. The same socially responsive individualistic ethos informs Gary Weiss's critical comments in his collection of interviews in contradistinction to the nuanced Objectivism that informs McConnell's book with Rand's friends and fellow travelers.

Both Rand and Stow explore the vexed question of the responsibility of individuals for others, including strangers. Both are avowed individualists; compare Rand's fictional hero in *Atlas Shrugged*, John Galt and his Galt's Gulch followers' loyalty oath, that "I swear by my life and my love of it that I will never live for the sake of another man nor ask another man to live for mine" with *Tourmaline's* narrator, the Law's comment after the return to the desert of their seeming savior that "There is no sin but cruelty. Only one. And that original sin, that began when a man first cried to another, in his matted hair: Take charge of my life, I am close to breaking."⁷ Yet Rand's and Stow's conclusions about the individual's responsibility to others, including strangers, are quite different, and their literary reflections on this matter illuminate the concerns of Scott McConnell and Gary Weiss, as well as those of contemporary policy makers.

The settings of both stories are apocalyptic. In *Atlas Shrugged* Rand's fictional United States was a dystopian republic whose energy and creativity were being sapped by those persons who are either "a looting thug or a mooching mystic."⁸ Those "mystics of spirit" and the "mystics of muscle" derive their authority from the political establishment in Washington DC, whose meretricious policies of altruism in the form of welfarism and statism have put the country on the path of inevitable decline. As a result of these policies, the weak, the foolish, the ignorant, the uncreative and the unproductive (all human "ballast"⁹ in Rand's theory), stand to inherit the earth, exploiting and ultimately destroying their betters, the creative and the productive, the rational, that is, those epitomes of morality, the industrial businessmen and women. Consequently, many creative and productive businesspeople, led and inspired by the handsome, scientific prodigy, John Galt, a diviner of atmospheric electricity, embark on "a strike of the mind." This involves their withdrawal from the economy, and some from society altogether, with a few settling in Galt's capitalist utopia at Galt's Gulch hidden in the inaccessible mountains of Colorado. Consequently, the processes of social and economic—and ultimately political—entropy gather momentum, wreaking desolation everywhere and threatening to destroy all the industrial societies of the world, potentially returning humanity not just to a pre-industrial condition, rather to a hunter-gatherer condition. The novel climaxes when Galt commandeers the President's radio broadcast time to deliver his sermon on the "the virtue of selfishness," after which he is outlawed and tortured before escaping to reclaim a collapsed society with his posse of entrepreneurs.

The contrast of Rand's transactional individualism with Stow's socially responsive individualism is stark. *Tourmaline* is an ageing West Australian gold mining town dying from want of water. The story's pivotal character, Michael Random, was a desert-stranded stranger, trucked to town by a passing contractor. The townsfolk who returned his life to him took him in. They found him "prepossessing."¹⁰ This stranger possessed a mysterious power. He is a diviner. He liked what he saw so he decided to stay.¹¹ Soon Random's presence galvanizes in the townsfolk a utopian vision of a bush Eden in *Tourmaline*, a return to its youthful glory days.¹² They would do just about anything that he ordained. The diviner, the story's narrator, the Law, quickly observes, has focused the

locals in a way in which his rambling and confused cenotaph speeches on Anzac Days could never hope to achieve.¹³ For the sake of this *esprit de corps* he goes along with the diviner's rituals and eccentricities, until his doubts finally overcome him. "A-a Utopia we could have, with the water," Random declaims, yet when he fails to find it, his fall from grace, he declaims further that "God's betrayed me."¹⁴ The Law finally recognizes him for what he was, "that he had been, somewhere, a criminal of quite extraordinary distinction."¹⁵ While Random's dowsing for water fails spectacularly, he manages to uncover a significant reef of gold. His divining finds what their souls truly craved. Under his direction, the townsfolk form "a co-operative society, for the exploitation of the reef," with the gold to be stored in The Law's safe under his stewardship, an arrangement that continued after Random's return to the desert whence he came.¹⁶ Their social arrangements resulted in "the employment of muscles and sinews for common gain, of sharing labor, of giving aid to whoever, wiping the sweat from his forehead, should say: 'Take over, will you?' and go off up the hill to the open cave there to rest."¹⁷ This conception of the individual could not be further from Rand's mind.

These two contrasting conceptions of individualism underpin Scott McConnell's and Gary Weiss's oral histories of the friends, associates and erstwhile latter day followers of Ayn Rand's libertarian-style Objectivist philosophy, based on her radical conception of capitalism. The interviewees in both collections, with a few exceptions, are broadly sympathetic with Rand's transactional individualism, as is Scott McConnell, while Gary Weiss's critical comments make plain his sympathies for a socially responsive individualism.

Voices From the Past:

Scott McConnell Meets Those Who Knew Ayn Rand

Ayn Rand's transactional individualism permeates most of Scott McConnell's interviews with those who knew her. McConnell, a Melbourne based television and documentary producer, writer and interviewer (according to his LinkedIn page), founded and headed the Ayn Rand Oral History Program, a project of the Ayn Rand Archives at the Ayn Rand

Institute (ARI) from 1995 to 2006. He was also director of communication at the ARI. (He should not be confused with conservative journalist, Scott McConnell, the founding editor of *The American Conservative*). This oral history comprises 100 interviews with Rand's family members, friends and associates, culled from more than 160. The interviews are organized in decades from the 1910s, with Rand's sister, Eleanora Drobysheva, until the 1980s (Rand died in 1982) with the bulk of the interviewees coming from friends and associates of the 1950s and 1960s, the peak period of Rand's life as a public intellectual.

Scott McConnell's questions typically focused on the context of the interviewee's relationship with Rand, exploring Rand's day-to-day persona in her private life, for example, her love of her cats, her relationships with others including her husband, the actor and painter, Frank O'Conner, as well as Rand's influence on him or her. Their Objectivist Damascene conversions make for powerful personal statements. As a latter day Objectivist, his respect for those who knew Rand and worked for her is transparent. McConnell also refers to, but did not interview, lapsed Objectivists such as Nathaniel and Barbara Branden and Alan Greenspan for this collection.¹⁸

McConnell tells us that he "selected the interviews in this collection to cover a broad range of years, contexts, relationships and observations, and to supplement the limited number of reliable biographical sources available elsewhere," and presumably to counter the many highly critical commentaries on her treatment of those close to her. According to McConnell, "The interviews reveal Ayn Rand angry, happy, betrayed, in love, fighting for her values, triumphant. They also show many aspects of her personality and the wide range of her values and life experiences."¹⁹

Most of McConnell's interviewees such as entertainers Duane Eddy, Robert Stack and Raquel Welch are candid in their enthusiasm for Rand's radical capitalist individualist ideas. These interviewees paint a picture of a highly intelligent woman of great personal energy and integrity with an "indomitable spirit."²⁰ They also describe a woman with traditional European manners, who showed warmth and personal charm when engaged, but who could also be aloof and blunt when provoked. Yet, other, more critical voices, such as Rand's sister, Eleanora Drobysheva, her housekeeper and Evangelical Christian friend, Eloise Huggins, her Trotskyist

editor, Patrick O'Connor, and journalists such as Mike Wallace, Alvin Toffler, and James Day, make this collection less one dimensional than Gary Weiss suggests. According to McConnell "What emerges from this collection is the picture of a larger-than-life, truly unique and fascinating individual, Ayn Rand."²¹

While the interviewees invariably mention the often life changing impact of Rand's ideas in so far as it relates to them as individuals, Scott Stanley, an editor of a number of conservative magazines, observes her much wider sphere of influence:

I'm sure that, without her advocacy and influence, the free-market economics of Ludwig von Mises and the Austrian School would never have gone beyond that small coterie of lower-case libertarians associated in the 1950s with the National Association of Manufacturers and the *Freeman*. What she did was to lead free-market economics out of the stuffy business community and put it into a community of artists and philosophers and intellectuals. And that was vital. They attracted to it a dimension of youthful support, which was vital as well, making it possible to raise up heroes of creativity among the business leaders who followed the age of mechanics to create electronics and high tech. The lady was a wowser.²²

McConnell omitted both Nathaniel and Barbara Branden, Rand's two most important early followers from his selection of interviewees. The only comment on Rand's split with the Brandens comes from Cynthia Peikoff, secretary to Rand at the end of her life, who describes the Brandens as "pathological liars."²³ McConnell makes no reference to the "trials" at which followers were excluded from the movement for their errors, though there are hints that she was often "betrayed" by her so-called followers. For some inexplicable reason, McConnell did not interview Rand's heir and the founder of the ARI, Leonard Peikoff, though both of his wives were. One can presumably rule out altruism.²⁴ He also passes over any analysis of her ideas. Moreover, McConnell assumes that the reader is aware of Rand's biography and the history of her movement. Many of the interviewees express their gratitude for the insights that her writings provided them. Despite this affirmation, McConnell does not probe very deeply, either what attracted them or to what may have in some cases ultimately repelled them.

That said, clearly a high proportion of McConnell's interviewees were culture workers such as entertainers, media professionals, academics or publishing professionals. Their roles as cultural gatekeepers gave them influence over the pattern and direction of public opinion, and they were undoubtedly as obliging in their roles as they were as McConnell's interviewees, notwithstanding the disrepute that Rand and her ideas often attracted. While most of Rand's early enthusiasts were culture workers of one kind or another such as entertainers, one early supporter was a career politician who in controversial circumstances would lead an important capitalist democracy.

Mr Fraser Goes to Washington

In the sphere of public policy her political and economic ideas were the guiding light of Australia's Prime Minister Fraser (1975-1983), as he explained to McConnell in his interview on August 17, 1999. Here, Fraser had no qualms in expressing his enthusiasm for Rand's radical capitalist ideology, even if his interpretation were not particularly doctrinaire.²⁵

As Malcolm Fraser explained, he first read Rand when he was already a mature politician. Fraser acknowledged that its libertarian credo resonated with his own libertarian worldview, "I thought there were some important truths in it," especially in relationship to what he considered public sector profligacy.²⁶ He goes so far as to affirm that if *Atlas Shrugged* is not his favorite book then it is "very close to" being his favorite book.²⁷ Ayn Rand evidently was aware of Fraser's interest in her ideas as she sent him a congratulatory telegram when he won the December 1975 election. Fraser observes that "[i]t was just one of those things that was moving and touching to think that somebody so far away, in a sense, could be interested about an election in Australia."²⁸

Malcolm Fraser boasted that Rand was impressed that his policies reflected her ideas: "You're the only head of government putting my policies into effect."²⁹ Fraser says, "I took that as a great compliment." He found her, moreover, to be "a most impressive person. She was a very significant personality. Great character. Great strength of purpose" and that "She is one of the most important writers of the last hundred years."³⁰ Fraser took great pride in the fact that "My government was about the first that

started to turn back the tide of excess socialist expenditure or social expenditure.”³¹ Fraser’s interview is noteworthy because he eventually met her at the State Reception organized by President Ford for his State Visit to the White House on July 27, 1976.³²

Yet any affirmation of Ayn Rand or her ideas is curiously absent from Malcolm Fraser’s memoirs. Instead, he admits to meeting the other two apostles of libertarianism, Milton Friedman and Friedrich Hayek, at the same time.³³ Rather, Fraser endorses the economic ideas of J.M. Keynes, whom he describes as “by far the best economist of the last century. I also think he has been the most maligned and misunderstood economist of the last century.”³⁴

Just two years after his interview with McConnell, in a speech given at Griffith University Fraser revealed the degree to which he abjured Rand’s libertarian ideology. He acknowledged that despite the many benefits of free international trade, “globalization,” there had also been many losers, that there had been market failures. Rather than quote Ayn Rand, he quotes George Soros’s concerns that laissez-faire capitalism may well undermine liberal democracy.³⁵ In addition, Fraser observes that

We have a trading system that is biased towards advanced nations. We have fragile financial markets with quite inadequate prudential supervisions and regulation. Social, cultural and environmental concerns are not adequately addressed. The problems of those who have lost out in the process of globalization, whether in rich or poor countries, are not addressed. Within these deficiencies, there are important problems that transcend national borders and which must be given attention.³⁶

While the corporate “triple bottom line” where “economic profit is weighed against the social and environmental costs of operating” appears to be his favored solution, he also considers an international institutional approach.³⁷ Of this, he is not fully convinced, so Fraser envisages a return of the nation state to center political stage. Fraser does not want to turn back the political clock, yet he envisages that

Governments must find a balance between allowing market forces to determine their own direction, and ensuring that the national interest is preserved. Some involvement in market regulation is essential both at a

national and international level, if we are to maximize the benefit of globalization for the most people.³⁸

He concludes his speech by observing that

Today our generation is without a political philosophy relevant to our time and circumstances. We have a theory of globalization but, baldly stated, it is cold and technical, it is not yet adequately related to human needs. Perhaps we need a new generation of philosophers, a new John Locke, a new Rousseau. . . . We need a philosophical framework.³⁹

Or perhaps we need to address Locke, Rousseau, et al. with more insightful and better informed questions. For Malcolm Fraser the Objectivism of Ayn Rand evidently no longer fits the bill.

Ayn Rand's Critique of Religion

One can perhaps find a clue to Rand's view of the contemporary two-step between the Objectivists and the Tea Party people in the Harry Binswanger interview. There, he reminisces that

When some religious conservatives were launching a movement called "The Moral Majority," Ayn said that she was considering starting a movement called "The Immoral Minority." Her idea was to find people who were not Objectivists but who were horrified at the Moral Majority, the religious right, and would join in a common front to oppose these people.⁴⁰

Rand was quite adamant that a conservatism whose moral and metaphysical foundations lie in religion lacked the rational individualism necessary to form the foundations of a free society.⁴¹ Furthermore, Rand's critique of Pope Paul VI's encyclical, *Populorum Progressio* (*The Development of Peoples*) (1967), highlights what in her opinion are its anti-rational, anti-individual, anti-property, and ultimately its anti-freedom message. Its message is one of statism and collectivism. As she concludes, "So much for those American 'conservatives' who claim that religion is the base of capitalism—and who believe that they can have capitalism and eat it, too, as the moral cannibalism of the altruist ethics demands."⁴²

Atlas Shrugged's hero, John Galt, commandeering President Thompson's national broadcast, makes clear his view of antithetical relationship

between religion and capitalism. With few if any qualms, he indicts the religious mindset, observing that

When a mystic declares that he feels the existence of a power superior to reason, he feels it all right, but that power is not an omniscient super-spirit of the universe, it is the consciousness of any passer-by to whom he has surrendered his own. A mystic is driven by the urge to impress, to cheat, to flatter, to deceive, to force that omnipotent consciousness of others.

He adds that

“They” are his only key to reality, he feels that he cannot exist save by harnessing their mysterious power and extorting their unaccountable consent, “They” are his only means of perception and, like a blind man who depends on the sight of a dog, he feels he must leash them in order to live. To control the consciousness of others becomes his only passion; power-lust is a weed that grows only in the vacant lots of an abandoned mind.⁴³

He affirms later that,

from its start, this country was a threat to the ancient rule of mystics. In the brilliant rocket-explosion of its youth, this country displayed to an incredulous world what greatness was possible to man, what happiness was possible on earth. It was one or the other: America or mystics.⁴⁴

For these reasons, Weiss’s interest in a movement whose members were both avowed Christians and Objectivists was piqued. Such paradoxes are catnip to any serious journalist.

That the purpose of Scott McConnell’s collection of interviews is to counter some long-standing highly negative perceptions of Ayn Rand’s persona is clear. This will of course assist in the further propagation and mainstreaming of her ideas. What emerges from these interviews is a somewhat more rounded picture of her life and her relationships with others, especially her husband, Frank O’Connor. By omitting the voices of key individuals such as psychologist and then heir designate Nathaniel Branden and Rand’s first biographer, Barbara Branden, as well as the economist Alan Greenspan, McConnell has evidently missed an opportunity for a more complete account of Rand’s relationships.⁴⁵

Yet the burden of persuasion remains. As the reader will see in the next section, Gary Weiss gives McConnell's *100 Voices* collection short shrift, observing that Ayn Rand's "nasty side didn't emerge at all in *100 Voices*."⁴⁶ That said, even he had to admit that in relation to his own oral history, "I came away with respect for the dedication and sincerity of her followers, and an appreciation of Rand's ability to tap into the emotions of the American people and influence the national dialogue."⁴⁷

Voices From the Present:

Gary Weiss Meets Rand's Contemporary Followers

In contrast to Scott McConnell's largely uncritical collection of interviews, a more skeptical interpretation of the merits of Rand's transactional individualism pervades Gary Weiss's series of interviews with some present day followers of Ayn Rand's Objectivism as well as some of her followers in the conservative populist Tea Party movement.

Gary Weiss is a freelance investigative financial journalist and author; he has also worked for *Condé Nast Portfolio*, *Businessweek* and *Barron's*. For his book, he interviewed Dr. Yaron Brook, president and executive director of the ARI, Dr. David Kelley, founder and senior fellow of the dissident The Atlas Society, and former associates of Rand, including the apostate Barbara Branden (whom McConnell did not interview), some contemporary followers of Objectivism, as well as a variety of Tea Party activists. Iris Bell, a former employee of Rand, uses Weiss's interview to complain about the way McConnell selectively edited her interview with him to create a viewpoint diametrically opposite to the one she presented him.⁴⁸

Weiss's questions were typically more probing than Scott McConnell's. He was typically interested in the circumstances in which the interviewee first encountered Rand's ideas, the extent of his or her knowledge of Rand's thought, and in any inconsistencies in their application of Rand's thought to contemporary issues. He also asks general questions probing the extent of the interviewee's understanding of the causes of the GFC. Dr. Leonard Peikoff, the owner of Rand's literary estate, declined Weiss's invitation to an interview, pleading that he was "more or less retired"; Dr. Alan Greenspan also declined to be interviewed, pleading his busy schedule.⁴⁹ For Weiss, McConnell's book is merely "ARI propaganda."⁵⁰

Weiss states that his interest in Ayn Rand arose in part from his belief that the standard explanations of Wall Street's ruthlessly acquisitive behavior "were glib: greed, status, and power, with 'regulatory capture' thrown in to explain government inaction." They "did not seem adequate." He says that he "saw a pattern of behavior in the actions and utterances of the main actors in the financial crisis." "I was wrong," he concedes about his earlier dismissal of her as unimportant. "And to make matters worse I was wrong for a long time."⁵¹ He observes that

Rand has experienced an extraordinary revival since the financial crisis, and nothing seems to be stopping her. It is a struggle for the soul of America, and she is winning. She is winning because she is not considered to be very important. She is dismissed by entire segments of informed opinion as a fringe character, a nut, a cultist, and an extremist. She is ridiculed, not analyzed, engaged or rebutted. Yes, she was an extremist, but she matters because her extremism is no longer on the fringe.⁵²

The main theme of Gary Weiss's book concerns the mainstreaming of Ayn Rand's radical capitalist ideas within contemporary American political life. So extensive has this phenomenon been that its net effect is that she is now a fixture within American popular culture. This mainstreaming, Weiss suggests, has not been a sudden event, rather, a long-term process, beginning with the publication of *The Fountainhead* in 1943. Her subsequent political activism, the publication of *Atlas Shrugged* in 1957, her emergence as a public intellectual during the 1960s and 1970s with often provocative, hence newsworthy, opinions, have meant that over a long period of time, she and her views became familiar to Americans.⁵³ It deepened further as Wall Street took heed of her message of small government and free markets.⁵⁴ For Weiss, Rand was the key piece of the puzzle concerning the emergence of the culture of greed on Wall Street. As he observes, "this philosophy of greed had a philosopher."⁵⁵

As notable as this rise is, for Weiss, her place in American public life acquired an enhanced significance with the emergence of public figures such as economist and presidential adviser, Alan Greenspan, and then after her death in 1982, a cabal of senators and congressmen, as well as electronic media commentators, who publicly referenced her books.⁵⁶ This influence became especially notable not only in the wake of the GFC,

but also as a reaction to the election of the first African-American president, Barack Obama in 2008.⁵⁷ Nor does Weiss underestimate the role of her enthusiasts in spreading the word via the internet.⁵⁸

More particularly, Weiss is interested in Rand's counter-intuitively inspirational role within the Tea Party, "She is the godmother of the Tea Party," that radical capitalist wing of Republican Party (GOP) whose mix of socially conservative populism and oligarchical opportunism has ruptured the traditional governing norms of the Republican Party. He cites David Frum's observation "that the Tea Party was trying 'to reinvent the GOP as the 'party of Ayn Rand.'"⁵⁹ This disruption extends to the undermining of the post-World War Two consensus established between business and labor. Weiss further cites Stanley Marcus, chairman of Neiman Marcus who in 1975 "decried the corporate obstruction of social legislation," and who noted that "All of us today," he said, "recognize that such legislation is an integral part of our system; that it has made us stronger."⁶⁰

These developments within American society naturally puzzle Weiss. He as with so many others read Rand "during the early to mid-1970s."⁶¹ In his opinion *Atlas Shrugged* "had the intellectual level of a pulp science-fiction novel. It was absurdly long and it was boring," and he notes that "Rand's concept of selfishness seemed to be an elaborate justification for oppressing the poor and middle class."⁶² He observes that his heritage is similar to hers, though less affluent. The capitalists that he knew and lived among were less glamorous than Rand's industrial titans. They were barely literate hucksters who swindled to survive. Her background meant that she was able to avoid the rigors of a marginal existence that radicalized so many of them. Now they are more educated and have moved from street barrows to Wall Street. A public education enabled Weiss to escape this marginal existence and to earn a decent life in society.⁶³ Though Weiss has presumably never read *Tourmaline*, his socially responsive individualism is reminiscent of Stow's.

We the Interviewed

The subjects of Gary Weiss's interviews cluster along different points on the libertarian conservative axis. Some are professional Objectivists,

either of the fundamentalist (the ARI) or the reform (the Atlas Society) schools, while others are lay followers. There are also those who share (or divide) their loyalty between Ayn Rand's ideas and their Tea Party activism. Weiss's focus is therefore somewhat narrower than McConnell's, whose interviewees included many not of the faith at all, merely Rand's professional associates. Weiss notes that both the ARI and its smaller Objectivist rival, the Atlas Society, have charitable status under US taxation law, even though both of them are engaged in political activity, contrary to both the spirit and letter of the relevant legislation.⁶⁴ That such a situation is thoroughly inconsistent with Rand's positions on the role of government in society and corporate and individual responsibility is evidently not an issue within the Objectivist movement naturally raises many questions concerning the measure of their own sense of fairness, as well as their own understanding of the nature of charity.

As Weiss's interviewees are almost all followers of Rand to one degree or another, her transactional individualism is the common thread in the interviews. Weiss probes for inconsistencies between their beliefs and their behavior, in other words, for hypocrisy in one form or another. To use Rand's expression, he "checks their premises" for contradictions. He notes that Rand herself at the end of her days, in the light of her and her husband's failing health signed up for Medicare, even though she fought it when it was introduced.⁶⁵

For a long period, Weiss sought unsuccessfully an interview with Dr. Yaron Brook. Prior to Brook's eventual agreement to be interviewed, Weiss had heard him speak at a fundraiser organized by the ARI in 2010 at the sumptuous St Regis Hotel in New York to raise funds to spread the Objectivist message. The focus of Brook's speech had been the importance of the ARI's ideological struggle against welfarism in America. The dissemination of Rand's novels free of charge to public schools to become part of the students' curriculum would grab the hearts and minds of the youth of America for Objectivism. Weiss of course notes that

Ayn Rand didn't believe in the use of force, and she didn't believe in government-run schools. She viewed government power as a 'gun'. Yet here we had hundreds of thousands of students, many if not most in schools funded by 'gun'-wielding governments, being forced at 'gun'-point to read the books of a person who would have kicked those kids out of those very schools and shut them down.⁶⁶

Weiss attempted to obtain an interview with Professor Tara Smith (Professor of Philosophy and holder of an endowed chair of Objectivist studies at the University of Texas at Austin) whose speech endorsed Brook's.⁶⁷ In the light of both speeches, Weiss observes that so far as contradictions are based on false premises, as Rand adjured, he could really only identify one false premise in this instance, that "Objectivism is free of contradictions."⁶⁸

A few months later in early 2011 Weiss attended a public debate between Yaron Brook on behalf of the ARI and Miles Rapoport on behalf of the Demos foundation in New York.⁶⁹ Most noteworthy in Weiss's blow-by-blow commentary on the debate was Brook's interpretation of the US Declaration of Independence in Rand's transactional individualist terms, countered by Rapoport's more orthodox interpretation in terms of socially responsive individualism. Weiss noted as well the Founding Father's theism over which (both Rand and) Brook passed in silence.⁷⁰

After Weiss mentioned to one of Brook's staffers that he had spoken with David Kelley of the rival Atlas Society, an interview with Yaron Brook was quickly forthcoming. In his interview Brook makes it clear that his *raison d'être* is the spreading of the Word, whether it be through a loose alliance with like-minded libertarians or through the Tea Party. As he observes, "It's a battle. We have very limited resources compared to the religious right. But we're doing what we can to try to infuse the Tea Party movement with as good ideas as possible"—with some success evidently given their warm receptions for him.⁷¹ He argues that "whatever Ayn Rand they absorb into their system, the world is a better place for that. If they absorbed all of it, it would be much better. But if they absorbed some of it, we're that much better than if they absorbed none of it."⁷² That he and the ARI have had a measure of success becomes clear in Weiss's interviews of a few leading Tea Partiers.

We the Politicking

For Gary Weiss, the conservative populist Tea Party movement has become more than merely another conduit in the mainstreaming of Ayn Rand's radical capitalist ideology. It has given her ideas a pivotal place in the national political discourse. This has not particularly surprised Weiss. In fact, he observes that "Ayn Rand was the very first Tea Bagger"

and notes that Rand was channeling the Tea Party decades before there even was a Tea Party.⁷³ As he observes,

Something remarkable happened early in the formation of the Tea Party: an atheistic philosophy achieved a foothold in a right-wing American political movement. If the Tea Party represented a unique and significant coalition of economic and social issue conservatives, as Scott Rasmussen and Douglas Schoen argue in their book *Mad as Hell*, then by 2011 Objectivists were firmly in place as a silent partner in that coalition.⁷⁴

This is not to say that the relationship is either well understood or problem free. Weiss notes that this involvement in an ostensibly conservative Christian political movement has been “low-key” largely because atheism is a key premise of Rand’s ideology.⁷⁵ The ARI even has a web page specifically for the ideological development of Tea Party members.⁷⁶ (It appears to have since been taken down). He notes furthermore that the media has paid more attention to the financial backers of the Tea Party rather than to the Rand-Tea Party axis.⁷⁷ The implications of this accommodation, if successful, for Weiss are quite dramatic, since “Objectivism will become even stronger than it is today, and its opponents will be even more off-balance than they already are.”⁷⁸

With this in mind, Weiss interviewed a number of prominent Tea Party activists with a view to ascertain the strength of Objectivism within their movement. One Objectivist Tea Party person asserted that

contrary to the propaganda, it’s [the Tea Party] not a bunch of homophobic, racist people; it’s just a bunch of people who are saying, “I’m tired of trying to be politically correct, and appeasing everybody and giving everybody the benefit of the doubt, and being so altruistically self-flagellating. Enough is enough.”⁷⁹

Weiss notes that they understood the GFC in terms of government economic mismanagement rather than corporate negligence or malfeasance. Moreover, traditional issues of social conservatism such as Americans’ right to bear assault weapons, school prayer, and the patriarchal family tended not to figure prominently as concerns. Weiss also observes that

The overarching factor, the reason Objectivists were so prominent in the Tea Party, was that the Randers had been exposed to some degree of ideological preparation—not necessarily very much, but enough—and had a sense of direction that non—Randers in the movement didn't have. Non—Randers are unlikely to have an entire philosophy to buttress their views, and to disseminate to their comrades.⁸⁰

That said, he also observes that the Tea Party was not being taken over by card carrying Objectivists as such, but by those “fellow travelers”—people influenced by her views without embracing all of them.”⁸¹ To make his point even clearer Weiss includes one interview with an uninformed Tea Party supporter which highlights the difference that familiarity with Rand's thought makes to the relative substance, focus and coherence of the Tea Party activists' answers.⁸² Indeed, as one Tea Party person observes to Weiss, “You won't find anybody more widely read than Rand” in the Tea Party.⁸³

Although the Tea Party has warmly accepted Rand's thought and her acolytes, Rand for her part scorned the political comprises of the conservatives of her day such as Barry Goldwater and Ronald Reagan. She believed that no accommodation was possible with the religious wing of the conservative movement. Rand damned conservatives such as William F. Buckley Jr. who tried to reconcile capitalism with Christianity—“moral treason,” she wrote, as much as she damned those libertarians who sought to abolish government altogether, whom she denounced as “plagiarists” (from her) and “a monstrous, disgusting bunch of people.”⁸⁴ Buckley's conservatives in turn vilified her atheism. For her this rapprochement with religion was symptomatic of a radical anti-intellectualism to be found among conservatives.⁸⁵ Yet Rand's atheism clearly does not disturb the Tea Party ideologues to the degree that it disturbed Buckley and his supporters. How times have changed. According to one Randian blogger, not a Tea Party member, “I do believe God created the universe. I think she's wrong,” and in reply to Weiss's question about the Tea Party, the same blogger said, “What's not to like?”⁸⁶ In Weiss's opinion, the bridge between the Randian Objectivists and the Christian right “was simple: politely disagree with Rand's beliefs that are repulsive to devout Christians.”⁸⁷

That many continue to believe in God while espousing Rand's rhetoric puzzles Weiss. He believes that "The Tea Party was a coalition of people of various political persuasions—from conservatives to libertarians to people tilting in the Randian direction—coalescing over laissez-faire capitalism and limited government."⁸⁸ In the light of his interviewees counterbalancing their support for Rand's thought with their deeply held religious views, the line in the Tea Party movement between the transactional and other (competing) conceptions (classical liberal and right wing Christian) of the individual blurs. That the Objectivist transactional conception has the most disciplined and articulate adherents suggests that it will ultimately prevail over the other conservative conceptions of the individual. More than a struggle for America's soul, the mainstreaming of Ayn Rand's radical capitalist ideology is thus a struggle for the soul of modernity.

In my opinion, Scott McConnell's and Gary Weiss's oral histories of Ayn Rand and her radical capitalist ideology, Objectivism, demonstrate the degree to which they have lost their fringe crackpot identities and have acquired a degree of respectability in mainstream democratic politics. McConnell's collection highlights her extensive impact on popular culture during her lifetime whereas Weiss's highlights the extent to which her followers are now reaching out to other conservatives and beyond to the mainstream community. They no longer merely seek roles that influence public opinion; rather, they now seek political leadership roles. Moreover, McConnell's interviews, to the extent that they provide clearer insights into Rand's persona as well as her personal relations, provide a clearer basis for ascertaining the truth from the many myths that surround her.

Weiss's collection also highlights the extent to which Rand's atheism is no longer an anathema to other conservatives. He also notes her extensive impact on the terms of the contemporary political discourse, for the most part resulting in the government's role in the economy becoming the central political issue rather than corporate negligence or malfeasance, or social justice. Rand's transactional individualism has thus made great strides to become the pre-eminent conception of the individual in the modern world, while alternative conceptions of the individual—such as Stow's socially responsive individualism as well as the classical liberal

conception and the religious conceptions of the individual—are quietly fading into the historical background. In all, Weiss’s book provides a readable and well-informed introduction to Rand’s life and thought. Regrettably, he goes lightly on her “trader principle,” merely deriding it as “shopworn.”⁸⁹ As it is in reality her *Grundkonzept*, her fundamental concept, a more comprehensive critique of this principle would have reinforced his critiques of the other, more circumstantial phenomena.⁹⁰

In his answer to McConnell’s question “Do you agree with Ayn Rand’s social philosophy?” the conservative journalist, Louis Rukeyser replied, “I believe that the same government that louses up the economy has no great capacity to rule in social issues either—to tell us which movies to see and what we should do in our bedrooms.”⁹¹ The question concerning the appropriate role of the government in the economy, or indeed, whether the government has any sort or role within the economy, remains the salient concern of the interviewees in both collections. As most of the interviewees are followers of Rand, this is as one would expect. The finer points of philosophical definition evidently do not appear to concern them even though Rand thought them important enough to attempt their reconceptualization.

Evidence of the mainstreaming of Rand’s thought can be seen in the lack of popular critique it has received in the wake of the GFC. The GFC has seen an explosion in her popularity. This is consistent with the tepid critiques of neo-liberalism more generally. Even empirical public institutional reports such as the Staff Discussion Note compiled by staff at International Monetary Fund in 2015, titled “Causes and Consequences of Income Inequality: A Global Perspective” have received only cursory responses from the commentariat.⁹²

This lack of traction points to more fundamental issues for public policy. In that sense, Weiss’s accusatory finger may be wide of the mark. He notes at various points that the revival in the popularity of Rand’s books may well be part of a wider counter cultural disenchantment. Unfortunately, he does not pursue this issue in any depth. Part of this popular disenchantment may well be due to the Welfare State becoming a victim of its own (relative) success in lifting many people out of poverty. Weiss himself points to the opportunities that it provided him in comparison to his ancestors.⁹³ Unlike Weiss many who have benefited from

Welfare State programs do not appear to be concerned whether or not subsequent generations are assisted by the same programs that assisted them. Furthermore, in the wake of the end of the Cold War the contemporary property owning classes do not appear to fear for their own future nor do they appear to be concerned with a radicalized underclass hence do not feel obliged to make them any concessions. Personal advancement rather than social justice has become the name of the game. Yet the world wide fragility of public finances and the ever widening socioeconomic inequalities are giving rise to widespread feelings of socioeconomic insecurity, as well as to an unpredicted instability within conservative politics themselves, which recent populist conservative electoral insurgencies have highlighted.

Much of Rand's posthumous success results from her re-conceptualization of the terms of the political discourse. This re-conceptualization poses a more problematic challenge to public policy. It grew out of the isolation in which Rand found herself as her writing career developed. The outrage that followed her radical re-imagining of the ethical and political world in *The Fountainhead* and *Atlas Shrugged* only served to harden her views in her later essays. The basis of her growing dogmatism was her belief that the progressive New Deal political discourse articulated by the New Dealers in response to the Great Depression of the 1930s was merely the thin edge of the totalitarian wedge. Her long struggle against this discourse convinced her that its terms needed to be radically changed. Therefore, notions of selfishness, selflessness, and altruism were given meanings in her writings that are counter-intuitive, indeed perverse, in comparison to those of ordinary usage or the usage of ethicists. Unsurprisingly, these redefinitions specifically reinforce her transactional conception of the individual.⁹⁴

Gary Weiss notes that Rand's citations in *The Virtue of Selfishness* of the *Webster's Collegiate Dictionary* and the *Oxford English Dictionary* definitions of "selfishness" were quite selective. He notes, moreover, that "Rand made up her own definitions of selflessness and altruism."⁹⁵ Rand's altruism came to mean "that man has no right to exist for his own sake, that service to others is the only justification for his existence, and that *self-sacrifice* is his highest moral duty, virtue, and value."⁹⁶ It follows that altruism is antithetical to reason and freedom and is the ultimate source

of all despotism. Rand also viewed altruism as inherently incompatible with capitalism, “Capitalism and altruism are incompatible; they are philosophical opposites; they cannot co-exist in the same man or the same society,” that “Capitalism was destroyed by the morality of altruism.” She also believed that “The social system based on and consonant with the altruist morality—with the code of self-sacrifice—is socialism, in all or any of its variants: fascism, Nazism and communism.”⁹⁷ Rand had without a doubt well earned her sobriquet of the “sorceress of reason.”⁹⁸

Weiss observes, moreover, that the notion of liberty so widely espoused by the various factions of the radical Right does not refer to the elimination of despotism, in line with the thinking of the American Founding Fathers, but merely to the elimination of taxation and government management of the economy.⁹⁹ Not surprisingly, as Yaron Brook proclaimed in his debate with Miles Rapoport of the Demos think tank, “If I had to start with getting rid of government from our lives, I would probably start with public education.”¹⁰⁰ Rand had learned well the lessons of the Soviet propagandists of her youth.¹⁰¹

One finds nothing in Rand’s writings, or in McConnell’s interviews or in the statements by Weiss’s interviewees comparable with Stow’s *The Law’s* expression of his love for his fellow townfolk,

Love inexpressible, inexhaustible. My love for him, it, them. No matter if such love is not returned. In the contemplation of stars, in the remembrance of oceans and flowers, in the voice of the lone crow, and the jacaranda-blue of far ranges, I have all I need of requital.¹⁰²

Stow’s socially responsive individualism recognizes the inherent inadequacies of a conception of the individual that is purely transactional. While undoubtedly pertinent to market based relationships, Rand’s transactional individualism fails to recognize that many, if not most, human relationships do not involve a commercially ratable *quid pro quo*. Indeed, often our relationships are based upon a spectrum of permanent or transitory bases, usually affective, that have a value but not a price.

By contrast Rand describes the deaths of passengers in a collision between two trains in an unsafe mountain tunnel as the inexorable result of their personal ideals of welfarism, of collectivism, in short, a result

of their altruism—a collision that is a metaphor for the responsibility of altruism for the wider collapse of society.

The man Bedroom A, Car No. 1, was a professor of sociology who taught that individual ability is of no consequence, that individual effort is futile, that an individual conscience is a useless luxury, that there is no individual mind or character or achievement, that everything is achieved collectively, and that it's masses that count, not men....These passengers were awake; there was not a man aboard the train who did not share one or more of their ideas. As the train went into the tunnel, the flame of Wyatt's Torch was the last thing they saw on earth.¹⁰³

That Ayn Rand's ideas represent a challenge to any sort of rational public policy making is readily apparent to those for whom an ounce of public education or training, or public health care, or public housing, offsets many pounds of hospital emergency ward care, homelessness or ultimately, participation in an expensive criminal justice system. Moreover, one would have thought that it is self-evident that business people may not care for expensive, compliance-focused insurance or for the high cost of legal representation in the judicial system to enforce their rights in lieu of a system of public law and administration and public welfare, where the costs are broadly dispersed.

For this reviewer, the contrast between Ayn Rand's and Scott McConnell's transactional individualism and that socially responsive conception of Randolph Stow and Gary Weiss cannot be clearer. In contrast to the perennial challenge of public policy, to reconcile the moral and political claims of the individual and the group, we now have a militant doctrine that denies the essential meaning of the second half of the dilemma. For many observers, Rand's militant doctrine is certainly seeking freedom, that is, freedom from responsibility for his or her neighbor's well-being and for the "needs of strangers," freedom from contributing toward the public infrastructure that is necessary for the viability of their businesses and the public education and public health of their employees and dependents. In my opinion, Ayn Rand's "trader principle" is a consummately inadequate idea around which to create a theory of ethics, let alone a social or political theory. It adds nothing to our conceptions of justice. Even in the market economy, in the light of current standards relating to

consumer protection, workplace safety and worker compensation, environmental protection and the like it is inadequate. The mainstreaming of this and related ideas, as Gary Weiss indicates, creates problems for public policy, not least of which is that the idea of a public policy itself is only given the scantest acknowledgement. The consequences of all of this are very much in plain view in the contemporary world.

According to John Galt, “A man whose vision extends to a shanty, might continue to build on your quicksands, to grab a fast profit and run. A man who envisions skyscrapers, will not.”¹⁰⁴ Perhaps. But why should he be trusted? In contrast, Stow’s narrator, The Law, makes the more modest claim that, “More truly we are tenants; tenants of shanties rented from the wind, tenants of the sunstruck miles.”¹⁰⁵ Between these competing visions of the individual there is humanity—men and women, living according to the family principle, the friendship principle, the neighbor principle, the citizen principle, and ultimately, the transcendental principle, not just “the trader principle,” voting and paying their share of taxes to build a better life for themselves, their families, their neighbors and for democratically imagined strangers.

NOTES

1. Ayn Rand, *Atlas Shrugged* (New York: Penguin New American Library, 1957); Randolph Stow, *Tourmaline* (1963; repr. Melbourne: Text Publishing, 2015).

2. Jonathan Freedland, “The New Age of Ayn Rand: How She Won Over Trump and Silicon Valley,” *The Guardian*, April 10, 2017, <https://www.theguardian.com/books/2017/apr/10/new-age-ayn-rand-conquered-trump-white-house-silicon-valley/>; Jennifer Burns, *Goddess of the Markets: Ayn Rand and the American Right* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009); Anne C. Heller, *Ayn Rand and the World She Made* (New York: Doubleday, 2009).

3. Letters Republic, Modern Library (1998), “100 Best Novels: the Readers’ List,” <https://lettersrepublic.wordpress.com/mlr/>.

4. For Donald Trump and his associates, see James Hohmann, “The Daily 202: Ayn Rand-Acolyte Donald Trump Stacks his Cabinet with Fellow Objectivists,” *The Washington Post*, December 13, 2016, https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/powerpost/paloma/daily-202/2016/12/13/daily-202-ayn-rand-acolyte-donald-trump-stacks-his-cabinet-with-fellow-objectivists/584f5cdfegb69b36fcfeaf3b/?utm_t&utm_term=.1a9a5db2d26f; and for Alan Greenspan, see Sebastian Mallaby, *The Man Who Knew: The Life and Times of Alan Greenspan* (New York: Penguin Book, 2017), ch. 4; for Clarence Thomas and for the other US politicians, see Wikipedia, “List of

People Influenced by Ayn Rand,” https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_people_influenced_by_Ayn_Rand; see also Ted Cruz’s “testimony” in relation to the defunding of Obamacare: YouTube, “Ted Cruz Reads from *Atlas Shrugged* (published September 25, 2013), https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IS_qbVksG2s/.

5. For these admirers of Rand see, Wikipedia, “List of People Influenced by Ayn Rand,” https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_people_influenced_by_Ayn_Rand and John Crace, “Ayn Rand’s A-List Fan Club,” *The Guardian*, March 11, 2009, <https://www.theguardian.com/books/2009/mar/11/ayn-rand>; for David Leyonhjelm, see the Liberal Democratic Party website at <https://www.ldp.org.au/>.

6. Thomas Piketty, *Capital in the Twenty-First Century*, trans. Arthur Goldhammer (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2017); Jonathan Chait, “Wealthcare: Ayn Rand and the Invincible Cult of Selfishness on the American Right,” *The New Republic*, September 14, 2009 <https://newrepublic.com/article/69239/wealthcare-0>.

7. Rand, *Atlas Shrugged*, 731–2, 1069, 1139; Stow, *Tourmaline*, 252.

8. Rand, *Atlas Shrugged*, 101.

9. Ayn Rand, *The Voice of Reason*, edited and with additional essays by Leonard Peikoff and Peter Schwartz (New York: Meridian, 1990), 21; Ayn Rand, “The Objectivist Ethics,” in *The Virtue of Selfishness* (New York: Penguin Signet, 1961), 16.

10. Stow, *Tourmaline*, 41, 69, 165, 219.

11. *Ibid.*, 44.

12. *Ibid.*, 44–5.

13. *Ibid.*, 169–72.

14. *Ibid.*, 82, 235.

15. *Ibid.*, 234.

16. *Ibid.*, 215–6, 249.

17. *Ibid.*, 221.

18. Nathaniel Branden was excluded for his romantic betrayal of Rand; Greenspan for his alleged apostasy for acknowledging that a market failure led to the Global Financial Crisis.

19. Scott McConnell (compiler and editor), *100 Voices: An Oral History of Ayn Rand* (New York: Penguin New American Library, 2011), ix–x.

20. *Ibid.*, 169.

21. *Ibid.*, xi.

22. *Ibid.*, 202.

23. *Ibid.*, 554.

24. See further, “Epilogue: Leonard Peikoff and Recollections of Ayn Rand,” in Podritske, M. and Peter Schwartz (eds.), *Objectively Speaking: Ayn Rand Interviewed* (Lanham: Lexington Books, 2009), 255–65.

25. Scott McConnell, *100 Voices*, 503–6.

26. *Ibid.*, 503–4.

27. *Ibid.*, 503.

28. *Ibid.*, 505–6.
29. *Ibid.*, 504.
30. *Ibid.*, 506.
31. *Ibid.*, 504.
32. The Ford Library, “Seating Chart for State Dinner for Prime Minister Malcolm Fraser of Australia July 27, 1976,” <https://www.fordlibrarymuseum.gov/library/exhibits/dinners/19760727sc.pdf>.
33. Malcolm Fraser and Margaret Simons, *Malcolm Fraser: The Political Memoirs* (Carlton: Vic.: The Miegunyah Press, 2010), 349–50.
34. *Ibid.*, 51.
35. Malcolm Fraser, “High Noon for Globalisation,” 3, speech given at Griffith University, July 9. 2001. The University of Melbourne Archives, The Malcolm Fraser Collection, <https://archives.unimelb.edu.au/explore/collections/malcolmfraser/resources/postparliamentspeeches/high-noon-for-globalisation/> Accessed April 24, 2019.
36. *Ibid.*, 7.
37. *Ibid.*, 7–10.
38. *Ibid.*, 10.
39. *Ibid.*
40. McConnell, *100 Voices*, 586.
41. Ayn Rand, “Conservatism: An Obituary,” in *Capitalism: The Unknown Ideal* (New York: Penguin Signet, 1967), 214–25.
42. Ayn Rand, “Requiem for Man,” in *Capitalism: The Unknown Ideal* (New York: Penguin Signet, 1967), 340–6, 361.
43. Rand, *Atlas Shrugged*, 1045.
44. *Ibid.*, 1061.
45. Nathaniel Branden, *Who is Ayn Rand? An Analysis of the Novels of Ayn Rand by Nathaniel Branden with a Biographical Essay by Barbara Branden* (New York: Random House, 1962); Barbara Branden, *The Passion of Ayn Rand* (London: W. H. Allen, 1987); Alan Greenspan, *The Age of Turbulence: Adventures in a New World* (New York: Penguin Press, 2007).
46. Gary Weiss, *Ayn Rand Nation: The Hidden Struggle for America’s Soul* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 2012), 47.
47. *Ibid.*, 20.
48. *Ibid.*, 40, 44.
49. *Ibid.*, 52, 211.
50. *Ibid.*, 47.
51. *Ibid.*, 2.
52. *Ibid.*, 4.
53. *Ibid.*, 5–8.
54. *Ibid.*, 20–1.
55. *Ibid.*, 3.
56. *Ibid.*, 6–7.

57. *Ibid.*, 15–20.
58. *Ibid.*, 7.
59. *Ibid.*, 5, 17.
60. *Ibid.*, 8.
61. *Ibid.*
62. *Ibid.*, 11–2.
63. *Ibid.*, 11–14, 101–2.
64. *Ibid.*, 98–9.
65. *Ibid.*, 61–4.
66. *Ibid.*, 57.
67. *Ibid.*, 58.
68. *Ibid.*, 49–64, esp. 57–8.
69. *Ibid.*, 119.
70. *Ibid.*, 195–208.
71. *Ibid.*, 245.
72. *Ibid.*
73. *Ibid.*, 138–9.
74. *Ibid.*, 177.
75. *Ibid.*, 143–4, 177.
76. *Ibid.*, 97.
77. *Ibid.*, 144.
78. *Ibid.*, 93; see also 144.
79. *Ibid.*, 190.
80. *Ibid.*, 193.
81. *Ibid.*, 157.
82. *Ibid.*, 160–8.
83. *Ibid.*, 157.
84. Rand, “Conservatism: An Obituary,” 217.
85. *Ibid.*, 214–25.
86. Weiss, *Ayn Rand Nation*, 134, 137.
87. *Ibid.*, 155.
88. *Ibid.*, 183.
89. Rand, “Conservatism: An Obituary,” 218; Weiss, *Ayn Rand Nation*, 205.
90. According to Rand, “The principle of *trade* is the only rational ethical principle for all human relationships, personal and social, private and public, spiritual and material. It is the principle of *justice*.” Rand, “The Objectivist Ethics,” 34.
91. McConnell, *100 Voices*, 574.
92. IMF, “Causes and Consequences of Income Inequality: A Global Perspective,” Staff Discussion Note (Washington DC: IMF, 2015), <https://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/sdn/2015/sdn1513.pdf>.
93. Weiss, *Ayn Rand Nation*, 13–4, 34–5.
94. Burns, *Goddess of the Markets*.

95. Weiss, *Ayn Rand Nation*, 134-5.
96. Rand, "Conservatism: An Obituary," 217.
97. *Ibid.*, 217-8, 224.
98. Nathaniel Branden, *Judgment Day: My Years With Ayn Rand* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1989), 156.
99. Weiss, *Ayn Rand Nation*, 174-6.
100. *Ibid.*, 207.
101. Chait, "Wealthcare."
102. Stow, *Tourmaline*, 116-7.
103. Rand, *Atlas Shrugged*, 605-7.
104. *Ibid.*, 1063.
105. Stow, *Tourmaline*, 5.