Houston Objectivism Society

Vol.4, No. 5 December 1991 Newsletter

Movie at January Meeting

On Friday, January 17, HOS will feature "One Against the Wind", a movie dramatizing the WWII years of Mary Lendell, an Englishwoman living in France who established and maintained an escape route for Allied pilots back to England. A Hallmark Hall of Fame release, the movie stars Judy Davis and chronicles the exploits of an uncompromising hero who survives Nazi imprisonment and a concentration camp.

In addition to being suspenseful, the movie steps a level above the ordinary with an intelligent script about a woman who understands the need for moral absolutism: "There's a special hell for fence-sitters," she tells a bureaucrat. And from today's movie actresses, few could convincingly dramatize the character of Mary Lendell, but it's well within the scope of Judy Davis ("My Brilliant Career", "A Woman Called Golda", "Impromptu", etc.), an actress who specializes in portraying intelligent, purposeful women.

Showtime begins at 7:30 pm, Friday, January 17, at the Wallingford Apartments, 2750 Wallingford, one block south of Westheimer, approximately three blocks west of Beltway 8.

October Meeting Reviews Jefferson School and enjoys Potluck

This meeting began with a sumptuous feast, provided by members who brought a wide assortment of entrees and desserts. Next, Michael Mazzone updated us on his courtroom activities in regard to Pro Bono in Austin, from where he had just returned (More on this later). Finally, Anna Franco, Dwyane Hicks and Jeri Eagan presented an informal review of their two weeks at last summer's Thomas Jefferson School, a review which included summaries of speeches and events, a display of pictures taken and the relating of anecdotal stories. The evening was a treat for all.

Mazzone takes Pro Bono to Court

On October 4, Michael Mazzone presented oral arguments before State District Judge Joe Hart in the Texas mandatory pro bono case. Plaintiffs in this case are suing the Texas Bar in an attempt to force it to require its member lawyers to perform free legal service, pro bono, in order to retain membership in the Bar.

Michael has intervened on behalf of the Texas Bar to present a principled Constitutional case against mandatory pro bono. With financial help from The Association for Objective Law (TAFOL), and research help from HOS member Jeri Eagan, Michael submitted a 40 page brief in the case.

Michael's First Amendment argument (See the next article, by Jeri Eagan) rests on a principle familiar to Objectivists, that all rights are interconnected, and violating one violates them all. This sort of principled integration of Constitutional law is the distinctive contribution to legal practice that Objectivists can make. To bolster his case, Michael submitted a copy of Ayn Rand's essay "Man's Rights". Michael believes Judge Hart is a conscientious judge who has read the relevant law and all the briefs, and that he probably read the essay as well.

Regardless of the ultimate outcome [As discussed in the next article by Jeri Eagan, Michael won a dismissal based on lack of jurisdiction], Michael is to be strongly commended for his efforts on behalf of individual rights. His courage in intervening in the case and his willingness to expend a great deal of effort (to do research, write an articulate and persuasive brief and present arguments in court) would be admirable under any circumstances. When the issues are so important, however, and the voices arguing for individual freedom in our legal system are so few, the effort is appreciated all that much more.--Reported by Warren Ross.

Forced Labor of Lawyers Narrow Escape-For Now

by
Jeri Eagan

When increasing direct taxation is politically unattractive, other means of victimization through wealth redistribution are often pursued. One such means was attempted in Texas recently when a suit was brought to force lawyers to perform services for the poor without compensation (mandatory pro bono). The case was dismissed. Unfortunately, the reason for dismissal was a narrow, technical one related to jurisdiction. Until the battle is won on the basis of principles, continued attempts at forced labor of lawyers and other professions are to be expected.

An examination of the arguments in this recent case is interesting and worthwhile. The case provides a frightening example of the trend towards statism. Yet, it also represents an inspiring example of a challenge to this trend by Michael Mazzone, an attorney, who is a member of HOS.

Plaintiff's Argument--Need is a Justification

James Harrington, the attorney who instituted this lawsuit, purports to represent poor people in Texas. He demands that the current right to an attorney, which applies in criminal cases, be extended to civil cases. But unlike criminal cases, where the lawyers

INSIDE

are paid by the state, he wants lawyers to provide their services to the poor for free.

The failure of lawyers to provide free labor, he claims, results in the poor being deprived of their constitutional right of free access to the courts. He also points out that, since most poor people are disabled, Black or Mexican American, their equal rights are being violated.

The argument upon which Harrington relies the most in this case is that it is a lawyer's moral obligation to provide this uncompensated service. What is the justification of this moral obligation? The needs that the poor people have.

Poor people, he claims, have an even greater need for legal services than other people. They need lawyers to obtain the basic necessities of life. Most people can obtain food and housing in the marketplace without a lawyer's help. But since poor people rely on the government, they need lawyers to help them deal with these government agencies. In other words, not only should lawyers support these poor people, through payment of taxes, they should also devote their services to helping the poor to obtain this support. Not only the victim's sanction, but his active participation is being demanded.

In the final section of his pleading before the court, Harrington requests that attorney fees be granted to his clients: he wants to be compensated for his efforts in forcing all attorneys to provide free services.

The State Bar's Inability to Defend Itself

The primary defendant in this case was the State Bar of Texas. It is they who would enforce any judicially required system of mandatory pro bono for lawyers. To practice law in Texas, a lawyer must belong to the State Bar.

Past actions and statements by the State Bar make this entity particularly impotent in defending this suit, particularly from a philosophical perspective. The preamble to the Texas State Bar's Disciplinary Rules states the following:

"A lawyer should render public interest legal services. The basic responsibility for providing legal services for those unable to pay ultimately rests upon the individual lawyer, and personal involvement in the problems of the disadvantaged can be one of the most rewarding experiences in the life of a lawyer. Every lawyer, regardless of professional prominence or professional workload, should find time to participate in or otherwise support the provision of legal services to the disadvantaged. The provision of free legal services to those unable to pay reasonable fees is a moral obligation of each lawyer as well as the profession generally."

In addition, the State Bar's Committee on Legal Services to the Poor in Civil Matters has recently issued a report which praised the virtues of mandatory pro bono but stopped short of recommending it. The Committee explicitly stated that there were only two reasons for not doing so. Firstly, the considerable administrative burden of such a program, including the staff to determine who was poor and to force the labor from Texas' fifty-five thousand lawyers, would cause mandatory pro bono to "very possibly not be cost effective at this time." Secondly, mandatory pro bono would not equitably address the needs of the poor since communities with few attorneys would not benefit much from such a system. They pointed out that in Travis county the proportion of lawyers to poor people is much greater than it is in Zapata county. (And they have not yet become so bold as to suggest that attorneys be required to leave their home counties to provide forced labor.)

The State Bar has practical, but not moral, objections to mandatory pro bono. It is willing and anxious to have its member lawyers be victims. In fact, it has contributed money, which it has obtained from Texas lawyers by dubious means, to the Texas Civil Rights Project, of which Harrington is the director. Lawyers are, in effect, financing the process by which they are to be victimized.

The Principled Objections

With the State Bar being in such a poor position to defend itself and given the disastrous consequences to Texas attorneys, it was clear that a defense on principles was required. Michael Mazzone intervened in the suit for this purpose. With financial support from The Association for Objective Law (TAFOL) and research assistance from this writer, as well as other individual members of TAFOL, Mazzone submitted a forty page brief and presented oral arguments before the court.

The basis of Mazzone's challenge was that mandatory pro bono (which he refused to call anything but "forced labor of lawyers") would represent a violation of four of the provisions in the U.S. Constitution's Bill of Rights, as well as similar provisions in the Texas Constitution.

His first and strongest legal argument was related to the Fifth Amendment's provision that "private property (shall not) be taken for public use without compensation." There is no question that a lawyer's labor or services are "property" within the meaning of this clause. Numerous prior court cases, as well as quotes from John Locke, were cited in support of this proposition.

But would this action be a "taking"? Objectively, one would think it would. But from a legal perspective, eighteen of the thirty-four states who have addressed this issue have said that it is not. Their position has been that "enforcement of an obligation already owed to the public cannot constitute a taking for public use within the fifth amendment strictures." The courts have constructed various justifications of this "obligation". These include "ancient and established tradition", a condition under which lawyers are allowed to practice, and the monopoly power that lawyers have over the practice of law. In his brief, Mazzone effectively refuted each of these claims.

The second constitutional challenge to mandatory pro bono which Mazzone presented was based upon the First Amendment's guarantee of the right of free speech. The U.S. Supreme Court has ruled that this right encompasses the right to refrain from speaking at all and the right to be free from coerced

association with causes, ideas and conduct espoused or engaged in by others. Mazzone argued that it is personally abhorrent to him to deal with or speak to individuals who regard him as a slave whose service can be commanded against his will. He stated the reasons for his philosophical opposition to forced labor and quoted from Ayn Rand's essay "Man's Rights", from *The Virtue of Selfishness*. This argument represented a novel use of the freedom of speech concepts in the context of mandatory pro bono; therefore, no prior court cases were found which address this issue.

Mazzone's third argument was that forced labor of lawyers would deny him equal protection of the laws in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment. Even if one were to agree that poor people were entitled to free legal services in civil cases, the proper means to accomplish this would be to use tax dollars to obtain the lawyer's services. To place this burden exclusively on lawyers is surely unequal treatment. It would be like requiring grocers to give food to the needy.

The final, and seemingly most obvious, constitutional provision which Mazzone indicated would be violated is the Thirteen Amendment's prohibition against slavery. The words of the amendment are quite clear:

"Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction."

Unfortunately courts have not demonstrated an understanding of the clear meaning of these words. Generally, judges are required to follow precedents when reaching a decision. With numerous prior cases upholding the constitutionality of such practices as the military draft, there is not much hope that this argument will hold much sway.

The Result

As stated earlier, this case was dismissed on the grounds of a lack of jurisdiction: the District Court decided that matters related to the State Bar have to be decided by the Texas Supreme Court. In the opinion of this writer, it was a very close call. The judge could easily have ruled on the merits of the case and ordered mandatory pro bono, particularly since there was not much disagreement between the original parties. But the intervention of Mazzone and his presentation of such strong arguments against mandatory pro bono probably prevented that result. Faced with such fundamental principles regarding the rights of lawyers, the judge likely found it more tempting to avoid a decision.

Although many attorneys in Texas may never know it, they owe a great debt to Mazzone for this selfish act of his. This Texas attorney does know it and would like to thank him.

The Thomas Hearings Part II

by
Dwyane Hicks

The last issue of this newsletter addressed the nature of the Thomas hearings prior to their re-opening in order to hear the charges of sexual harassment brought by Anita Hill.

With the introduction of Hill's testimony, the nature of the hearings changed from a largely unsuccessful examination by liberals of a pragmatically silent Republican to an emotionally charged personal confrontation between Hill and Thomas. Hill's sexually explicit charges were countered by Thomas' explicit and wholesale denial. But the nature of the hearings changed in a more subtle way.

The prior examination of Thomas took place before a committee charged with the responsibility of passing judgment on a nominee for an important post. Implicit in this situation was the assumption not only of the nominee's general innocence of any wrongdoing but of great regard, in that he should be nominated for such a high post. Implicit in the re-opening of the hearings was the judgement of the committee that substantive evidence existed to warrant re-examination of their previous approval. Thus even before Anita Hill spoke a word before the cameras, the burden of proving innocence had shifted to Thomas.

What fueled the re-opening? By the end of all the testimony, it was evident that Hill could not substantiate her charges, even with the presence of her "witnesses". Further, many details were presented which cast doubt on her assertions: not only the absence of other victims of Thomas' attentions, but a flood of Thomas' female employees who celebrated his decency, Hill's absence of corroborating notes, her status as a class A employee (which rendered her invulnerable to being discharged) and her failure to come forward through three previous confirmation hearings. Also in The Wall Street Journal of November 20, 1991, columnist Lally Weymouth reports in her article "Some Clues to Anita Hill's Motive" that "Anita Hill was a supporter of 'comparable worth'; she was in favor of quotas; she believed that statistical evidence was enough to justify a discrimination inquiry." Past and present students of Hill described her as a militant feminist, and Todd Cone, a third-year student at the University of Oklahoma Law School, "reported in writing to the Judiciary Committee that 'Miss Hill is not an innocent professor thrust into the situation by the media... but rather a political activist furthering a cause she had so vehemently advanced in the past.'" Mrs. Weymouth points out that had Hill not been portrayed as a conservative, it might have put a different light on her testimony. Weymouth also notes that "According to her own testimony, Ms. Hill was promised anonymity in an effort to draw her out.

"When the reality of Ms. Hill's political orientation is considered, and the fact that she was led to believe she would not have to tell her tale in public, her motive no longer seems so perplexing.

"Ms. Berry-Myers [a witness for Thomas] sums it all up: 'It was politics. We warned him about how his whole political life threatened the black leadership's hold on the hearts and

minds of black America. He threatened the women's movement by positions he had taken at EEOC...He understood, but not really. He was a novice politically...He's an intellectual and a kind and decent man."

Most of this was known by the Judiciary Committee when it, properly, declined to provide a public forum for Hill's arbitrary assertions. The hearings were re-opened only when PBS's Cokie Roberts reported, through a Committee leak, that Hill's testimony had been rejected. Feminists were outraged because in their view the all-male Committee had run rough-shod over women everywhere by not publically hearing Hill's testimony.

Thus the Committee abandoned a policy of integrity and sacrificed Thomas because of an arbitrary assertion by collectivist women, giving credence to arbitrary assertions by Hill. To Thomas' credit, his indignant testimony changed the terms of the debate, to the extent possible, to that of questioning the forum in which he was to answer to unsubstantiated charges concerning alleged events occurring a decade ago. Alabama Senator Heflin made explicit the situation when he asked Thomas to prove that Hill's allegations were false. Thomas replied that one is not logically required to prove a negative, defusing the most dangerous threat to his nomination.

The media focussed primarily, during these days, on the value of "consciousness raising" with regard to sexual harassment, even after it was apparent that Hill's testimony was shaky (All that was missing was a screening of "Thelma and Louise"). I believe this occurred for two reasons: this approach presented Hill as an example of sexual oppression, thereby tacitly assuming Thomas' guilt without debate. Also, the attention of the public was diverted into accepting the manufactured wholesale victimization of women. Here, for feminists, was not only a chance to defeat an explicit opponent of collectivist policies, but a chance to do for the feminist movement what the good ship Valdez had accomplished for environmentalism: provide them an opportunity for resurrection.

In a sense, it was a consciousness raising experience. For at least three days, the American public had the opportunity to feel what it would be like with feminist thought police dominating the country. I found myself reviewing my past conversations with my female boss and associates. Americans had a chance to experience the feelings of a campus professor, marked as politically incorrect. And in the phrase "Men just don't get it", one could experience an unreasoning hatred from someone who could never know you apart from your stereotyped sexual identity, and this in the name of combatting sexism.

Collectivism and Non-objective Law

The arbitrary assertions and collectivist intimidation, used against the Committee and Thomas, have a pattern and a payoff: non-objective law in the hands of feminists. Sexual harassment is defined "as any unwelcome verbal or physical contact of a sexual nature that is a condition of employment, is a basis for personnel decisions, or creates such an offensive work environment as to interfere with an individual's work performance." The casualness of the word "unwelcome" rivals anything found in an anti-trust law. Had the word "consent" been used, it would have, at least, implied force and a decision made, manifested by the consequent action or non-action of the potential victim. But "unwelcome" lets a person suppress or repress herself, or himself, for a while, perhaps even for ten years, like Ms. Hill. "It was unwelcome, but I needed the job; in shame, I blamed myself, and he had a dominating personality." The only thing missing is the phrase "every woman's prerogative to change her mind", but that's too close to pre-Betty Freidan feminine mystique.

There are other subjective aspects to this definition, but its blatant violation of the First Amendment in regard to free speech is not. Sexual harassment includes "unwelcome verbal contact", in a situation not involving force, direct or indirect (Notice the equivocation between force and persuasion with the word, contact). Mind you, we're not talking about civil suits in regard to a contractual situation, but rather criminal charges brought against obnoxious speech.

Censorship is not new to feminists; they joined with conservatives years ago in its pornographic application. But someone should have noticed that the advocates of ever expanding "Civil Rights" were using a tool of censorship in an attempt to defeat a nominee to the Supreme Court. That this irony should pass unmentioned is only one indication of the intellectual gulf between today's establishment and that of the founding fathers.

The immediate source of that gulf is a collectivism based on the physical aspect of sexual identity, a collectivist view which provided the rationale for "sexual harassment", the intimidation of the Committee and the consequent intimidation of Thomas. But feminism was only a historical and legal extension of another collectivism, based on another physical aspect: race. Sexual harassment comes from Title Seven of the Civil Rights Act, the original (1964) of which addresses "offensive work environment" in the context of race. It is racism that provided the platform for feminism and it is racist organizations that worked behind the scenes with feminists. Thomas alluded to this when he called the proceedings a high-tech public lynching of an uppity black who dared to think for himself. Thomas' real crime is his rejection of the following: black racial identity requires one to be liberal, and a conservative black "betrays his people", premises even Archie Bunker would agree with.

The Civil Rights Movement of the 60's embraced "collective" rights, as manifested by the Civil Rights Act of 1964, in opposition to the individual rights of liberty and property. Ayn Rand pointed out that since human behavior is necessarily the product of the mind, the control of behavior is indirectly the control of the mind. Logically, the next step in controlling behavior is controlling the mind directly, and with campus political correctness, censorship of conversation between individuals and "consciousness raising", that is what we are witnessing. The

irony of attempted censorship by feminists against Thomas is surpassed only by the spectacle of black Civil Rights leaders opposing Thomas for his exhibiting a mind independent of physical attributes.

On the last day of the hearings, nearly all members of the Judiciary Committee spoke of a need for reform of the process, but no one addressed the notions of "collective" rights and collectivism, the root causes of this committee's humiliation and of much else.

Objectivism: The Philosophy of Ayn Rand
by Leonard Peikoff
(Dutton, 512 pages, Index, $24.95)

Reviewed by Warren S. Ross
(The following review was written for a non-Objectivist audience. It was submitted to 66 newspapers. To date, I have received seven rejections, and I await hearing from the rest.)

The twentieth century thinker Ayn Rand, in addition to writing her two famous novels, *The Fountainhead* and *Atlas Shrugged*, wrote literally thousands of pages on nonfiction topics, some on current cultural analysis but many on deeper philosophical issues. From 1962 to 1970, she published a philosophical journal called *The Objectivist Newsletter* (and later *The Objectivist*), and from 1970 to 1976 she published an individual vehicle for her ideas called *The Ayn Rand Letter*. Readers familiar with Ayn Rand's writings may be aware of her controversial views--selfishness in ethics and complete laissez-faire capitalism in politics. Most readers, however, will not be aware of the ideas underlying those positions. Ayn Rand was a systematic thinker, and her validation of those positions took her to the heart of Western thought--she wrote on topics in every branch of philosophy. Her best nonfiction medium was the self-contained essay, and although her philosophy, called Objectivism, was a fully integrated one she never published a treatise that presented that philosophy in one volume. The closest she came was a lengthy philosophical speech in the context of her novel *Atlas Shrugged*. For a long time there has been a need for a systematic treatise on the entire philosophy of Objectivism, beginning with its roots and carrying the development all the way through the later, applied branches of philosophy: ethics, politics and esthetics.

Such a work has just been written by Ayn Rand's long-time associate, Leonard Peikoff. Dr. Peikoff, who studied Ayn Rand's philosophy for more than thirty years, has recently completed *Objectivism: The Philosophy of Ayn Rand*. The book is an update and rewrite of Dr. Peikoff's 1976 course on Objectivism, taught to students via tape transcription.

Dr. Peikoff characterizes this book as "a proper, academic presentation" of the philosophy of Objectivism. In this characterization, both "academic" and "proper" are important. By "academic," Dr. Peikoff means that the book contains material that is technical enough that it covers the philosophy completely. It explains Ayn Rand's theories in enough detail that an academic philosopher would be able to understand them and apply them. By "proper," Dr. Peikoff means to distinguish his book from the narrowly specialized word-chopping of modern writing on philosophy. There are no modern treatises on philosophy because modern philosophers eschew systematizing. This book is, unabashedly, a philosophic treatise. On the other hand, it is directed toward the philosophically interested lay person as well as the philosophic professional: The book seems ideal for a person--whether a professional or not--who has read some or all of Ayn Rand's writings and now wants to see her ideas organized into a single unified whole.

Dr. Peikoff begins with Ayn Rand's metaphysics, the theory of the fundamental nature of existence. He defines and defends the axioms of her philosophy, which lead to a view that Ayn Rand called "the primacy of existence". This view means that existence--external reality--has primacy, rather than men's mind or feelings. Man's consciousness has a single role--to apprehend or be aware of existence--and it has no power to control or alter it. Whether the reality in question is your dependence on alcohol or your love of a career in the theater, Ayn Rand's philosophy uncompromisingly holds that facts are facts, and they remain so despite your wishes or protestations to the contrary.

Dr. Peikoff validates sense experience, which is the basis upon which all of man's concepts and other knowledge are derived. He then validates man's volition, and refutes all forms of determinism, whether of the "nature" or "nurture" variety (Parole Board members and writers of penal codes, take note). Having presented Ayn Rand's view that existence has primacy, that man has choice and that man's senses are valid, Dr. Peikoff then proceeds to what he calls "the Great Hall of philosophy," the theory of concept-formation.

Man is a conceptual being. All of his knowledge, his thinking, his intellectual achievements are held and communicated in conceptual form. One could not feed one's family, let alone get to the moon and beyond, without concepts. Hence validation of man's conceptual faculty is the central issue in philosophy (which is why Ayn Rand devoted an entire book to the subject). Ayn Rand's theory of concept-formation is unique in that it solves a problem that has troubled philosophers for millennia--the problem of universals. Her theory identifies specifically what is the nature of concepts and it validates their objective character. In other words, the theory defends the view that concepts tell us about reality--they don't distort reality but tell us about things as they actually are. The question is often posed as follows: When we form the concept "man," this is obviously a device of human cognition. Does this device tell us about men, or is it a mere mental construct agreed upon by society and having no necessary relationship to the facts? Is the definition we form of man--rational animal--objectively valid? Or is the definition arbitrary, just a linguistic agreement among members of society that could without impunity be replaced by something like "two-legged economic animal"?

The key to the answers to these questions is Ayn Rand's identification of a process called "measurement omission" in forming concepts. When we form the concept "man" what we focus on is the fact that a man possesses certain characteristics--two arms, two legs, a heart, a body of a certain size and shape, a consciousness of a certain type. What we don't focus on in forming the concept are the detailed specifications of the measurements of any of those characteristics: We say a man has a face, but we don't focus on the size of the nose or the color of the eyes. This process allows us to mentally group men together, dealing with them as a single mental unit. More generally, a concept allows us to group any class of similar entities together, not only for the purpose of communication but also to isolate the entities for thought and further study. Because they group an unlimited number of entities of a certain kind together, concepts vastly expand the range of things we can deal with beyond what we would be limited to if we had no conceptual faculty. (No animal could form the concept "rights" or "cyclotron".)

Ayn Rand emphasizes that the measurement-omission process is not a distortion but simply a selective focus, one based on observed facts. Furthermore, it is not a mystical or mysterious process but a perfectly natural way to organize sense data. Similarly with definitions: Definitions are neither inventions nor distortions. They are based on observed facts.

Ayn Rand considered this theory of concept-formation central to her philosophy. And in fact if one looks at her essays covering branches of philosophy such as ethics and politics, one observes that she continually relies on and refers back to her theory of concepts, not just for developing insightful definitions of key terms ("morality," "capitalism," "Romantic literature") but also for identifying man's essential nature. For example, in her essay "The Objectivist Ethics," she devotes considerable space to discussing conceptual knowledge and its objective character so that she can draw ethical consequences from it--namely that conceptual awareness, reason, is man's means of survival and thus the essence of moral life. (A philosopher who denies the validity of concepts, as all moderns do, could arrive at no such moral code.) In essays on capitalism, Ayn Rand's defense of her view that laissez-faire capitalism is the only moral social system is based in turn on her ethical view that reason is man's means of survival: a moral social system is one that protects reasoning, thinking, productive men.

Dr. Peikoff's book is full of many noteworthy integrations, which is his primary contribution. He is presenting Ayn Rand's philosophy, which is her achievement, but as a consequence of having worked with and studied under Ayn Rand for so many years, and having taught her philosophy to students (with their endless confusions), he himself has made a number of major integrations that make the material clear and accessible to nonphilosophers. Whether it is the relation between concept-formation and painting, or the relation between certainty and happiness, or the relation between the dispassionate use of reason and the unprecedented moral fire in Ayn Rand's characters, this book shows how Ayn Rand's philosophy is tied together into an integrated whole.

Ayn Rand's philosophic thought has not had the hearing or treatment it deserves--either in the universities or among the public. There are many reasons for that. First, her rejection of supernaturalism and her opposition to altruism challenges 2000 years of the Judeo-Christian tradition. Second, her defense of reason and the supremacy of the individual goes against the last 200 years of German philosophy (which resulted in the two totalitarian movements--Marxism and Nazism). One contributory reason for the neglect of Ayn Rand's thought, however, is that she has been published mostly in essay form, so that her philosophy has simply not been available in a single systematic treatise. Dr. Peikoff's book remedies this situation admirably, and represents a valuable source for those who wish to examine Ayn Rand's philosophy of Objectivism in its entirety.

Announcements

$ "Adopt-a-Library" program--Give one hardbound copy of Dr. Peikoff's *Objectivism: The Philosophy of Ayn Rand* to a Houston-area library. Those who wish to contribute may either send $24.95 or a hardbound copy of the book to Warren Ross ( ). Thus far, Ronnie Shoemaker, Carl Hanks and Warren Ross have donated books.

$ It's that time: please send in your 1992 dues.

HOS President *Warren S. Ross*
Editor: *Dwvane Hicks*

HOS Executive Committee:
C. J. Blackburn
Anna Franco
J. Brian Phillips
Warren S. Ross

The Houston Objectivism Society Newsletter supports Objectivism and the Ayn Rand Institute; however, we do not purport to represent or speak for the same. The Newsletter is published bimonthly for members, and membership dues are $10 per year.