

ENVIRONMENTALISM:
The Anti-Industrial Revolution

by
Ayn Rand

This reprint compliments of:

THE AYN RAND INSTITUTE

THE CENTER FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF OBJECTIVISM

From *The New Left: The Anti-Industrial Revolution* by Ayn Rand. Copyright © 1970, 1971 by Ayn Rand. Copyright © 1970, 1971 by The Objectivist, Inc. Reprinted by arrangement with NAL Penguin Inc., New York, New York and with the permission of the Estate of Ayn Rand.

Excerpted from
“The Left: Old and New”
by Ayn Rand

The real motive behind the anti-pollution campaign is stated all but explicitly [in *Time* magazine, December 19, 1969]: “As the decade advances, it will become clear that if the ecological effort is to succeed, much of today’s existing technology will have to be scrapped and something new developed in its place. [“You’ll do something, Mr. Rearden!”]...Increasingly, it will be seen that any kind of mass transportation, however powered, is more efficient than the family car. [Such as the New York subway, for instance?]... Planning will have to be a much greater concern.”

And here is the motive behind the motive: “The attitude, central to the modern mind, that all technology is good technology will have to be changed radically. ‘Our society is trained to accept all new technology as progress, or to look upon it as an aspect of fate,’ says George Wald, Harvard’s Nobel-laureate biologist. ‘Should one do everything one can? The usual answer is “Of course”; but the right answer is “Of course not.”’ ...

“Bertrand de Jouvenal adds: ‘Western man has not lived with his natural environment. He has merely conquered it.’”

By the grace of Aristotle, of Galileo, of Pasteur, of Edison and of a long, thin line of often-martyred men stretching back through millennia, Western man has not lived with his natural environment, in the sense intended by that quotation. But the rest of mankind has and does.

An Asian peasant who labors through all of his waking hours, with tools created in Biblical times—a South American aborigine who is devoured by piranha in a jungle stream—an African who is bitten by the tsetse fly—an Arab whose teeth are green with decay

in his mouth—these do live with their “natural environment,” but are scarcely able to appreciate its beauty. Try to tell a Chinese mother, whose child is dying of cholera: “Should one do everything one can? Of course not.” Try to tell a Russian housewife, who trudges miles on foot in sub-zero weather in order to spend hours standing in line at a state store dispensing food rations, that America is defiled by shopping centers, expressways and family cars.

It is not possible that the “anti-pollution”—i.e., *anti-technology*—crusaders are ignorant of man’s condition in the midst of an *unconquered* nature. It does not seem possible that, knowing it, they would advocate its return. But there it is, out of their own mouth.

The thing that permits men to utter public statements which, if believed, would cause people to run from them as from lepers, is the fact that no one believes it. Most people have been conditioned to regard broad generalizations, abstract ideas, fundamental principles and logical consequences as impotent, irrelevant, invalid or non-existent. “Aw, they don’t mean it,” is the general attitude toward the anti-technologists, “they don’t want to go that far. They just want to clean up the smog and the sewage.” Well, Hitler, too, announced his abstract principles and goals in advance, and evoked a similar reaction from the pragmatists of the time. The Soviets have openly preached world conquest for fifty years and have conquered one-third of the globe’s population—yet some people still do not believe that they mean it.

(As far as the issue of actual pollution is concerned, it is primarily a scientific, not a political, problem. In regard to the political principle involved: if a man creates a physical danger or harm to others, which extends beyond the line of his own property, such as unsanitary conditions or even loud noise, and if this is *proved*, the law can and does hold him responsible. If the condition is collective, such as in an overcrowded city, appropriate and *objective* laws can be defined, protecting the rights of all those involved—as was done in the case of oil rights, air-space rights, etc. But such laws cannot demand the impossible, must not be aimed at a single scapegoat, i.e., the industrialists, and must take into consideration the whole context of the problem, i.e., the absolute necessity of the continued existence of industry—if the preservation of human life is the standard.)

(February 1970)

Excerpted from
"The Anti-Industrial Revolution"

by Ayn Rand

Now observe that in all the propaganda of the ecologists—amidst all their appeals to nature and pleas for "harmony with nature"—there is no discussion of *man's* needs and the requirements of *his* survival. Man is treated as if he were an *unnatural* phenomenon. Man cannot survive in the kind of state of nature that the ecologists envision—i.e., on the level of sea urchins or polar bears. In that sense, man is the weakest of animals: he is born naked and unarmed, without fangs, claws, horns or "instinctual" knowledge. Physically, he would fall an easy prey, not only to the higher animals, but also to the lowest bacteria: he is the most complex organism and, in a contest of brute force, extremely fragile and vulnerable. His only weapon—his basic means of survival—is his mind.

In order to survive, man has to discover and produce everything he needs, which means that he has to *alter* his background and adapt it to his needs. Nature has not equipped him for adapting himself to his background in the manner of animals. From the most primitive cultures to the most advanced civilizations, man has had to *manufacture* things; his well-being depends on his success at production. The lowest human tribe cannot survive without that alleged source of pollution: fire. It is not merely symbolic that fire was the property of the gods which Prometheus brought to man. The ecologists are the new vultures swarming to extinguish that fire.

It is not necessary to remind you of what human existence was like—for centuries and millennia—prior to the Industrial Revolution. That the ecologists ignore or evade it is so terrible a crime against humanity that it serves as their protection: no one believes that anyone can be capable of it. But, in this matter, it is not even necessary to look at history; take a look at the conditions of existence in the undeveloped countries, which means: on most of this earth, with the exception of the blessed island which is Western civilization.

The wisest words I read on the subject of pollution and ecology were spoken by the ambassador of one of those countries. At a United Nations symposium, Oliver Weerasinghe, ambassador from Ceylon, said: "The two-thirds of mankind who live in developing countries do not share the same concern for the environment as the other one-third in more affluent regions. *The primary problem for these developing areas is the struggle for the bare necessities of life.* It would, therefore, not be realistic to expect governments of these areas to carry out recommendations regarding environmental protection which might impede or restrict economic progress." (*Industry Week*, June 29, 1970. Italics mine.)

In Western Europe, in the preindustrial Middle Ages, man's life expectancy was 30 years. In the nineteenth century, Europe's population grew by 300 percent—which is the best proof of the fact that for the first time in human history, industry gave the great masses of people a chance to survive.

If it were true that a heavy concentration of industry is destructive to human life, one would find life expectancy declining in the more advanced countries. But it has been rising steadily. Here are the figures on life expectancy in the United States (from the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company):

1900—47.3 years
1920—53 years
1940—60 years
1968—70.2 years (the latest figures compiled)

Anyone over 30 years of age today, give a silent "Thank you" to the nearest, grimmest, sootiest smokestacks you can find.

No, of course, factories do not have to be grimy—but this is not an issue when the survival of technology is at stake. And clean air is not the issue nor the goal of the ecologists' crusade.

The figures on life expectancy in different countries around the globe are as follows (from *The New York Times Almanac*, 1970):

England	—70 years
India	—50 years
East Africa	—43 years
Congo	—37 years
South Vietnam	—35 years

If you consider, not merely the length, but the kind of life men have to lead in the undeveloped parts of the world—"the *quality* of life," to borrow, with full meaning, the ecologists' meaningless catch phrase—if you consider the squalor, the misery, the helplessness, the fear, the unspeakably hard labor, the festering diseases, the plagues, the starvation, you will begin to appreciate the role of technology in man's existence.

Make no mistake about it: it is *technology* and *progress* that the nature-lovers are out to destroy. To quote again from the *Newsweek* survey [*Newsweek*, January 26, 1970]: "What worries ecologists is that people now upset about the environment may ultimately look to technology to solve everything..." This is repeated over and over again; technological solutions, they claim, will merely create new problems.

"...a number of today's environmental reformers conclude that mankind's main hope lies not in technology but in abstinence—fewer births and less gadgetry....The West Coast has also spawned a fledgling 'zero GNP growth' movement. Harvey Wheeler, of Santa Barbara's Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, believes the U.S. may reach a point—perhaps in ten years—when 'the present rate of growth is absolutely disastrous and economic growth may well have to be eliminated altogether.'"

And: "Russell Train [one of President Nixon's advisers] warns that improving the quality of life will entail unpopular cutbacks on luxuries. 'People have shown no inclination,' he points out, 'to give up the products of affluence—TV sets and gadgets.'"...

The immediate—though not the ultimate—motive is made quite clear in the *Newsweek* survey. "To a man they [the ecologists] maintain that a national population plan must be invoked, primarily through a national land-use plan." "The battle against pollution must also overcome the jurisdictional lines that carve the planet into separate sovereignties." The ecologists' programs cannot be accomplished "without some fairly important modifications of the American tradition of free enterprise and free choice." The "obstacles to reform [are] man's traditional notions of growth, sovereignty, individualism and time." "What is needed, the ecologists suggest, is a rebirth of community spirit, not only among men but among all of nature." How they intend to impose a "community spirit" on nature, where living species exist by devouring one another, is not indicated.

The immediate goal is obvious: the destruction of the remnants of capitalism in today's mixed economy, and the establishment of a global dictatorship. This goal does not have to be inferred—many speeches and books on the subject state explicitly that the ecological crusade is a means to that end.

There are two significant aspects in this New Left switch of the collectivists' line. One is the open break with the intellect, the dropping of the mask of intellectuality worn by the old left, the substitution of birds, bees and beauty—"nature's beauty"—for the pseudoscientific, super-technological paraphernalia of Marx's economic determinism. A more ludicrous shrinking of a movement's stature or a more obvious confession of intellectual bankruptcy could not be invented in fiction.

The other significant aspect is the reason behind this switch: the switch represents an open admission—by Soviet Russia and its facsimiles around the world and its sympathizers of every political sort and shade—that collectivism is an industrial and technological failure; that *collectivism cannot produce*.

The root of production is man's mind; the mind is an attribute of the individual and it does not work under orders, controls and compulsion, as centuries of stagnation have demonstrated. Progress cannot be planned by government, and it cannot be restricted or retarded; it can only be stopped, as every statist government has demonstrated. If we are to consider nature, what about the fact that collectivism is incompatible with man's nature and that the first requirement of man's mind is freedom? But observe that just as the ancient mystics of spirit regarded the mind as a faculty of divine origin and, therefore, as unnatural, so today's mystics of muscle, observing that the mind is not possessed by animals, regard it as unnatural.

If concern with poverty and human suffering were the collectivists' motive, they would have become champions of capitalism long ago; they would have discovered that it is the only political system capable of producing abundance. But they evaded the evidence as long as they could. When the issue became overwhelmingly clear to the whole world, the collectivists were faced with a choice: either turn to the right, in the name of humanity—or to the left, in the name of dictatorial power. They turned to the left—the New Left.

Instead of their old promises that collectivism would create universal abundance and their denunciations of capitalism for creating poverty, they are now denouncing capitalism *for creating abundance*. Instead of promising comfort and security for everyone, they are now denouncing people for being comfortable and secure. They are still struggling, however, to inculcate guilt and fear; these have always been their psychological tools. Only instead of exhorting you to feel guilty of exploiting the poor, they are now exhorting you to feel guilty of exploiting land, air and water. Instead of threatening you with a bloody rebellion of the disinherited masses, they are now trying—like witch doctors addressing a tribe of savages—to scare you out of your wits with thunderously vague threats of unknowable, cosmic cataclysm, threats that cannot be checked, verified or proved.

One element, however, has remained unchanged in the collectivists' technique, the element without which they would have had no chance: altruism—the appeal for self-sacrifice, the denial of man's right to exist. But observe the shrinking of plausibility with the expansion of the scale: some forty years ago, Franklin D. Roosevelt exhorted this country to sacrifice for the sake of an underprivileged "one-third of a nation"; fifteen years later, the sacrifice was stretched to include the "underprivileged" of the whole globe; today, you are asked to sacrifice for the sake of seaweeds and inanimate matter....

What is the semiplausable bait? The actual instances of local pollution and dirt, which do exist. City smog and filthy rivers are not good for men (though they are not the kind of danger that the ecological panic-mongers proclaim them to be). This is a scientific, *technological* problem—not a political one—and it can be solved *only* by technology. Even if smog were a risk to human life, we must remember that life in nature, without technology, is wholesale death.

As far as the role of government is concerned, there are laws—some of them passed in the nineteenth century—prohibiting certain kinds of pollution, such as the dumping of industrial wastes into rivers. These laws have not been enforced. It is the enforcement of such laws that those concerned with the issue may properly demand. Specific laws—forbidding specifically *defined* and *proved* harm, physical harm, to persons or property—are the only solution to problems of this kind. But it is not solutions that the leftists are seeking, it is controls.

Observe that industry has been made the scapegoat in this issue, as in all modern issues. But industry is not the only culprit; for instance, the handling of the sewage and garbage disposal problems, which is so frequently denounced, has been the province of the local governments. Yet the nature-lovers scream that industry should be abolished, or regulated out of existence, and that more power should be given to the government. And as far as the visible dirt is concerned, it is not the industrial tycoons who strew beer cans and soda-pop bottles all over the highways of America.

Since the enormous weight of controls created by the welfare-state theorists has hampered, burdened, corrupted, but not yet destroyed American industry, the collectivists have found—in ecology—a new excuse for the creation of more controls, more corruption, more favor-peddling, more harassment of industry by more irresponsible pressure groups.

The industrialists, as usual, will be the last to protest. In a mixed economy, the industrialists will swallow anything and apologize for anything. Their abject crawling and climbing on the “environmental” bandwagon is consistent with their policy of the past four or five decades, inculcated by Pragmatism: they would rather make a deal with a few more bureaucrats than stand up and face the issue in terms of philosophical-moral principles.

The greatest guilt of modern industrialists is not the fumes of their factory smokestacks, but the pollution of this country’s intellectual life, which they have condoned, assisted and supported.

As to the politicians, they have discovered that the issue of pollution is pay dirt and they have gone all out for it. They see it as a safe, non-controversial, “public-spirited” issue, which can mean anything to anyone. Besides, a politician would not dare oppose it and be smeared from coast to coast as an advocate of smog. All sorts of obscure politicians are leaping into prominence and onto television screens by proposing “ecological” reforms. A wise remark on the subject was made by a politician with whom I seldom agree: Jesse Unruh of California. He said: “Ecology has become the political substitute for the word mother.”

The deeper significance of the ecological crusade lies in the fact that it does expose a profound threat to mankind—though not in the sense its leaders allege. It exposes the ultimate motive of the collectivists—the naked essence of *hatred* for achievement,

which means: hatred for reason, for man, for life.

In today's drugged orgy of boastfully self-righteous swinishness, the masks are coming down and you can hear all but explicit confessions of that hatred.

For example, five years ago, on the occasion of the East Coast's massive power failure and blackout, *Life* magazine published the following in its issue of November 19, 1965: "It shouldn't happen every evening, but a crisis like the lights going out has its good points. In the first place, it deflates human smugness about our miraculous technology, which, at least in the area of power distribution and control, now stands revealed as utterly flawed...and it is somehow delicious to contemplate the fact that all our beautiful brains and all those wonderful plans and all that marvelous equipment has combined to produce a system that is unreliable."

Currently, the *Newsweek* survey criticizes the spectacular progress of the United States, as follows: "The society's system of rewards favored the man who produced more, who found new ways to exploit nature. There were no riches or prestige for the man who made a deliberate decision to leave well enough alone—in this case, his environment." Observe that this "system of rewards" is treated as if it were an arbitrary whim of society, not an inexorable fact of nature. Who is to provide the riches—or even the minimum sustenance—for the man who does not choose "to exploit nature"? What is "prestige" to be granted for—for nonproduction and non-achievement? For holding man's life cheaper than his physical environment? When man had to "leave well enough alone"—in prehistoric times—his life expectancy was 15 to 20 years.

This phrase, "to leave well enough alone," captures the essence of the deaf, blind, lethargic, fear-ridden, hatred-eaten human ballast that the men of the mind—the prime movers of human survival and progress—have had to drag along, to feed and to be martyred by, through all the millennia of mankind's history.

The Industrial Revolution was the great breakthrough that liberated man's mind from the weight of that ballast. The country made possible by the Industrial Revolution—The United States of America—achieved the magnificence which only free men can achieve, and demonstrated that reason is the means, the base, the precondition of man's survival.

The enemies of reason—the mystics, the man-haters and

life-haters, the seekers of the unearned and the unreal—have been gathering their forces for a counterattack, ever since. It was the corruption of philosophy that gave them a foothold and slowly gave them the power to corrupt the rest.

The enemies of the Industrial Revolution—its displaced persons—were of the kind that had fought human progress for centuries, by every means available. In the Middle Ages, their weapon was the fear of God. In the nineteenth century, they still invoked the fear of God—for instance, they opposed the use of anesthesia on the ground that it defies God's will, since God intended men to suffer. When this weapon wore out, they invoked the will of the collective, the group, the tribe. But since this weapon has collapsed in their hands, they are now reduced, like cornered animals, to baring their teeth and their souls, and to proclaiming that man has no right to exist—by the divine will of inanimate matter.

The demand to "restrict" technology is the demand to *restrict* man's mind. It is nature—i.e., reality—that makes both these goals impossible to achieve. Technology can be destroyed, and the mind can be paralyzed, but neither can be restricted. Whenever and wherever such restrictions are attempted, it is the mind—not the state—that withers away.

Technology is applied science. The progress of theoretical science and of technology—i.e., of human knowledge—is moved by such a complex and interconnected sum of the work of individual minds that no computer or committee could predict and prescribe its course. The discoveries in one branch of knowledge lead to unexpected discoveries in another; the achievements in one field open countless roads in all the others. The space exploration program, for instance, has led to invaluable advances in medicine. Who can predict when, where or how a given bit of information will strike an active mind and what it will produce?

To restrict technology would require omniscience—a total knowledge of all the possible effects and consequences of a given development for all the potential innovators of the future. Short of such omniscience, restrictions mean the attempt to regulate the unknown, to limit the unborn, to set rules for the undiscovered.

And more: an active mind will not function by permission. An inventor will not spend years of struggle dedicated to an excruciating work if the fate of his work depends, not on the criterion

of demonstrable truth, but on the arbitrary decision of some "authorities." He will not venture out on a course where road-blocks are established at every turn, in the form of the horrendous necessity to seek, to beg, to plead for the consent of a committee. The history of major inventions, even in semi-free societies, is a shameful record, as far as the collective wisdom of an entrenched professional consensus is concerned.

As to the notion that progress is unnecessary, that we know enough, that we can stop on the present level of technological development and maintain it, without going any farther—ask yourself why mankind's history is full of the wreckage of civilizations that could not be maintained and vanished along with such knowledge as they had achieved; why men who do not move forward, fall back into the abyss of savagery.

Even a primitive, preindustrial economy, run primarily on muscle power, cannot function successfully through the mere repetition of a routine of motions by passively obedient men who are not permitted to think. How long would a modern factory last if it were operated by mechanics trained to a routine performance, without a single engineer among them? How long would the engineers last without a single scientist? And a scientist—in the proper meaning of the term—is a man whose mind does not stand still.

Machines are an extension of man's mind, as intimately dependent on it as his body, and they crumble, as his body crumbles, when the mind stops.

A stagnant technology is the equivalent of a stagnant mind. A "restricted" technology is the equivalent of a *censored* mind....

Now observe the grim irony of the fact that the ecological crusaders and their young activist followers are vehement enemies of the status quo—that they denounce middle-class passivity, defy conventional attitudes, clamor for action, scream for "change"—and that *they are cringing advocates of the status quo in regard to nature.*

In confrontation with nature, their plea is: "Leave well enough alone." Do not upset the balance of nature—do not disturb the birds, the forests, the swamps, the oceans—do not rock the boat (or even build one)—do not experiment—do not venture out—what was good enough for our anthropoid ancestors is good enough for us—adjust to the winds, the rains, the man-eating tigers, the malarial mosquitoes, the tsetse flies—do not rebel—do not anger the unknowable

demons who rule it all.

In their cosmology, man is infinitely malleable, controllable and dispensable, nature is sacrosanct. It is only man—and his work, his achievement, his mind—that can be violated with impunity, while nature is not to be defiled by a single bridge or skyscraper. It is only human beings that they do not hesitate to murder, it is only human schools that they bomb, only human habitations that they burn, only human property that they loot—while they crawl on their bellies in homage to the reptiles of the marshlands, whom they protect from the encroachments of human airfields, and humbly seek the guidance of the stars on how to live on this incomprehensible planet.

They are worse than conservatives—they are “conservationists.” What do they want to conserve? Anything, except man. What do they want to rule? Nothing, except man.

“The creator’s concern is the conquest of nature. The parasite’s concern is the conquest of men,” said Howard Roark in *The Fountainhead*. It was published in 1943. Today, the moral inversion is complete; you can see it demonstrated in action and in explicit confessions.

The obscenity of regarding scientific progress as “aggression” against nature, while advocating universal slavery for man, needs no further demonstration.

But some of those crusaders’ vicious absurdities are worth noting.

Whom and what are they attacking? It is not the luxuries of the “idle rich,” but the availability of “luxuries” to the broad masses of people. They are denouncing the fact that automobiles, air conditioners and television sets are no longer toys of the rich, but are within the means of an average American worker—a beneficence that does not exist and is not fully believed anywhere else on earth...

What do they regard as luxury? Anything above the “bare necessities” of physical survival—with the explanation that men would not have to labor so hard if it were not for the “artificial needs” created by “commercialism” and “materialism.” In reality, the opposite is true: the less the return on your labor, the harder the labor. It is much easier to acquire an automobile in New York City than a meal in the jungle. Without machines and technology, the task of mere survival is a terrible, mind-and-body-wrecking ordeal. In “nature,” the struggle for food, clothing and shelter consumes all

of a man's energy and spirit; it is a losing struggle—the winner is any flood, earthquake or swarm of locusts. (Consider the 500,000 bodies left in the wake of a single flood in Pakistan; they had been men who lived without technology.) To work only for bare necessities is a *luxury* that mankind cannot afford.

Who is the first target of the ecological crusade? No, not big business. The first victims will be a specific group: those who are young, ambitious and poor. The young people who work their way through college; the young couples who plan their future, budgeting their money and their time; the young men and women who aim at a career; the struggling artists, writers, composers who have to earn a living, while developing their creative talents; any purposeful human being—i.e., the best of mankind. To them, *time* is the one priceless commodity, most passionately needed. *They* are the main beneficiaries of electric percolators, frozen foods, washing machines and labor-saving devices. And if the production and, above all, the *invention* of such devices is retarded or diminished by the ecological crusade, it will be one of the darkest crimes against humanity—particularly because the victims' agony will be private, their voices will not be heard, and their absence will not be noticed publicly until a generation or two later (by which time, the survivors will not be able to notice anything).

But there is a different group of young people, the avant-garde and cannon fodder of the ecological crusade, the products of "Progressive" education: the purposeless. These are the concrete-bound, mentally stunted youths, who are unable to think or to project the future, who can grasp nothing but the immediate moment. To them, time is an enemy to kill—in order to escape a confrontation with inner emptiness and chronic anxiety....

These youths have some counterparts among the group they regard as their antagonists: the middle class. I once knew a hard-working housewife whose husband offered to buy her a dish-washing machine, which he could easily afford; she refused it; she would not name her reason, but it was obvious that she dreaded the emptiness of liberated time....

These are its followers. The soul of its leaders is worse. What do the leaders hope to gain in practice? I shall answer by quoting a passage from *Atlas Shrugged*. It was published in 1957—and I must say that I am not happy about having been prophetic on this

particular issue.

It is a scene in which Dagny Taggart, at a conference with the country's economic planners, begins to grasp their motives.

Then she saw the answer; she saw the secret premise behind their words.... These men were moved forward, not by the image of an industrial skyline, but by the vision of that form of existence which the industrialists had swept away—the vision of a fat, unhygienic rajah of India, with vacant eyes staring in indolent stupor out of stagnant layers of flesh, with nothing to do but run precious gems through his fingers and, once in a while, stick a knife into the body of a starved, toil-dazed, germ-eaten creature, as a claim to a few grains of the creature's rice, then claim it from hundreds of millions of such creatures and thus let the rice grains gather into gems.

She had thought that industrial production was a value not to be questioned by anyone; she had thought that these men's urge to expropriate the factories of others was their acknowledgment of the factories' value. She, born of the industrial revolution, had not held as conceivable, had forgotten along with the tales of astrology and alchemy, what these men knew in their secret, furtive souls: ...that so long as men struggle to stay alive, they'll never produce so little but that the man with the club won't be able to seize it and leave them still less, provided millions of them are willing to submit—that the harder their work and the less their gain, the more submissive the fiber of their spirit—that men who live by pulling levers at an electric switchboard, are not easily ruled, but men who live by digging the soil with their naked fingers, are—that the feudal baron did not need electronic factories in order to drink his brains away out of jeweled goblets, and neither did the rajahs of the People's State of India.

(January–February 1971)

AYN RAND'S FICTION

We the Living (1936)

Anthem (1937)

The Fountainhead (1943)

Atlas Shrugged (1957)

The Early Ayn Rand (Short fiction and plays, 1926–1939)

Night of January 16th (1933)

AYN RAND'S NON-FICTION

Capitalism: The Unknown Ideal (1966). Essays on political philosophy, including "What is Capitalism?" "The Roots of War," "Conservatism: An Obituary," and "The Anatomy of Compromise."

For the New Intellectual (1961). A 48-page essay tracing the history of philosophy and its influence on culture, plus the philosophic speeches from Ayn Rand's novels.

Introduction to Objectivist Epistemology (Second Edition, 1990). The Objectivist theory of concepts, with emphasis on the relationship of abstractions to concretes. Includes chapters on concept-formation, definitions, axioms, the cognitive role of concepts, Objectivism's answer to Kant, and (by Leonard Peikoff) the analytic-synthetic dichotomy. The lengthy appendix, drawn from Ayn Rand's epistemology workshops, contains discussions of such issues as meaning and referent, induction, and the base of introspective concepts.

The New Left: The Anti-Industrial Revolution (1971). Cultural analysis, including critiques of contemporary education, environmentalism and other anti-scientific movements.

Philosophy: Who Needs It (1982). Essays explaining and illustrating the importance of philosophy, including "The Metaphysical Versus the Man-Made," "Faith and Force: Destroyers of the Modern World," and "Causality Versus Duty."

The Romantic Manifesto (1975). Essays on esthetics, including "Philosophy and Sense of Life," "The Psycho-Epistemology of Art," "What is Romanticism?" "Basic Principles of Literature," and a short story illustrating the role of the subconscious in creativity.

The Virtue of Selfishness (1964). Ethics and political philosophy, including "The Objectivist Ethics," "Man's Rights," "The Nature of Government," "The 'Conflicts' of Men's Interests," and "Racism."

The Voice of Reason: Essays in Objectivist Thought (1988). Philosophy and cultural analysis, including "Who is the Final Authority in Ethics?" Also "Religion Versus America" by Leonard Peikoff, and a critique of Libertarianism by Peter Schwartz.

PERIODICALS

(Under Ayn Rand's editorship, three periodicals were published between 1962 and 1976. These publications contain many articles reprinted in the nonfiction books listed above, many that have not been reprinted, and articles by writers other than Ayn Rand.)

The Objectivist Newsletter (1962–1965). Essays, book reviews and an "Intellectual Ammunition Department." Subjects include philosophy, politics, psychology, and current events.

The Objectivist (1966–1971). Essays, book reviews and Ayn Rand's Ford Hall Forum speeches. Subjects include philosophy, politics, education, journalism, and the arts.

The Ayn Rand Letter (1971–1976). Essays on philosophy and philosophical analyses of current events and trends.

OTHER OBJECTIVIST WORKS

Objectivism: The Philosophy of Ayn Rand (1991), by Leonard Peikoff. The definitive statement of Ayn Rand's philosophic system, written by her foremost interpreter.

The Ominous Parallels: The End of Freedom in America (1982), by Leonard Peikoff. The Objectivist philosophy of history, illustrated by an analysis of the causes of Nazism and their parallels in contemporary America.

The Ayn Rand Lexicon: Objectivism from A to Z (1986), edited by Harry Binswanger. A compilation of excerpts from Objectivist writings and lectures, covering 400 topics in philosophy and related fields.

My philosophy, in essence, is the concept of man as a heroic being, with his own happiness as the moral purpose of his life, with productive achievement as his noblest activity, and reason as his only absolute.

Ayn Rand

The Ayn Rand Institute, a non-profit, educational organization, was established in 1985 to serve as the center for the advancement of Ayn Rand's philosophy, Objectivism.

The Institute engages in projects at all levels of education. It supports scholarly research and publications and a campus speakers bureau, and it produces videotapes and pamphlets for a network of college Objectivist clubs. The Institute also sponsors annual essay contests for high-school students based on Ayn Rand's novel *The Fountainhead* and her novelette *Anthem*.

For further information, contact:

**The Ayn Rand Institute
4640 Admiralty Way, Suite 715
Marina del Rey, CA 90292
(310) 306-9232
(310) 306-4925 FAX**