

# CHAPTER ONE

## GENERAL INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Introduction

Ayn Rand a philosopher and a novelist, advocates philosophy in general and objectivism in particular. She believes that philosophy like any other knowledge and achievement is necessary for a good life. This is because, philosophy creates an opportunity for a good living, and gives the basic cognitive and normative abstractions that identify and evaluate reality. For her, everyone needs a philosophy that guides him. Thus, if our philosophy is correct our lives will be successful, and if our philosophy is wrong, our lives will be disastrous. Therefore, Rand observes that “philosophy has an urgent practical importance, in which social change has to begin with a moral revolution within every individual through the spread of right ideas and ideals.”<sup>1</sup>

Accordingly, Rand sees capitalism “the unknown ideal” as the only political economic system compatible with her philosophy, and this system is based on respect for human beings as an end in themselves. So, Rand called her philosophy “Objectivism” and describes its essence as “the concept of man as a heroic being, with his own happiness as the moral purpose of his life, with productiveness as his noblest activity and

reason as his only absolute”<sup>2</sup> [Sic]. This makes her see objectivism as “a systematic philosophy that has metaphysics, epistemology, ethics, political philosophy and aesthetics as its branches.”<sup>3</sup> Rand’s political objectivism lays emphasis on individual rights of property, liberty, pursuit of happiness and gender rights. She considers laissez faire capitalism as “the only moral system that can protect individual rights”<sup>4</sup> and opposes “statism that includes Nazism, theocracy, fascism, absolute monarchy, dictatorship and democratic socialism”<sup>5</sup> and emphasizes on the “enforcement of rights by a constitutionally limited government”<sup>6</sup>. In the essay *Voice of Reason* she advocates “woman’s right especially over their own reproductive choices.”<sup>7</sup> Many people classify her political views as conservative or libertarian, but she prefers to call it radical for capitalism.

## **1.2 Statement of Problem**

Ayn Rand political objectivism states that every man in peaceful pursuit of his fulfillment has an absolute right to his own life, liberty and property, and the government has the duty to protect those rights. She also argues that the only social political system that is compatible and conducive for man is capitalism. This makes her to advocate absolute individual right and freedom to the detriment of the society, thereby

showing that it does not guarantee a necessary condition for moral socio-political system and development.

### **1.3 Purpose of Study**

The aim of this research is to examine Ayn Rand political objectivism, with a view to showing that it does not guarantee a necessary condition for moral social-political system and development. It intends to examine Rand's political philosophy, particularly her concept of right, government, capitalism, environmentalism and feminism. In doing this we show that political objectivism does not guarantee adequate order and development in the society.

Further, we shall explore universal communalism as an alternative framework to political objectivism. It will highlight how the elements of universal communalism can solve social political problems in the society. And the work will also discuss some thematic issues in development discourse as these pertain to the society.

### **1.4 Significance of Study**

This study has the basic significance of fulfilling an academic requirement. Theoretically, the study is going to contribute significantly

to the extant literature available on objectivism, governance, capitalism, feminism, human rights and universal communalism among others.

At the level of practice, it will address the problem caused by political objectivism. And, it is hoped that by adopting the recommendations made in this work, as these pertain to the essential ingredients of universal communalism by policy makers, social political problems will be addressed in our society.

### **1.5 Scope of the Study**

The scope of this research is within the domain of philosophy. Through this means, Rand's ideas will be analyzed with a view to relating them to our society. The scope of study covers salient ideas of Rand's social political philosophy. It will specifically expose Rand's political objectivism (philosophy) viz. rights, government, capitalism and feminism. The dissertation will also present universal communalism as an alternative platform to political objectivism.

### **1.6 Methodology**

In order to present succinctly the political objectivism of Ayn Rand, this study makes use of analytic method. We employed this method because it will give us an opportunity to examine and understand Rand's

idea of political objectivism. It will also make available the philosophical tools of logical analysis, evaluation, criticism and argumentation employed in this study. Analytic method pays more attention to the analysis of the concept of discussion in order to acquire knowledge or clearer understanding of it.

Thus, this method will help us to know and understand clearer Rand's political objectivism, in order to proffer solution to some defective aspect of her objectivism. However, the work comprises six chapters. Chapter one which is the preliminary consists of general introduction to the dissertation. Chapter two exposes the views of some philosophers and scholars on Ayn Rand's political objectivism. Chapter three focuses on background of Ayn Rand political philosophy; life and times of Ayn Rand, influences on her political objectivism, the objectivist movement and objectivism. Chapter four dwells on Ayn Rand political objectivism and political philosophy. Chapter five deals on philosophical appraisal of political objectivism, and suggests universal communalism as its alternative. Chapter six revolves around evaluation and conclusion.

## **1.7 Explication of Terms**

### **1.7.1 Objectivism**

It is “a philosophical system that originated as the personal philosophy of Ayn Rand.”<sup>8</sup> According to Rand, her 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.”<sup>9</sup> Objectivism as a philosophy of rational individualism holds that the highest moral goal is to achieve individual happiness. Hence, she defines the essence of her philosophy as metaphysics (objective reality), Epistemology (reason), Ethics (self interest), Politics (capitalism) and holds that; reality exists as an objective absolute, and that facts are facts independent of man’s feelings, wishes, hopes or fears; and reason is the only means through which man can perceive reality, his only source of knowledge, guide to action and basic means of survival. For Rand every man is an end in himself and not a means to the ends of others and man exists for his own sake, not sacrificing himself for others or sacrificing others to himself. The highest moral purpose of man becomes the pursuit of his own rational self interest and his own happiness. She opines that the ideal political – economic

system is laissez faire capitalism that separates the state and economy. This capitalism guarantees a situation where men deal with one another, not as victims and executioners, or as masters and slaves, rather as traders where there is free and voluntary exchange to mutual benefit. In this system nobody obtains values from others by resorting to physical force, or by initiating the use of physical force against any one. Thus, the government becomes a police man that protects man's rights, and it may use physical force in retaliation against those that initiate the use of forces especially criminals or foreign invaders.<sup>10</sup> This shows that objectivism is "a systematic philosophy that has metaphysics, epistemology, ethics, political philosophy and aesthetics as its branches,"<sup>11</sup> which seeks individual freedom and happiness.

### **1.7.2 Rights**

Rights are "legally, social, or ethical principles of freedom or entitlement; it is the fundamental normative rules about what is allowed of people or owed to people, according to some legal system, social convention, or ethical theory"<sup>12</sup>. Rand defines right as a moral principle defining and sanctioning a man's freedom of action in a social context. The only fundamental right is man's right to his own life. Right only

entails freedom of action and freedom from physical compulsion, coercion or interference by other men. Rand holds that “for every individual, a right is the moral sanction of a positive of his freedom to act on his own judgment, for his own goals, by his own voluntary, uncoerced choice. And that the right to life is the source of all rights and the right to property is their only implementation [Sic].”<sup>13</sup>

### **1.7.3 Capitalism**

The modern conception of capitalism is attributed to Karl Marx when he analyzed and criticized the mode of production. For him, “owners of capital exploit their workers”<sup>14</sup> and through his theory of historical materialism (one of the stages in the society evolution), workers will gain class consciousness and take control of the state. So contrary to Marx belief, “capitalism becomes an economic and political system in which a country’s trade and industry are controlled by private owners for profit rather than by the state.”<sup>15</sup>

Accordingly, it is defined “as the economic and social system in which the means of production are predominantly privately owned and operated for profit, and distribution and exchange is in mainly market economy. It involves the right of individuals and corporations to trade in



goods, services, labour and land.”<sup>16</sup> Rand defines capitalism as “a social system based on the recognition of individual rights, including property rights, in which all property is privately owned. Capitalism involves a competition among many other desirable social features.”<sup>17</sup> Here, capitalism becomes a kind of socio – economic system that allows and encourages private ownership in terms of property and business, in view of making profits for their owners.

### **1.7.3 Government**

According to Oxford dictionary it is “a group of people with the authority to govern a community or state. It becomes a system by which a state or community is governed. It also involves the action or manner of controlling, or regulating a state, organization, or people.”<sup>18</sup>

For the Objectivists, government is an institution that holds special power to enforce certain rules in an area. Government becomes a means of placing the retaliatory use of physical force under objective control. Here, Rand sees the aim of government as “to protect man’s rights, especially from a physical violence. Then, a proper government becomes a police officer, who acts as an agent of man’s self-defense, and may resort to force against those who start the use of force.”<sup>19</sup>

#### **1.7.4 Feminism**

According to Stanford Encyclopedia feminism is both “an intellectual commitment and a political movement that seeks justice for women and the end of sexism in all forms.”<sup>20</sup> It is the “theory of the political, economic, and social equality of the sexes. It is also seen as an organized activity on behalf of women’s rights and interests.”<sup>21</sup> Rand sees feminism as “the doctrine that men and women are morally, intellectually, and spiritually equal and should enjoy full equality of rights before the law, such as the right to vote or to own property in one’s own name.”<sup>22</sup>

#### **1.7.5 Universal Communalism**

It is the best social political system that guarantees the rights of the individual and the groups in a society. It is a systematic and universal application of communalism. It has an underpinning philosophy of “Live and Let Live” and consists of solidarity and subsidiarity. Solidarity, because there is alliance, collaboration, help, compassion, commitment to the cause of the needy, friendship and social charity among one another. Subsidiarity because the society protects the particular right and

competence of individuals and the groups. It establishes social justice that impels everyone in the society to promote and advance the cause of common good in the society.”<sup>23</sup> It gives the individual members of the society a “sense of belongingness, complementarity and integration in the society.”<sup>24</sup> It is also a social political system that guarantees an individual right and involves a rational process.

## Endnotes

1. A. Rand, "Ayn Rand", *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/ayn-rand>, (11/6/2014).
2. A. Rand, *Atlas Shrugged* (35<sup>th</sup> anniversary ed). (New York: Dutton, 1992), p. 1170.
3. D.U. Douglas & R Douglas, (eds.), *The Philosophic Thought of Ayn Rand*, (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1986), p. 224.
4. G. Allan, "On Ayn Rand", *Wadsworth Philosophers Series*, (Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing, 2000), p. 91.
5. L. Peikoff, *Objectivism: The Philosophy of Ayn Rand*, (New York: E.P. Dutton, 1991), p. 369.
6. Ibid. p.367.
7. A. Rand, *The Voice of Reason: Essays in Objectivist Thought*, L. Peikoff, (ed.), (New York: Meridian, 1990), p. 46.
8. "Objectivism (Ayn Rand)", Wikipedia the Free Encyclopedia, <https://en.m.wikipedia.org/.../objectivism-/ayn>, (10/08/2014).
9. A. Rand, *Atlas Shrugged*, p. 1170.
10. A. Rand, "Introducing Objectivism", <https://aynrandlexicon.com/ayn-rand-ideas>, (30/6/2014).
11. M. Gladstein & C. Sciabarra, (eds), *Feminist Interpretations of Ayn Rand*, (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1999), p. 2.

12. “Rights”, Wikipedia, <https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/rights>, (1/09/2014).
13. A. Rand, “Individual Rights”, Ayn Rand Lexicon, <https://aynrandlexicon.com//individual-rights.html>, (30/08/2014).
14. K. Marx, *Capital*, Ben Fowkes (tr.), (London: Penguin Books, 1990), p. 367.
15. “Capitalism”, Oxford Dictionary, <http://www.oxforddictionary.com>, (01/09/2014).
16. “Capitalism”, By Branch/ Doctrine – The Basics of Philosophy, <http://www.philosophybasics.com/branch-capitalism.html>, (05/09/2014).
17. A. Rand, “Government”, *Ayn Rand Lexicon*, <https://aynrandlexicon.com/.../government.html>, (30/08/2014).
18. “Government”, Oxford Dictionary, <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com>, (09/09/2014).
19. A. Rand, “Government”, *Ayn Rand Lexicon*, online
20. “Topics in Feminism”, *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, <https://www.plato.stanford.edu/entries/feminism-topics>, (13/09/2014).
21. M. R. Gladstein and C. M. Sciabarra, “Feminist Interpretations of Ayn Rand”, <https://www.nyu.edu/fem/femdsph>, (04/08/2014).

22. “Feminism”, *Merriam-Webster Dictionary*, <https://www.Merriam-webster.com/.../feminism>, (05/08/2014).
23. F.C. Ofoegbu, *Live and Let Live: A Philosophical Cum Historical Reflection on Nigeria @ 100*, (Owerri: Applause B Multi-sects Ltd, 2014), p. 84.
24. Ibid. p. 85.

## CHAPTER TWO

### Literature Review

Wetten in his article “Private War: Objectivist Political Philosophy and the Privatization of Military Force” looks into the questions of ethical justification of using private military forces in waging war. This is because Pattison opines that the use of Private Military Forces or Private Military Companies (PMC) is ethically a dubious business in terms of justifying waging of war. Here, Wetten argues that “objectivism accepts the privatization of the military business and objectivism can overcome the profit motive and right intention objections that Pattison lays out.”<sup>1</sup>

To do this, Wetten discusses the nature of the objectivist view of the state, which promotes individual natural right that has ethical and epistemological foundations. He also presents Pattison’s arguments against Private Military Companies and how objectivism challenges this question. Thus objectivism provides moral and political defense of a state, by stating that the state has the function to protect the rights of individuals and so long as Private Military Companies act in accordance with objectivist principles in just war, there is no objection to the use of private military companies. But objectivism’s moral and political defense of a

state is lopsided, thus the essence of this study is to present a balanced and ideal conception of the state.

Gladstein's book *The New Ayn Rand Companion* is a compendium of Ayn Rand objectivism. It begins with a brief biography of Ayn Rand and summarizes her fictional and non fictional works. It describes almost all the characters in Rand's works and presents her journals. In this work Gladstein collects some books on Ayn Rand's philosophy including "summaries on explanations and critique of Rand's objectivism."<sup>2</sup> This work is to some extent logical and informative on Rand's philosophy, but lacks in dept explanation and clarification. Hence, this work makes an adequate exposition and explanation of Rand philosophy.

Bostaph in his article "Ayn Rand's Economic Thought" writes about social economic system and Rand's thoughts on economy along with the thoughts of scholars from Menegerian Tradition. To do this Bostaph explores Rand social-economic ideas through her fiction and nonfiction writings. Thus, Rand argues for "free economy that rest on ethical and political- philosophical principles."<sup>3</sup> She opines that a real free society should be politically and economically free. This is because moral failure and political intervention destroy the prosperity of free economy in the state.



Further, Bostaph argues that Rand's formal knowledge of economics is limited and that her case for free market is ethical and political. He therefore, buttresses Rand's argument that individual freedom is actually complete in a free market economy. In addition, he opines that a necessary condition for human development and success is political and economic freedom but this cannot be achieved without the state, hence, this is what this work sets out to achieve.

Cade Share in her article "A Defense of Rothbardian Ethics Via Mediation of Hoppe and Rand" justifies and defends Rothbard's Ethics of Liberty using Hans-Hermann Hoppe's argumentation ethics and Ayn Rand's Objectivist ethics. Rothbard is of the view that all statist interventionism is economically undesirable against humanism and natural law.

Further, Share makes a rational defense of a private property ethics, by supplementing Rothbard's Ethics of Liberty, with Hoppe's argument and Rand's Objectivism. She argues that "praxeological (Hoppe's view) and objectivism (Rand's view) epistemology informs what constitutes a morally superior economic order and what does not."<sup>4</sup> There by, creating a theory of social order that states that it is what man is that determines how he ought to coexist. This makes man an end in itself. Following the

aforementioned, the author stated the obvious but his position is particular and limited, it is not holistic hence, the essence of this study to proffer solution to the problem.

Emily J. Barr in her article “Sex and the Egoist: Measuring Ayn Rand’s Fiction Against her Philosophy” examines Rand’s view on sex and feminism. Sex here with regard to rational human beings constitutes a union of pride and admiration (pleasures). Also in Rand’s concept of sex, each person exercises his or her own rational self-interest to get a partner whose mind and body equals his or her own. For Barr, Rand’s works present individualist feminists (Dagny and Dominique) who believe that being a woman has nothing to do with her ability as a person in any context. As against collective feminists one who fights for every woman’s right and liberation.

More so, Barr argues that taking cognizance of Rand’s philosophy of self preservation, equal trade and non violence, she authorizes rape (Force) and self sacrificing, thereby going against her objectivism because Rand in attempt to show how sex is a way to express highest form of pride and admiration, promotes superiority and inferiority complexes. This makes Rand a “traitor to her own sex”<sup>5</sup> and a “traitor to her own

philosophy.”<sup>6</sup> Therefore, this research makes a positive case for gender equality in our society.

Fred Seddon in his book *Ayn Rand, Objectivists and the History of Philosophy* argues that the disregard of objectivism by academics is a result of Rand and objectivists disregard for other philosophers except Aristotle. This is because Rand and her followers have false belief about the history of philosophy. Hence, Seddon (an objectivist) in this work corrects some errors in Ayn Rand, objectivists, and the History of philosophy. Through textual analysis Seddon shows how “Rand and some objectivists misinterpreted Friedrich Nietzsche, Immanuel Kant, David Hume and Plato among others.”<sup>7</sup> Following Seddon observations, objectivism is not devoid of error, we hereby rely on this study for an alternative framework (universal communalism).

Bissell in his article “The Logic of Liberty: Aristotle, Ayn Rand, and the Logical Structure of the Political Spectrum” writes on Rand’s philosophical insights alongside with Aristotle’s Law of Excluded Middle, showing how an individual rights and laissez-faire capitalism system relate logically to other politico-economic systems and ideology. Here, Bissell uses Rand’s objectivist method to resolve fallacy of false alternative (the error which occurs when we fail to consider all the

relevant possibilities in an argument) and relates it with American Politico-economic system and ideology, using David Nolan and Murray Rothbard methods in clarifying it.

Accordingly, Bissell's logical analysis through Rand's method finds that American social-economic system is tending towards socialism by using fascist transitional measures wrapped in and made palatable by communist slogan (e.g. rich people need to pay a little more). This he illustrates in "the Obama Care (President Obama healthcare reform programme), which if fully implemented, the insurance and pharmaceutical industries will earn more privileges on the free market that should have been difficult for them." <sup>8</sup> For Bissell, this will favour and profit the government created cartels and impoverish many American citizens. He further advocates objectivism in order to protect the rights of individuals as against socialism or fascism in America. Consequently, Bissell's suggestion of objectivism is reasonable, but it is not sufficient to solve the problems of statism. Therefore, this dissertation will proffer adequate solution to these problems.

Joseph Maurone in his article "The Trickster icon and objectivism" argues about the future of objectivism and the need to separate Rand's idea (objectivism) from Rand and a trickster. Here, trickster suggests an

amoral action, something right or wrong that will get life going. It implies body of ambiguity and ambivalence, doubleness and duplicity, contradiction and paradox. And a trickster, neither knows good or evil, but responsible for them. He has no moral or social values, yet his actions bring values into being.

Maurone presents Rand's characters as embodiments of trickster. Because they find themselves in an evil and oppressive society and their tricksters attitude makes them to survive and triumph. Also, he reexamines Rand's personal and cultural background that justifies her as a trickster. As a trickster, Rand challenges the notion that an atheist is amoral, and she did not clarify the conventional distraction between right and wrong, but changes the criteria of morality. Hence, Maurone observes that "some of Rand's actions conflict with her philosophy and suggests new tricksters that will redefine objectivism." <sup>9</sup> Hence this study has the task of providing an alternative framework for objectivism.

Parrish in his article "God and Objectivism: A Critique of Objectivist Philosophy of Religion" presents objectivism as a philosophical naturalism, and argues the objectivists thesis of theism as a corpse. As a philosophical naturalism, objectivism holds that the physical cosmos viz. molecules, stars, atoms galaxies and even anything that exist

are physical objects and ultimate reality. It also holds that conscious beings as such depend on the ultimate realities and the existence of God or any supernatural entities are not exceptional.

Further, objectivism argues that no one can prove existence of God and the theist can only have an arbitrary belief of God by faith. Hence, the concept of God is incoherent and to believe in God is irrational and immoral. Accordingly Parrish observes that objectivists underestimate philosophy of the modern religion, and their philosophy has a lot of fallacies especially that of “begging the question” <sup>10</sup>. This is because, objectivists fail to support Rand atheism and undermine their central tenet for failing to support reason. Hence, the article suggests the need for the redefinition of objectivism.

Leonard Peikoff in his book *Objectivism: the Philosophy of Ayn Rand* presents definitive statement on objectivism and a comprehensive work on Rand’s philosophy. This is because; it contains a lengthy philosophic discussion between the author and Rand. It also has a “collection of every branch of philosophy recognized by Rand Viz. Metaphysics, Epistemology, Ethics, politics, and Aesthetics.” <sup>11</sup> And it covers every important philosophic topic treated by Rand ranging from certainty to money, logic to art, measurement to sex, individual to society.

Accordingly, this work makes a holistic statement on objectivism, but this dissertation does not support all the views of objectivism. Therefore, it suggests an alternative framework for objectivism.

Branden in his article “The Benefits and Hazards of the Philosophy of Ayn Rand: A Personal Statement”, writes about his personal relationship with Rand and how her works especially the *Fountainhead* and *Atlas Shrugged* influence objectivism and become its kernel. He opines that the central tent of objectivism emphasizes reason, individualism, enlightened self-interest, political freedom and a heroic vision of life’s possibilities. Branden also upholds and agrees with some benefits, values, and visions of objectivism, which serve as an inspiration for both the old and young. One of which is the objectivists belief that one’s life belongs to oneself and one ought to live his or her life and not to endure or suffer, but to enjoy and prosper.

On the contrary, Branden argues that “there are errors in the visions of Objectivism, some of which have to be changed, eliminated, modified and amplified. This is because of the absence of adequate psychology to support Rand intellectual structure, which is full of destructive moralism, and encourages repression, self-alienation and guilt.”<sup>12</sup> Following the

aforementioned, the author stated the obvious and we shall attempt a solution to these problems in this study.

Nicholas Dykes in his article “The Facts of Reality: Logic and History in Objectivist Debates about Government” writes about “the critique of anarchism by David Kelley, the protection of individual rights, and examines if the government is justified to protect rights in the light of Ayn Rand.”<sup>13</sup> Dykes also argues on the facts of reality that “objectivism based libertarian anarchism is the real way forward for humanity.”<sup>14</sup> This he did by questioning if government is not essential to protect rights, or is she not (government) the precondition necessary for the creation of objective law.

Accordingly, the author addresses the nature of individual rights and queries some of Ayn Rand’s interpretation of history. He hopes that the objectivist will realize the essence of government not as a voracious and expensive institution, which is armed with the claws to hurt its citizens, but will look upon the government for real protection.

Andrew Hoberek in his book *The Twilight of the Middle Class* differs from the common conception that post-world war II American fiction shuns the economic situation of the society and favours psychology and spirituality of the people. He argues that the “works of



Ayn Rand on the politics of property”<sup>15</sup> among other authors transforms American middle class from small property owners to white-collar employees.

Further, he buttresses that even though the financial breakthrough and good jobs enjoyed by post war middle class through ingenuity of Rand and her fellow authors. It paves the way for the insecure and unstable economic situation in the society, especially the increasing class divisions in the state.

More so, Dykes in his article “Ayn Rand in England” argues that Rand’s literary success and philosophical influence are felt in the united state. He regrettably states that Rand’s work relatively has little or no impact in England. This is because a lot of English literary icons, philosophers and scholars like Shakespeare, George Orwell, Bacon, Hobbes, Locke, Hume, Smith, Bentham, Mill, Moore, Ayer, Ryle, Popper and their interesting thought. As a result of this Rand’s idea is not taken serious and British philosophy department refuses to consider her idea.

Dykes opines that Rand’s books were too American, long, philosophical, perverse and unpredictable to the British. The author avers that “Rand’s ideas are more politically incorrect in Britain than USA. This

is because the British are naturally benevolent, well-mannered, good tempered and altruistic, with the sense of duty to help the poor.”<sup>16</sup>

George Reisman in his article “Ayn Rand and Ludwig Von Mises” argues that Rand and Mises are distinct advocates of laissez-faire capitalism in any century. He opines that they have complementary and mutually reinforcing ideas on laissez-faire capitalism. And the differences that exist between them are superficial and minor. Reisman buttresses that Rand presents the best treatment of the concepts of individual rights and freedom anywhere in the world, and even demonstrates that capitalism is the only system that is consistent with individual rights and freedom from man’s nature as a rational being, which are the conditions of man’s existence required for his proper survival in nature.

Contrarily, Reisman argues that Rand’s nature of individual rights and freedom is insufficient to make a case for capitalism. This is because of Rand’s lack of extensive knowledge of economic theory, as the people perceive capitalism as a threat to human survival and must be neutralized by the force of government. So Reisman suggests “the complementary ideas of Rand and Mises, as the later (Mises) supports utilitarianism and makes a case for capitalism in terms of its utility to man, where individual rights of businessmen and capitalists serve the wellbeing of others.”<sup>17</sup>

Hence, the author concludes that the works of Mises and those of Rand are important to defend capitalism. And the combined study of their works will produce better stalwarts and capable defenders of capitalism.

Robert White in his article “Ayn Rand versus Adam Smith” observes the difference between Rand’s trader principle and Smith’s invisible hand principle. He buttresses that Rand’s defense of laissez-faire capitalism and Smith’s defense of the market economy is misrepresented by some people. White then, argues that Rand and Smith do not have or share the same idea on the importance of self-interest, or support the same minimalist government.

Consequently, the author concludes that Rand and Smith do not share the same ideas on the importance of self interest, because Rand’s self interest consists in the practice of those virtues required to promote one’s own survival and flourishing. While for Smith, self interest consists in the practice of “inferior” virtues that ought to be subordinated to the “noble” self-sacrificial virtues. Further, Rand supports “laissez-faire capitalism, while Smith supports extensive government intervention in the economy.”<sup>18</sup>

Furthermore, Walter Block in his article “Ayn Rand, Religion and Libertarianism” presents the “relationship of Objectivism, Libertarianism

and Religion.”<sup>19</sup> He observes that Rand’s philosophy of objectivism is all encompassing, especially her political economy, metaphysics, epistemology, aesthetics, morality, logic among other disciplines. He argues that Rand favours liberty but disregards any relationship with libertarianism. He also buttresses that Rand denigrates and attacks religion as an institution that makes freedom to be unrealizable. Thus, Block corrects Rand’s objectivism by demonstrating that religion and liberty are not enemies, but complimentary.

Den Uyl Douglas and Rasmussen Douglas in their article “Capitalism”<sup>20</sup> opine that except Ayn Rand’s ethical views, her political philosophy is the most notorious feature of her philosophic system. Her defense of laissez-faire capitalism and her firm denunciation of all forms of collectives, made her political position to be under serious criticism. Also the authors observe that the critique on Rand political theories lacks an appreciation of philosophic basis that support Rand’s political theory. Hence, the authors buttress that whether Rand’s political theory is good or bad, any objective reader of Rand must admit, that her political views flow from a comprehensive philosophy of man and nature, while her defense of capitalism is insightful and original.

Further, in order to show how Rand's political views flow from comprehensive philosophy of man and nature; the authors combine the essential classical view of man with modern political doctrine. Thus they integrate Aristotelian view of man with a liberal political doctrine which argues that freedom of action in society is functional to good human living and fulfills human potentials. Hence, the authors opine that no one else has shown comprehensive and successful connection between the above outlooks like Ayn Rand. And this is what this work is about to achieve.

Examining the literature reviewed above, one may agree with some authors' exposition of political objectivism because of its absolute support of individual right and freedom. On the other hand, other authors were not totally in support of Rand's political objectivism because of its jettisoning of altruism and aggressive support of capitalism against the state. This is well expressed by her when she rejected help for any individual from government or fellow human being. Rather she encouraged selfishness, self preservation and rational self interest in one's pursuit of his happiness and fulfillment. As a result of these their argument either for or against Rand's objectivism is limited to the particular issue that they dealt on. Hence, one may ask, what is the way forward? It is the aim of this

dissertation to proffer solution to this question, by showing how the essential elements of universal communalism will be an alternative framework to political objectivism of Ayn Rand through sense of togetherness.

## Endnotes

1. M.V. Wetten, "Private War: Objectivist Political Philosophy and the Privatization of Military Force", *The Journal of Ayn Rand Studies*, 12, 2, (2012), p. 264.
2. M.R. Gladstein, *The New Ayn Rand Companion* (Revised and Expanded edition), (West Port, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1999), p. 155.
3. S. Bostaph, "Ayn Rand's Economic Thought", *The Journal of Ayn Rand Studies* 11, 1, (2011), p. 39.
4. C. Share, "A Defense of Rothbardian Ethics via a Mediation of Hoppe and Rand", *The Journal of Ayn Rand Studies*, 12, 1,(2012), p. 142.
5. S. Brownmiller, *Against our Will: Men, Women, and Rape*, (New York: Simeon and Schuster, 1975), p. 314.
6. E. J. Barr, "Sex and the Egoist: Measuring Ayn Rand's Fiction Against her Philosophy", *The Journal of Ayn Rand Studies*, 12, 2, (2012), p. 206.
7. F. Seddon, *Ayn Rand, Objectivists and the History of Philosophy*, (Lanham: University Press of America, 2003), p. 40.
8. R. E. Bissell, "The Logic of Liberty: Aristotle, Ayn Rand and the Logical Structure of the Political Spectrum" *The Journal of Ayn Rand Studies* 12, 1, (2012), p. 47.

9. J. Maurone, "The Trickster Icon and Objectivism" *The Journal of Ayn Rand Studies* 12, 1, (2012), p. 252.
10. S. Parrish, "God and Objectivism: A Critique of Objectivist Philosophy of Religion", *The Journal of Ayn Rand Studies* 8, 2, (2007), p. 206.
11. L. Peikoff, *Objectivism: The Philosophy of Ayn Rand*, (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1991), p. 4.
12. N. Branden, "The Benefits and Hazards of the Philosophy of Ayn Rand: A Personal Statement", *Journal of Humanistic Philosophy*, 24, (1984), p. 21.
13. N. Dykes, "The Facts of Reality: Logic and History in Objectivist Debates about Government", *The Journal of Ayn Rand Studies*, 7, 1, (2005), p. 79.
14. Ibid, p. 133.
15. A. Hoberek, *The Twilight of the Middle Class*, (Princeton N.J: Princeton University Press, 2009), p. 33.
16. N. Dykes, "Ayn Rand in England", *The Journal of Ayn Rand Studies*, 5, 2, (2004), p. 397.
17. G. Reisman, "Ayn Rand and Ludwig Von Mises", *The Journal of Ayn Rand Studies*, 6, 2 (2005), p. 257.
18. R. White, "Ayn Rand versus Adam Smith", *The Journal of Ayn Rand Studies*, 7, 1, (2005), p. 174.



19. W. E. Block, "Ayn Rand, Religion and Libertarianism", *The Journal of Ayn Rand Studies*, 11, 1, (2011), p. 63.
20. D.U. Douglas & R Douglas, (eds.), "Capitalism", *The Philosophic Thought of Ayn Rand*, (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1986), p. 165.

# CHAPTER THREE

## Background of Ayn Rand Political Philosophy

### 3.1 Life and Times of Ayn Rand

Ayn Rand (Alisa Zinov'yevna Rosenbaum) a philosopher and a novelist, was born on February 2, 1905, to a Russian Jewish bourgeois family living in Saint Petersburg. She was the eldest of the three daughters of Zinovy Zakharovich Rosenbaum and his wife, Anna Borisovna (nee Kaplan), largely non – observant Jews. Zinovy Rosenbaum was a successful pharmacist and business man, eventually owning a pharmacy and the building in which it was located. In her high school years, Rand witnessed both the Kerensky Revolution, which she supported and in 1917 the Bolshevik Revolution, which she denounced from the outset. In order to escape the fighting, her family went to Crimea, where she finished high school. The final communist victory brought the confiscation of her father's pharmacy and periods of near starvation. When introduced to American history in her last year of high school, she immediately took America as her model of what a nation of freemen could be.

After the Russian Revolution, Rand family returned from the Crimea and she became among the first group of women to enroll at the

Petrograd State University to study philosophy and history. At the university she majored in history, and among other programs she enrolled on are Philosophy, Law, and Philology. Her formal philosophical education included ancient philosophy (especially Plato and Aristotle), Logic, Philosophical psychology, Marxism – Leninism, and non – Marxist political thought. Also, she was exposed to Hegelian and Nietzschean ideas, which flourished during the “Russian Silver Age”, and privately she studied a great deal of Friedrich Nietzsche philosophy. Graduating in 1924, Rand witnessed decline in free inquiry and the takeover of the university by communist thugs, no wonder her contempt for Communist government. Because of her interest in screen writing, she enrolled in the State Institute for Cinematography and studied Russian novelists and poets, especially Victor Hugo who influenced her.

In 1925, she was permitted to visit her relatives in United State of America, and hating the Soviet government, she left without coming back to Russia. Few months after staying with her relatives in Chicago, she went to Hollywood where she got a job as a script reader and later a screenplay writer. “It is in Hollywood that she met with Cecil B De Mille, and Frank O’ Connor (an actor) the man she married in 1929, and they were married for fifty years until his death in 1979. In 1951 Rand and her

husband moved to New York City, where she mingled with some intellectuals to revive classical liberalism, these intellectuals include Henry Hazlitt, Ludwig Von Mises and Isabel Paterson among others. She also studied and admired Lockean ideas.”<sup>1</sup>

From her philosophical experience she propagated “Objectivism” which is seen in both her technical and popular works of philosophy especially *Atlas Shrugged* and *The Fountainhead* that won several awards. She acknowledged Aristotle as her greatest influence and recommended the “three A’s” – Aristotle, Aquinas and Ayn Rand in history of philosophy. She died of heart failure in New York City on March 6, 1982. The Objectivist Movement spreads her ideas, both in public and academic settings. Her philosophy has influenced many generations of intellectuals and people. Some of her selected works include; *We the Living* (1939), *The Fountainhead* (1943), *Atlas Shrugged* (1957), *Night of January 16<sup>th</sup>* (1934), *Anthem* (1938), *For the New Intellectual* (1961), *The Virtue of Selfishness* (1964), *Capitalism: The Unknown Ideal* (1966), *The Romantic Manifesto* (1969), *The New Left: The Anti – Industrial Revolution* (1971), *Introduction to Objectivist Epistemology* (1979), and *Philosophy: Who Needs It* (1982) among others. It is pertinent to note that Leonard Peikoff is Rand student and chosen heir, who studied under Rand for thirty years

and published a formal text book on Objectivism (*Objectivism: The Philosophy of Ayn Rand*).

### **3.2 Influences on Ayn Rand Political Philosophy**

#### **Aristotle**

He is an ancient philosopher, biologist and tutor. Aristotle was born in 384 BC in Stageira in Thrace and a former student of Plato's Academy, but later found his own Lyceum. He was a copious writer who invented formal logic and the idea of separate sciences. Ayn Rand acknowledged that the only influence on her philosophy is Aristotle, this could be seen in the theme of her book '*Atlas Shrugged*' as Non contradiction, either or and A is A, which are Aristotle's logical principle. His philosophy of primacy of existence, realism, rational self interest, influenced Ayn Rand philosophy. Also, his concept of reason as an aid to man's happiness and objectivity was an inspiration to Rand. One could say that Aristotle's critique on Plato's communism of wives, property and children must have inspired Ayn Rand detest of collectivism and statism.

## **John Locke**

He is an empiricist and was born in Wrington Somerset in England. He studied Aristotle's logic and metaphysics, as well as medicine because of his scientific inclination. He is known for bifurcating experience into sensation and reflection as only channels the human mind can be furnished with ideas. Locke also denied the principle of innatism. John Locke's idea that in the state of nature people were independent, free, equal, and have no jurisdiction over any one, inspired Rand's concept of capitalism as a system men act and interact voluntarily, by individual choice and free trade. His notion of natural rights influenced Ayn Rand concept of right and the declaration of human right by the founding fathers of America. Also, Locke's idea that the people delegate their power to government for mutual preservation of lives, estates, and liberties as well as law enforcement agent, inspired Ayn Rand concept of government as an agency that protects man's right.

## **Karl Marx**

He is a revolutionary philosopher and was born in 1818 at Trier, Rhineland of Germany. He lived a life plagued by chronic illness, poverty and death of family members. He is a friend to Friedrich Engels, who was his frequent source of financial support. Marx is known for his

“Dialectical Materialism” that had governments’ overthrown, changed maps and revolutionized the twentieth century. His critique of religion as opium that anesthetizes people from realizing the real source of the problem must have influenced Rand. Thus he writes:

Religion is the sigh of the oppressed creature, the sentiment of a heartless world, and the soul of soulless conditions. It is the opium of the people. The abolition of religion as the illusory happiness of men is a demand for their real happiness. The call to abandon their illusions about their condition is a call to abandon a condition which requires illusions<sup>2</sup>.

Thus, one may be of the opinion that his view on religion must have influenced Rand’s deride and rejection of religion.

Further Karl Marx idea of money being god must have influenced Rand’s concept of it. Thus he writes;

Money is the jealous god of Israel, besides which no other, god may exist. Money abases all the gods of mankind and changes them into commodities. Money is the universal and self-sufficient value of all things. It has, therefore, deprived the whole world, both the human world and nature, of their own proper value. Money is the alienated essence dominates him and he worships it<sup>3</sup>.

For him, this reduced human relations to “naked self-interest” and callous cash payment that leads to individualism. Thus, one is of the view that this idea of Marx must have inspired Rand’s concept of capitalism where money is a great value. Also, his notion of communism and alienation influenced Rand’s anti collectivism and statism. No wonder, Karl Popper writes that “Marx enlightened so many people, including all modern writers that remain indebted to Marx even without knowing it.”<sup>4</sup>

### **Friedrich Nietzsche**

A professor of classical philology was born in 1844 at Saxony. He is known as a lonely prophet and for his idea of “Death of God” and “Will to Power”, irrespective of his ill health, he wrote eighteen books and a lengthy unfinished manuscript about 1872 to 1888. His “Master Morality” could be said to inspire Rand’s idea of values, virtues and capitalism. For Valliant Nietzsche influenced Ayn Rand by the way of her rejecting his subjectivism and his acceptance of the false-dichotomy that one must either be a self-sacrificer or a psychopath. He also influenced her writings especially “*The Fountainhead*”, where she writes “The noble soul hath reverence for itself”. Although, Valliant observes that Rand thought that this is true, but “rejected Nietzsche notion of the noble soul because, it was not objectively tied to reality.”<sup>5</sup> Accordingly, Lawhead buttresses



that although Rand despised Nietzsche's irrationalism, but her work "*The Fountainhead*" and "*Atlas Shrugged*" betrays her youthful attraction to "*Thus Spoke Zarathustra*". And that Rands despise for "the herd mentality and traditional Christian virtues, and her respect as well as support of egoism, the heroic and creative individual would be cherished by Nietzsche." <sup>6</sup>

### **3.3 The Objectivist Movement**

This movement seeks to study and promote the philosophy of objectivism. Ayn Rand who is a philosopher, novelist and screen writer founded this movement. Informally, the movement began in 1950s after the publication of Rand's novel "*The Fountainhead*", which consisted of some students that fall in love with Rand's work. This group of students is ironically known as "the Collective" because of their propagation of "individualism", they consisted of Nathaniel Branden, Barbara Branden, Alan Greenspan, Leonard Peikoff, Allan Blumenthal, Harry Kalberman, Elayne Kalberman, Joan Hitchell, and Mary Ann Sures (Nee Rukavina). They met with Rand on weekends at her apartment on east 36<sup>th</sup> street, New York City to discuss philosophy. Thus, this movement emerged into

a collection of think tanks, academic organizations, magazines and journals.

In 1957 Rand published another novel and her magnum opus “*Atlas Shrugged*” and shortly after this, the formal presentation of objectivism began with the Nathaniel Branden Lectures (NBL), which graduated to Nathaniel Branden Institute (NBI). Through this in 1962 Rand and Branden co-founded the publication of “The Objectivist Newsletter” which later expanded into “The Objectivist” that specialized in the study and application of objectivism. Thus, the Nathaniel Branden Institute (NBI) hosted lectures on objectivism, the history of philosophy, art, and psychology in so many cities. But in 1968, Rand officially broke with the Brandens, she accused Nathaniel Branden of departing from the principles of objectivism, financial exploitation and deception of people. The Brandens denied these charges against them and NBI was closed down. Hence, Peikoff described this expulsion as the “first of many schisms that objectivist movement encountered in history.”<sup>7</sup>

Accordingly, in 1971 “The Ayn Rand Letter” replaced “The Objectivist” and marketed as a personal newsletter from Rand and Peikoff. Also, Peter Schwartz and Rand’s associate in 1979 began the editing and publishing of “The Intellectual Activist” a publication that

Rand recommended to her audience. During this time too Harry Binswanger (Rand associate) came up with a mini-encyclopedia of objectivism “The Ayn Rand Lexicon: Objectivism from A to Z” and “The Objectivist Forum” a journal on objectivism which Rand supports and served as a “philosophic consultant”. Few years after the death of Rand in 1985 Leonard Peikoff and Ed Snider established the “Ayn Rand Institute” (ARI), which becomes the first organization which studied and advocated for objectivism since the closure of Nathaniel Branden Institute in 1968. This institute sponsored many essays contest in objectivism and taught objectivism for the aspiring academics.

Further, the objectivist movement witnessed a major split in 1989, when David Kelley (a philosopher and lecturer with Ayn Rand institute) was expelled from the objectivist world, as a result of supporting Barbara Branden’s biography of Rand and going against the objectivists’ principle. But Kelley responded to this allegation in his work “*Truth and Toleration*” and founded the Institute for Objectivist Studies (IOS) with the help of Ed Snider. He was joined by some objectivist scholars like, George Walsh, Jim Lennox, Joan Blumenthal, Allan Blumenthal, Nathaniel and Barbara Branden among others. Kelley’s institute for objectivist studies, published materials, and hosted conferences on

objectivism. In 1999 it changed its name to “The Objectivist Centre” and later in 2006 to “The Atlas Society”.

From the foregoing, currently the objectivist movement has two major splits, the “Ayn Rand Institute” (ARI) and the “Atlas Society”. It is also necessary to note that in 1994 Ayn Rand Institute expanded its educational programs into “Objective Graduate Centre” (OGC) which developed into the “Objectivist Academic Centre” (OAC) in 2000, offering “undergraduate and graduate courses on objectivism, writing, history, the history of philosophy and the history of science.”<sup>8</sup> It was also on this platform that the first systematic presentation of Rand’s philosophy book “Objectivism: The Philosophy of Ayn Rand” was published by Leonard Peikoff in 1991. On the other hand too, the Atlas Society stands at the heart of this movement, but not all the objectivists and admirers of Ayn Rand agreed with Kelley’s vision. Hence the objectivist movement remains divided against among themselves, especially through personal differences and debates of the factions.

### **3.4 Objectivism**

It is a philosophy developed by Ayn Rand and expressed in her polemic writings and novels, such as the *Fountainhead* and *Atlas*

*Shrugged* among others. Later, it was given more formal structure by Leonard Peikoff, a designated intellectual heir of Rand and a philosopher. Its central tenets states that reality exists independently of consciousness, human beings have direct contact with reality through sense perception, and that one can only know objectively from perception by the process of concept formation and inductive logic. It states that the moral goal of one's life is the pursuit of his own happiness (i.e. rational self interest) and that the social-political system that is compatible with this morality is laissez faire capitalism which has respect for individual right. Also, it holds that the role of art in human life is to transform human's metaphysical ideas by selective reproduction of reality into a physical form (a work of art), which one can understand as well as respond to emotionally.<sup>9</sup>

Rand derives the name "objectivism" from the idea that human knowledge and values are objective. That they exist and are determined by the nature of reality, which can be discovered by one's mind. But not created by the thoughts one has. Rand chose the name because her preferred term for a philosophy based on the primacy of existence "existentialism" has been used. The essence of objectivism is "to present the concept of man as a heroic being, whose happiness is the moral

purpose of his existence that engages in productive achievement as his noblest activity, and reason as his only absolute.”<sup>10</sup> Thus, objectivism becomes a systematic philosophy that has metaphysics, epistemology, ethics, political philosophy and aesthetics as its branches. Let’s now examine these branches of objectivism.

### **Metaphysics**

In his metaphysics Rand begins with existence, consciousness, and identity, which she identifies as axioms. Thus, she defines an axiom as a statement that identifies the base of knowledge and of any further statement pertaining to that knowledge, a statement necessarily contained in all others whether any particular speaker chooses to identify it or not. She sees an axiom as a proposition that defeats its opponents by the fact that they have to accept it, and use it in the process of any attempt to deny it.

Accordingly, Rand opines that existence is the perceptually self-evident fact at the base of all other knowledge, i.e., that “existence exist”. She buttresses that to be is to be something”, that “existence is identity”. So “to be” is to be “an entity of a specific nature made of specific attributes”. Thus, that which has no nature or attributes does not and cannot exist. And the axiom of existence is grasped in differentiating

something from nothing, while the law of identity is grasped in differentiating one thing from another, i.e., one's first awareness of the law of non-contradiction, which is another crucial base for the rest of knowledge.<sup>11</sup> Therefore, Rand writes that "A leaf cannot be all red and green at the same time; it cannot freeze and burn at the same time. . . . A is A."<sup>12</sup> This makes objectivism to reject any belief that transcends existence.

Also in his metaphysics Rand argues that consciousness is the faculty of perceiving that which exists. She avers that to be conscious is "to be conscious of something", meaning that consciousness itself cannot be distinguished or grasped except in relation to an independent reality. Hence, objectivism is of the view that the mind does not create reality; rather, it is a means of discovering reality. More so, in her metaphysics Rand shows how objectivism derives its explanations of action and causation from the axiom of identity, while causation is seen as the law of identity applied to action. For Rand, it is the entity that acts and every action is the action of an entity. So, the way entities act is caused by the specific nature (or "identity") of those entities; if they were different they would act differently. Therefore, to understand causation, it must be derived from one's primary observations of causal connections among

entities even before it is verbally identified and serves as the basis of further knowledge. Let us now briefly examine epistemological objectivism.

## **Epistemology**

The epistemology of objectivism begins with the principle that consciousness is identification, meaning a direct consequence of the metaphysical principle that “existence is identity. Thus she defines reason as “the faculty that identifies and integrates the material provided by man’s senses.”<sup>13</sup> She also talked about logic as the fundamental concept of method on which all others depend. And the distinguishing characteristic of logic indicates “the nature of the actions (actions of consciousness required to achieve a correct identification) and their goal (knowledge), while omitting the length, complexity or specific steps of the process of logical inference, as well as the nature of the particular cognitive problem involves in any given instance of using logic.”<sup>14</sup>

For Rand, consciousness possesses a specific and finite identity, like every other thing that exists, so it ought to operate by a specific method of validation. Thus, an item of knowledge cannot be “disqualified” by being arrived at by a specific process in a particular



form. Hence, Rand opines that the fact of consciousness must itself possess identity, implying the rejection of both universal skepticism based on the “limits” of consciousness, as well as any claim to revelation, emotion or faith based belief. So for objectivist epistemology all knowledge is ultimately based on perception. No wonder, Rand opines that “percepts, not sensation are the given, the self-evident.” She maintains that the validity of sense perception is not susceptible to proof nor should it be denied, because perceptual error is not possible. Rand thus rejects the “epistemological skepticism”, as she observes that skeptics’ claim to knowledge, distorted by the form or the means of perception is impossible.

Further in her epistemology, Ayn Rand elaborates the theory of concept formation and argues that concepts are formed by a process of measurement omission. For her, the term “measurements omitted” does not mean, that measurements are regarded as non-existent, but means that measurements exist, but are not specified. That measurements must exist is an essential part of the process. Thus, the principle becomes: “the relevant measurements must exist in some quantity, but may exist in any quantity.”<sup>15</sup> Therefore, Rand argues that those concepts are organized hierarchically. For instance, concepts such as ‘dog’ bring together

“concretes” which are available in perception and can be differentiated (into the concepts of dachshund, ‘poodle’, etc) or integrated (along with ‘cat’, etc, into the concept of ‘animal’). Also, abstract concepts such as ‘animal’ can be further integrated, via “abstraction from abstractions’ into concept of “living thing”. So, she opines that concepts are formed in the context of knowledge available. For instance, a young child may differentiate dogs from cats and chickens, but may not differentiate them from deep-sea tube worms, or from other types of animals not yet known to him, to form a concept ‘dog’.

Also in her epistemology, Rand rejects ‘feeling’ as sources of knowledge, but acknowledged the importance of emotion for human beings. She believes that emotions are a consequence of the conscious or subconscious ideas that a person already accepts, not a means of achieving awareness of reality. Thus, she opines that emotions are not tools of cognition. More, she rejects all forms of faith or mysticism and defines faith as “the acceptance of allegations without evidence or proof, either apart from or against the evidence of one’s senses and reason... mysticism is the claim to some non-sensory, non-rational, non-definable, non-identifiable means of knowledge, such as instinct’, ‘intuition’, ‘revelation’, or any form of ‘just knowing’.”<sup>16</sup> For Rand, reliance on

‘revelation’ is like reliance on an ‘Ouija board’, it bypasses the need to show how it connects its results to reality. Therefore, “faith is not a ‘short-cut’ to knowledge, but a ‘short-circuit’ destroying it.”<sup>17</sup>

Consequently, objectivism acknowledges that human beings have limited knowledge, vulnerable to error and may not instantly understand all of the implications of their knowledge. Rand also, rejects the traditional rationalist and empiricist dichotomy, because it embodies a false alternative. Accordingly, she opines that conceptually-based knowledge, independent of perception (rationalism) versus perceptually-based knowledge independent of concepts (empiricism) neither is possible because the senses provide the material of knowledge while conceptual processing is also needed to establish knowable propositions.

Following the above, objectivist epistemology emphasizes that the only means for man to obtain a reliable knowledge is through ‘reason’. And reasoning entails observing reality and thinking logically about what one can perceived by the senses. But, this philosophy has received a lot of criticism, one of which is from Roderick Long, who argues that “objectivist epistemology conflates the perceptual process through which judgments are formed, with the way in which judgments are to be

justified. Thereby leaving it unclear how sensory data can validate propositionally structured judgements.”<sup>18</sup>

### **Ethics (Rational self-interest)**

Rand defines morality as a code of values to guide man’s choices and actions, the choices and actions that determine the purpose and the course of man's life. She opines that the first question is not what the code of values should be, but does man need values at all and why? Rand maintains that “it is only the concept of ‘Life’ that makes the concept of ‘value’ possible” and, “the fact that a living entity is, determines what it ought to do.”<sup>19</sup> She observes that the primary focus of man’s free will is in the choice “to think or not to think”. Thus, she observes that thinking is not an automatic function. In any hour and issue of his life, man is free to think or to evade that effort. Here for Rand thinking requires a state of awareness and man focuses his mind to a full, active, purposefully directed awareness of reality or he can unfocused it and let himself drift in a semiconscious daze. Therefore, Rand stresses that since human beings possess free will, they must choose their values: one does not automatically hold one’s own life as his ultimate value. Thus, she avers “whether a person’s actions promote and fulfill his own life or not is not a

question of fact, but whether a person will act to promote his well-being is up to him, not hard-wired into his physiology. Hence, man has the power to act as his own destroyer-and that is the way he has acted through most of his history.”<sup>20</sup>

Accordingly, Rand buttresses that “man’s mind is his basic tool of survival. Life is given to him, survival is not. His body is given to him, its sustenance is not. His mind is given to him, its content is not. To remain alive he must act and before he can act he must know the nature and purpose of his action. He cannot obtain his food without knowledge of food and of the way to obtain it. He cannot dig a ditch-or build a cyclotron without knowledge of his aim and the means to achieve it, to remain alive he must think.”<sup>21</sup> Thus, Rand emphasizes the primary virtue of rationality, as she buttresses on the recognition and acceptance of reason as an absolute source of knowledge, judge of values and one’s guide to action.

Consequently, Rand believes that the purpose of a moral code is to provide the principles by reference to which man can achieve the values his survival requires. Thus she buttresses that if man chooses to live, a rational ethics will tell him what principles of action are required to implement his choice. If he does not choose to live, nature will take its

course. Thus, she observes that “reality confronts a man with a great many “musts”, but all of them are conditional. The formula of realistic necessity is ‘you must, if’- and the ‘if’ stands for man’s choice: If you want to achieve a certain goal.”<sup>22</sup>

Further, Rand presents the principal virtues of rationality, honesty, justice, independence, integrity, productiveness and pride, which will help an individual to achieve his moral obligation, the pursuit of his personal happiness. Thus, Rand in her ethics emphasizes the need for man to choose his actions, values and objectives through a moral standard (rational self interest), in order to achieve, maintain, fulfill and enjoy the ultimate value which is his own life. Contrarily, many philosophers oppose the view of objectivist ethics. According to O’ Neil, “Robert Nozick sees ethical foundational argument of Rand as unsound, because it does not explain how an individual should prefer to die and having no values. Nozick further argues that Rand’s solution to David Hume’s famous ‘is-ought problem’ is unsatisfactory and Rand’s attempt to defend morality of selfishness is an instance of begging the question.”<sup>23</sup>

### **Aesthetics**

It is the fifth and last branch of philosophy of objectivism. It is the study of art, which is based on metaphysics, epistemology and ethics.

Objectivism defines art as a selective re-creation of reality according to an artist's metaphysical value-judgments. This implies what the artist believes to be ultimately true and important about the nature of reality and humanity. So, objectivism sees art as a way of presenting abstractions concretely in perceptual form.

According to the objectivist, human need for art stems from the need for cognitive economy. Since a concept is a sort of mental shorthand which stands for a large number of concretes, that allow human being to think indirectly or implicitly of many more such concretes than can be held explicitly in mind. But human mind cannot hold indefinitely many concepts explicitly in mind either, so the objectivist suggests that man needs a comprehensive conceptual framework to provide guidance in life. For them, "art" offers a way out of this dilemma by providing a perceptual, easily grasped means of communicating and thinking about a wide range of abstractions, including one's metaphysical value judgments. Hence, objectivism regards art as an effective way to communicate a moral or ethical ideal.

Further, objectivism does not see art as propagandistic, although it involves moral values and ideals. For the objectivists, the purpose of art is not to educate, only to show or project. They also opine that "art need not

be and usually is not an outcome of a full-blown, explicit philosophy, but stems from an artist's sense of life."<sup>24</sup> No wonder, Rand observed that Romanticism was the highest school of literary art, based on the recognition of the principle that man possesses the faculty of volition. She also believes that literature is robbed of dramatic property while emphasizing that what Romantics brought to art was the primacy of values. And she avers that "values are the source of emotions and a great deal of emotional intensity which was projected in the work of the Romantics and in the reactions of their audiences, as well as a great deal of color, imagination, originality, excitement, and all the other consequences of values-oriented view of life."<sup>25</sup>

## **Politics**

Politics of objectivism argues that every individual, in the peaceful pursuit of his personal fulfillment, has an absolute right to his or her own life, liberty and property. These rights are necessary if man is to survive and thrive by means of reason, which is his mode of survival. Thus, objectivism argues that a free society is one in which the rights of life, liberty and property are not violated. Thus, the only way to violate a person's right to life, liberty and property is to initiate physical force against a person or his property without his consent. It further states that



capitalism is the only socio-economic system compatible and conducive to man. This is because; it guarantees absolute freedom of an individual in the society. Let us now examine this political objectivism in details by considering Rand's concept of rights.

## Endnotes

1. “Ayn Rand” Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, [www.plato.stanford.edu/entries/ayn-rand/](http://www.plato.stanford.edu/entries/ayn-rand/) (20/4/2015).
2. W. Lawhead. *The Voyage of Discovery*. (California: Wadsworth Group, 2002), p. 430.
3. Loc. Cit.
4. K. Popper, *The Open Society and Its Enemies*, vol. 2 (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1966), p. 82.
5. J. Valliant. “Ayn Rand’s Critics”, *Capitalism Magazine*, <http://capitalismmagazine.com>, (20/8/2014).
6. W. Lawhead. *The Voyage of Discovery*, p. 430.
7. L. Peikoff. “Fact and Value”. *The Intellectual Activist* 5, 1, (1989), p.5.
8. “Objectivist Movement”, [www.en.wikipedia.org/wiki/objectivist-m/](http://www.en.wikipedia.org/wiki/objectivist-m/), (20/5/2015).
9. A. Rand, “Objectivism”, [www.en.wikipedia.org/wiki/objectivism](http://www.en.wikipedia.org/wiki/objectivism), (20/4/2015).
10. A. Rand, *Atlas Shrugged*, (New York: Dutton, 1992), p. 1170.
11. A. Rand, “Objectivism”, [www.en.wikipedia.org/wiki/objectivism](http://www.en.wikipedia.org/wiki/objectivism), (20/4/2015).
12. A. Rand, *Atlas Shrugged*, p. 1016.

13. A. Rand, *The Virtue of Selfishness*, (New York: signet, 1964), p. 22.
14. A. Rand, *Introduction the Objectivist Epistemology*. H. Binswanger, & L. Peikoff (eds.), (New York: Medridian, 1990), p. 36.
15. Ibid. p. 12.
16. A. Rand, *Philosophy: Who Needs It*, L. Peikoff (ed.), (New York: Signet, 1982), p. 62.
17. A. Rand, *For the New Intellectual*, (New York: Random House, 1961), p. 223.
18. R Long “Reason and Value: Rand versus Aristotle”. *Objectivist Studies Monographs* (Ponghkeepsie, New York: The objectivist Center, 2000), p. 20.
19. A. Rand, *The Virtue of Selfishness*, p. 18.
20. A. Rand, *Atlas Shrugged*, p. 1013.
21. Ibid. p. 1012.
22. A. Rand, *Philosophy: Who Needs It*, p. 119.
23. P. O’ Neil, “Ayn Rand and the Is-Ought Problem”, *Journal of Libertarians Studies*, 7, 1, (1983), p. 81.
24. L. Peikoff, *Objectivism: The Philosophy of Ayn Rand*, (New York: Dutton, 1992), P. 426.
25. A. Rand, *The Romantic Manifesto* (New York: Signet, 1971), p.1.

# CHAPTER FOUR

## Ayn Rand Political Objectivism

### 4.1 Rand's Concept of Rights

A “right” is a “moral principle defining and sanctioning a man’s freedom of action in a social context.”<sup>1</sup> Rand believes that the basic and fundamental principle of politics is “rights”, which is the principle endorsed by American Founding Fathers as ‘Individual Rights’. Thus she states:

Rights are a moral concept – the concept that provides a logical transition from the principles guiding an individual’s actions to the principles guiding his relationship with others the concept that preserves and protects individual morality in a social context – the link between the moral code of man and politics. Individual rights are the means of subordinating society to moral law<sup>2</sup>.

Here, “right” defines and sanctions man’s freedom in the society. And it becomes a sanction to independent action, and their opposite becomes acting by permission. For instance, Rand opines that if anyone borrows your pen, you will set the term of its use. And whenever he returns it, nobody detects to you on how to use it. Hence, Peikoff buttressed, that a “right becomes a prerogative which cannot be morally infringed or

alienated, even when an innocent man is robbed or enslaved, the man has an inalienable right while the criminal is wrong.”<sup>3</sup>

Further, Rand believes that when men decide to stay in a society which is moral, they need a guiding principle which is the principle of rights. Thus, one does not need any agreement or approval from others nor should anyone interfere with his or her rights. She also opines that the fundamental right is the right to life, which has right to liberty, property and the pursuit of happiness as its derivatives. Also, Rand opines that the right to life is the right to sustain and protect one's life. To do this, man needs a method of survival which requires his rational faculty that will help him to gain knowledge choose his values and achieve it. The right to liberty becomes the right to the method of man's survival. And for Rand, to sustain one's life, man needs to create a material means of survival, which involves the right to property. Thus Rand states:

To sustain one's life, man's purpose must be his own welfare, which is the right to the pursuit of happiness and the right to live for one's own sake and fulfillment.<sup>4</sup>

This shows that the right to property is the right to gain, keep, use, and dispose of material values in order to sustain human life.

Accordingly, Rand observes that the right to life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness is often misinterpreted and denied by some

intellectuals and people today. For instance, she argues that some intellectuals claim that the right to private property clashes with the principle of human rights. Hence, she buttresses:

Just as man can't exist without his body, so no right can exist without the right to translate one's right into reality – to think, to work and to keep the results – which means: the right of property... The doctrine that “human rights” are superior to “property rights” simply means that some human beings have the right to make property out of others; since the competent have nothing to gain from the incompetent, it means the right of the incompetent to own their betters and to use them as productive cattle. Whoever regards this as human and right has no right to the title ‘human’.<sup>5</sup>

Here, Peikoff affirms that man is an integrated being of mind and body, and every right entails every other, none is apart from the rest. For example, “there can be no right to think apart from the right to act or the right to act apart from the right to own.”<sup>6</sup> No wonder, Rand observes that “intellectual freedom cannot exist without political freedom; political freedom cannot exist without economic freedom; a free mind and a free market are corollaries.”<sup>7</sup>

Also for Rand, a proper philosophy is an integrated system because of this; each right rests on all the principles from every branch of philosophy. Hence, she emphasizes that all rights rest on all the facts that man's life is the moral standard and man survives by means of reason,

productive activity, and by ethics of egoism. As a result of this, Rand opines that the rights to life, liberty, property, and the pursuit of happiness are treated by political philosophy. But the various applications and implementations of these rights belong to the field of philosophy of law.

Further Rand believes that the concept of a “right” by its nature belongs specifically to freedom from physical compulsion, coercion or interference by other men. Consequently, the right to life becomes the right to a process of self preservation, not giving other people food, medicine or job when they need it. While her idea of right to liberty does not mean to satisfy other person’s desires, and her concept of right to property does not mean to be supported by government but to produce and earn the property. So the right to the pursuit of happiness becomes to pursue it not quite attaining it.

Furthermore, Rand buttresses the need to define this right rationally in order to avoid conflicts. Thus she writes:

If rights are defined in a rational terms, no conflict is possible between the rights of one individual and those of another. Every man is sovereign. He is absolutely free within the sphere of his own rights, and every man has the same rights .<sup>8</sup>

Thus, Rand emphasizes on the need not to separate the concept of right from reason and reality. Because if right is separated from reason and

reality the resultant effect will be the destruction of the theory of right, which is the corollary of conflict. And she believes that this is what is happening in the world, where bad principles (false right) drive out good principles (proper rights). For instance in the rapid increase of false rights like economic, collective, fetal, animal rights among others.

Following the above, Rand believes that these false rights negate the concept of “rights” replacing it with the principle of mob rule. Thus she avers:

A group can have no rights other than the rights of its individual members. In a free society, the “rights” of any group are derived from the rights of its members through their voluntary, individual choice and contractual agreement, and are merely the application of these individual rights to a specific understanding ... The principle of individual rights is the only moral base of all groups or associations .<sup>9</sup>

Therefore, Rand is of the view that there are no rights to the labor of other people, groups, parts, or non humans. Rather there is only the right of man, which is to pursue his own choice of action.

Importantly, Rand holds that the rights of man can only be violated by the initiation of physical force, including indirect means by way of fraud. Hence she declares:

One cannot expropriate a man’s values, or prevent him from Pursuing values, or enslave him in any manner at all, except by the use of physical force.



Whoever refrains from such initiation – whatever his virtues or vices, knowledge or errors – necessarily leaves the rights of others unbreached .<sup>10</sup>

Thus, Rand observes that man's right can only be violated by the use of physical force, while the violators can only be detected not by intuition, feeling, or vote, but, by his action. And to protect one's right, involves protecting the innocent from physical force. She believes that an individual can be hurt in many ways by men's irrationality, dishonesty, injustice among others; on these he can only be disappointed. But as long as his property is not taken from him and he remained physically unharmed, the damage he sustains is only spiritual not physical. Therefore, the victim has the power and responsibility of healing his wounds, since he is free to think, he can start afresh to pursue his happiness. So only a crime of force can make a victim helpless and it is the responsibility of the organized society to protect the individual's right.

In addition, Rand observes that the source of man's right is in reality and not God or group. Accordingly Rand states:

The source of man's rights is not divine law or congressional law, but The law of identity. A is A – and Man is man. Rights are conditions of existence required by man's nature for his proper survival. If man act on his own for his values and to keep the product of his work .<sup>11</sup>

Rand shows that the source of man's right is not God or group, but reality and his freedom of action. Here rights become an earthly and absolute thing. The individual becomes an autonomous entity whose rights are absolute. For Rand every noble political theory must begin with this fact. Let us now examine Rand's concept of government.

#### **4.1.1 Government**

Ayn Rand conceives government as an agency that protects man's rights. This is because if a society should protect man's rights, her citizens must create an agency capable of doing the job. The government becomes an institution that holds the exclusive power to enforce certain rules of social conduct in a geographical area. This power for Rand is not primary, because government is mainly a social creation and society is made up of individuals. Thus, government derives her powers from the individuals that create it. Here, the government becomes the servant of the citizens, not their ruler in order to be their agent of self-defense. She then has the power to use force in retaliation against those persons and nations who start its use, but not against the innocent.

Accordingly, Rand opines that government by its nature has a monopoly on the use of force. Because, in any rational society individuals

agree to delegate their right of self-defense and renounce the use private physical force even in self protection unless, there is emergency which requires immediate action before the police can be summoned, hence an individual may use physical force. So Rand is of the view that in order to protect and uphold ones right in the society delegation of individual's right of self-defense is essential. If not, every man would have to live and work armed and must be ready to shoot any suspicious stranger, and stranger must be ready to shoot too. Alternatively, men may form packs to protect themselves from other packs, there by leading to gang wars and mob rule, that will never guarantee peaceful coexistence.

Further Rand buttresses that a society must differentiate the retaliatory use of force methodically from unreasonable wishes and ideas. So the use of force must be clearly defined in advance, validated, codified: under what conditions force can be employed, by whom, against whom, in what forms and to what extent. Thus, the use of force requires objective rules of evidence establishing that a crime has been committed, prove who committed it and objective rules of punishment must be defined and enforced. Anyone who prosecutes crimes without the objective rules in considered as a lynch mob by Rand. Hence, a government becomes the means of placing the retaliatory use of physical

force under objective control. This implies that for men to enjoy freedom they need a government of laws and not of men.

Moreso, Rand sees the essential function of government as protection and enforcement of contracts including an objective resolution of disputes that may arise from there. Here she bars men from using physical force against other men no matter the reason for it. Succinctly, Rand states governmental functions as the police to protect men from criminals; the armed services to protect men from foreign invaders; and the law courts to settle disputes among men according to objective laws. For her, any additional function of government would be the initiation of force against innocent citizens and such a government acts as a criminal instead of man's protector.

Consequently, Rand view of government is inherently negative, since the authority given to the government is only for destruction and not of creation or development. So, the state (government) must not in any way intervene in the intellectual or moral life of its citizens. Thus Peikoff corroborates that:

It has no standards to uphold and no benefits to confere in regard to education, literature, art, science, sex or philosophy. Its function is to protect freedom, not truth or virtue. <sup>12</sup>

Here, Ayn Rand categorically refused the intervention of the government in any aspect of man's moral and intellectual life, be it in the aspect of production, trade or others. Hence, it must not provide any economic standards or benefits, whether in terms of goods, services, or conditions of trade. Her only function is to offer freedom from coercion, since she deals only with the use of force and knows how to "destroy destruction" (that which initiates force). Rand also believes that in doing its function, government must operate jails and military installations, but must not conscript individuals to police or army against their wish, nor confiscate their properties by way of making money without the individuals consent.

Furthermore, Rand believes that in a proper society, the government has no right, while the citizens have rights. And that the source of government's power is the "consent of the governed" since government is only an agent of its citizens. For Rand, this 'consent' is not an arbitrary type, but a rational consent, based on an objective principle, the rights of man. Lets us now examine idea on initiation of force.

#### **4.1.2 Initiation of Physical Force**

Rand sees 'physical force' as coercion exercised by physical agency, such as among many other examples, by punching a man in the

face, incarcerating him, shooting him, or seizing his property. While the concept 'initiation' means starting the use of force against an innocent individual(s) who did not use force against another person. Therefore, the initiation of physical force is the act of using force against any individual. For Rand to initiate force is to commit a major evil that represents the antithesis and destruction of the virtues and values.

Accordingly Rand sees the initiation of force as a negation of reason. This is because the person, who uses force in attacking another person's body or seizing his property, negates and paralyzes the victim's mind. Thus Rand writes;

A rational mind does not work under compulsion, it does not subordinate its grasp of reality to any one's orders, directives or controls; it does not sacrifice its knowledge, its view of the truth, to any one's opinions, threats, wishes, plans, or "welfare". Such a mind may be hampered by others, it may be silenced, proscribed, imprisoned, or destroyed, it cannot be forced; a gun is not an argument.<sup>13</sup>

Here, to force one to accept a conclusion against his own thought is like forcing him to accept everything he knows that is untrue. Thus, one becomes enslaved and he cannot perform the essential process of human cognition, that is, he cannot think.

Rand in the climax of "*Atlas Shrugged*" showed a good example of the relationship between force and thought. Here, John Galt the leader of

striking industrialists could not give a clue to save the country, even though surrounded with a gang of things (who were afraid that their statist government will collapse) that tortured him. Rather, under this dictatorship Galt refused to share his knowledge or solution to these torturers in order to save their country. So, physical force threatens to deny one the power to act according to his will, which makes him to be doomed by reality. This is because rationality demands one to think and be guided by his action but force clashes with this requirement. This made Rand believe that whoever initiates the use of force is a killer and a murderer.

Further Rand opines that physical force is the antithesis of man's means of achieving value. Thus, the initiator of force attacks all aspects of its victim's moral life, as well as rejecting the victim's right to live on his own. This made Rand to opine that morality ends where a gun begins.

Moreso, for Rand whatever destroys virtues necessarily destroys values and force and values are opposites. Hence, she teaches that physical force is a negation of value. She writes thus;

An attempt to achieve the good by physical force is a monstrous contradiction which negates morality at its root by destroying a man's capacity to recognize the good, i.e. his capacity to value. Force invalidates and paralyzes a man's judgment, demanding that he act against it, thus rendering

him morally impotent .<sup>14</sup>

Following the above one cannot achieve any good or value through the use of force. Rather the initiation of force brings frustration, resentment, non thought, with bloody existential results that are negatives. He also believes that this principle is universal and applies to governmental coercion private crime among other things.

Furthermore, Rand holds that man's right can only be violated by the initiation of physical force, directly or indirectly (through fraud) thus she writes;

One cannot expropriate a man's values, or prevent him from pursuing values, or enslave him in any manner at all, except by the use of physical force. Whoever refrains from such initiation whatever his virtues or vices, knowledge or errors-necessarily leaves the rights of others unbreached<sup>15</sup>.

From the above, Ayn Rand holds that the initiation of force against another person is evil. While the use of force in retaliation, against any one or nation that first use it, is properly in order. And here using force in retaliation must not be used on an innocent person except on criminals or aggressors. Rand's idea of initiation of physical force gives rise to what has been called the non-aggression principle. It states that no person may initiate or threaten to initiate the use of coercive physical force. Mc



Keerer expounds this principle in five different ways: Firstly, he opines that the principle does not rule out the use of coercive physical force. Thus, it does not rule out self. Secondly, for a physical force to be coercive, the person it is used upon must not consent to it. For instance, if a person consents to being punched, the initiation of physical force is no longer coercive. Thirdly, all coercion is seen to be ultimately physical, but concepts, ideas, beliefs, messages, and opinions are not physical. Thus, with the exclusion of using threat to initiate the use of coercive physical force, the mere communication tone or more people do not constitute the violation of the non-aggression principle. Fourthly, in view of the objectivist view, inaction is never coercion nor violates this principle, even if it involves refusing to help someone stay alive. And the fifth, in view of objectivism fraud is an indirect way to initiate the coercive use of physical force, because it violates this principle of non aggression. No wonder, political objectivism argues that in a society the government has the monopoly to initiate retaliatory use of force, in order to protect the life liberty and property of every individual.<sup>16</sup>

## **4.2 Rand's Concept of Capitalism**

Capitalism is a social system based on the recognition of individual rights, including property rights, in which all property is privately owned.

For Rand under capitalism, state and economics are separated, as the state and the church are separated for the same reasons. Thus, capitalism becomes the system of laissez-faire, where government does not have control over the economy, but a free market. For her, it is also a place man act and interacts voluntarily, by individual choice and free trade. Historically, Rand believes that pure capitalism never existed but was approached by the west (Americans) during the period of the industrial revolution.

Accordingly, Rand opines that since rights are the means of subordinating the society to moral law, capitalism becomes the only moral social system. This is because a free mind is a corollary of a free market. Thus, capitalism for Rand guarantees man's freedom to think and act accordingly. It is a system which assures basic social need of reason, freedom and all the needs of man's life. It becomes the system that helps in the achievement of virtue and every moral value as against other social systems that clash with the functions of the mind.

Rand opines that capitalism is the only system that can uphold the virtue of independence, because it respects individual freedom as an absolute. Buttressing this Peikoff writes:

Materially, independence requires that one support himself by the work of his own mind.

This presupposes a political system without a government favors or favorites-without looters or moochers, rulers or ruled. The character of the rulers is irrelevant; it makes no moral difference whether they are kind or cruel, benevolent or male-violent, responsible or irresponsible.<sup>17</sup>

Here the emphasis becomes on the need for independence, which requires that one forms one's own judgments. And that a government should not think for anyone or defines any one's right ideas and behavioral standards. But, everyman must be left alone.

Also Rand observes that capitalism as a social system is in consonant with justices. Justice here becomes the virtue of judging men morally and of granting to each what he deserves. Thus, this system guarantees independent thought and self protection. It also assures the essential rule of justice, which is the trader principle. Rand opines that this trade principle requires a system of voluntary relationship, where government is forbidden to hold - up men. And the opposite of justice becomes the principle of statist societies, which penalizes virtue and rewards evil, according to Rand.

According to Rand, capitalism encourages productiveness which is the virtue of creating material values. It becomes a system of and for producers, of free thought and creativity. Thereby, encouraging

competition which brings about man's freedom to offer his best to produce, buy or not to buy product.

Also Rand believes that capitalism protects one's integrity. This is because integrity is the refusal to permit a breach between thought and action, and a capitalist system assures this unlike in statism which inherently breaches one's thought and action. She also opines that capitalism also promotes honesty, which is the selfish refusal to fake reality, this because capitalism as a system is geared to selfishness and reality.

In addition, Rand conceives capitalism as a system that respects individual pride, because it requires the moral ambitiousness of seeking to observe every moral principle. Thus Peikoff asks "As to the value of self-esteem, who can achieve it in a system that degrades him to the status of helpless social atom?"<sup>18</sup> Hence, capitalism adheres to the principle of egoism and promotes the pursuit of rational self-interest, that makes a man an end in himself. It also includes the profit motive, which means a man's encouragement to work in order to gain something for himself, for instance in economic terms to make money.

Additionally, Rand buttresses capitalisms as a system of objectivity, because it implements the right code of morality based on

good metaphysics and epistemology. It also protects objective rights by means of objective laws and is incompatible with any kind of subjectivism. Thus, she validates capitalism as that which not only institutionalizes right values and virtues but the deepest truths. She also avers that any opposition to capitalism which can be seen in statism among others critiques, are dependent on bad epistemology.

Thus, Peikoff affirms:

Without a proper epistemology, men do not use their minds properly and their political conclusions are correspondingly worthless. In today's culture, this principle works out as follows. Irrationalism leads the intellectuals to discard the possibility of independence in favour of altruism which leads them to conclude that capitalism is evil. Thereafter, however, scandalously they drop context, rewrite history or contradict themselves, they feel no shame, so long as they are anticapitalist, they feel noble.<sup>19</sup>

Here, one sees the validation and defense of capitalism against its opposition. Let's now examine some of Rand's conceptions of the opposites of capitalism.

#### **4.2.1 Collectivism**

It holds that in human affairs the collective (society, community, nation, proletariat, race, etc) is the unit of reality and the standard of

value. This means for Rand the subjugation of the individual to a group and also encourages that man should be chained to a collective action and thought for the sake of common good. For Rand in collectivism the individual has no rights, his life and work belong to the group. And the group may sacrifice the individual against his own interests. She also opines that the doctrine of collectivism is implemented through the use of brute force and the political system that goes with collectivism is statism. She buttresses that fascism and communism are variants of statism based on the collectivist principle that man is the slave of the state.

Accordingly, Rand believes that what subjectivism is in the area of ethics is what collectivism is in the politics. For instance the notion that ‘anything one does is right because one chooses to do it’ is not a moral principle, but unethical. So as the notion that ‘anything the society does is right because society chooses to do it’ is not a moral principle, but unethical and the rejection of morality from social issues. Thus, she observes that collectivism as a cultural intellectual power and moral ideal died in World War II. And if anyone is still toeing towards this path (collectivism) is heading to destruction. This is because for her collectivism lost the elements of reason and morality on the socialist-

communist-fascist system that demonstrated brute irrationality and inhumanity of altruism as moral code in history of the world.

In addition she opines that the collectivist see the society as a super organism and as a supernatural that is superior to sum of its individual members. Hence Peikoff writes:

Man is not on cell of some larger whole, supernatural or social. He is not a coral bush or even an ant, in the sense of an anatomically specialized organism that can survive only in a colony. A man can survive alone, on a desert island or a self sustaining farm. Man's ability to survive is enhanced by his living in society-but only, if it is a human society, which is governed by the power of reason, i.e. only if the individuals comprising it think and act as individuals, with everything this entails<sup>20</sup>

So for Rand, collectivism is wrong a system which does not exist. It is only man; the man is self-created, self-directed, self-responsible and sovereign.

Consequently, she sees collectivism as a politics where there is an application of the ethics of altruism. Because man exists only to serve other men, thereby forfeiting his individual right, while the group becomes the unit of value and bearer of sovereignty. As a result of this permanent sacrifice as a man's way of life, his success, independent, happiness and prosperity is destroyed. Hence, she holds that all the

advocates of collectivism are not motivated by desire for men's happiness, but unhappiness and fury. Therefore, collectivism is evil. Let us examine Rand's conception of statism.

#### **4.2.2 Statism**

It is any system that concentrates power in the state at the expense of individual freedom. The variants of statism include; theocracy, absolute monarchy, Nazism, fascism, communism, democratic socialism, dictatorship among others and they differ in terms of forms, tactics, and ideology. This system for Rand may nationalize the means of production, allow private ownership but have control over them, practice a caste system in the society.

Rand sees statism as the politics of the unreason, where some rulers regard thought as useless and control individual's action through force and brutality. Thus Peikoff states:

Just as individualism is the politics of demanded by reason, so statism is the politics of unreason. Just as a free system of government flows from and then fosters in its citizens a philosophy that accepts reality, the conceptual level of consciousness, egoism, productiveness, and man the self-made sovereign, so an unfree system flows from and fosters the opposite of such a philosophy.<sup>21</sup>



Following the above, statism as a system, makes man irrational and hopeless. In agreement with the objectivists one may observe that this system makes one to be docile, leading to his hopelessness and intellectual stagnation.

Additionally, Rand observes that the essence of the policy of statist government is “war against man,” that is war against man’s mind, body and property. Thus she writes;

A statist is a man who believes that some men have the right to force, coerce, enslave, rob, and murder others. To be put into practice, this belief has to be implemented by the political doctrine that the government-the state-has the right to initiate the use of physical force against its citizens<sup>22</sup>.

This shows that the statist government has the unlimited authority to use physical force anyhow on her powerless citizens. And the resultant effect of this doctrine is dictatorship and destruction.

Furthermore, Rand believes that statism has an ideological root that has the tribal premise of primordial savages, who cannot conceive of individual rights. Rand conceives a tribe as supreme and omnipotent ruler, who owns man’s life and sacrifices him for its own good. For her the history of primitive people is that with a succession of tribal wars and intertribal slaughter, and this ideology according to Rand is now what

rules the nation's armed with nuclear weapons which should be a great concern for man's survival.

Rand also conceives statism as a gang rule. Because, she believes that a dictatorship is a gang who is devoted in looting the products of her industrious citizens. Thus, she opines that when a statist ruler exhausts his country's economy, he begins to attack his neighbors in order to postpone his internal collapse and extends his rule. Thus, she observes that history of major wars in the world was caused by the statist government against the more-freer government. Like in World War I, the monarchist Germany and Czarist Russia dragged freer allies to war. Likewise in World War II the Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia attacked Poland. In this war Germany and Russia confiscated all the factories of the conquered nations to their various nations. While the freest and semi-capitalist nation United State of America sent billion worth of equipment and factories to her allies. Therefore, Rand views statism as evil and believes that nothing can justify the horror, brutality, plunder, destruction, starvation, slave-labor campus, torture chambers and slaughter perpetrated by statist government.

### 4.2.3 Anarchism

It is a political belief that there should be no government in the society. This makes lawlessness, social and political disorder to reign in the society. For Rand, this results to the idea that every man should defend himself by using physical force against others whenever he or she feels to do so, with no objective standards of justice, crime or proof. Thus, she observes that any society without an organized government would be at the mercy of criminal, which may result in to chaos of gang warfare.

Hence, Peikoff warns:

It is a contradiction to assert one's right to use force as one chooses, while demanding that others refrain from organizing to protect themselves. Whoever breaks the laws of a proper government, no matter what his philosophic reasons, becomes thereby a criminal and men are morally bound to treat him as such.<sup>23</sup>

She also sees anarchism as a variant of statism that is senseless, which is not an extreme freedom, but the negation of the concept of freedom. That is why Peikoff believes that anarchism as a theory does not recognize that disagreement and deliberate evil will be possible to men in the society. He opines that anarchism as a theory does not understand the need of any mechanism that will make human being live harmoniously. For him the

reason is because anarchism as a theory has no place for real human beings (individuals).<sup>24</sup> Thus Rand buttresses the need of objective laws that necessitates the establishment a government.

#### **4.2.4 Environmentalism**

It is a political and social ideology that seeks to prevent the environment from degradation by human activity. This led to the formation of ecological environmental movement, which campaigns on how to clean up man's environment for healthy and happy lives. But Rand argues this movement is only a façade to cover the main motivating ideology of this movement. Thus, she opines that they are not motivated to be pro human life, but against technology, man and his mind (his basic tool of survival). Hence, she writes that ecology as a social principle:

Condemns cities, culture, industry, technology,  
the intellect, and advocates men's return to  
"nature, to the state of grunting sub animals  
digging the soil with their bave hands. <sup>25</sup>

Here Rand sees ecological/environmental movement as enemy of man, since it impedes on man's freedom of productiveness.

Further, she observes that in all the appeals for harmony with nature which the environmentalists propagate, they have never considered man's needs and how he should survive. And as a result of this, man is

treated an unnatural phenomenon, but Rand objects that man cannot survive in this state which environmentalist projects. Therefore Rand avers:

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 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.<sup>26</sup>

Hence, Rand asserts the necessity for man's survival which hinges on his productiveness, which environmentalist ideology cannot suppress or subdue.

More so, Rand buttresses the need to counter what she called "the antihuman ideology of environmentalist" and support the importance of values like reason, science, technology, industrialization and laissez-faire capitalism. Emphasizing the goal of this antihuman ideology she writes:

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.<sup>27</sup>

Thus, Rand believes that the main objective of the environmental movement through their ideology (Environmentalism) is to destroy the most moral socio-economic and political system laissez-faire capitalism. Hence, she calls for an end to this ideology, and unflinching support for the cornerstones of the environment-laissez-faire capitalism which makes an individual to flourish.

### **4.3 Rand's Concept of Feminism**

Feminism is the doctrine which states that men and women are morally, intellectually and spiritually equal and should enjoy full equality of rights before the law. Thus, Branden observes that “if feminism has the view which recognizes women as men’s intellectual, moral, sexual and political equals, then objectivist philosophy of human nature is inherently feminist, since it applied equally to all human beings, less irrespective of gender.”<sup>28</sup> Rand depicts this by creating heroines in her novels, Kira (*We the Living*), Dominique (*The Fountainhead*) and Dagny (*Atlas Shrugged*) and none of them sacrifices her interests, intellect or principles for the man or men in their lives.

She believes that everyone is a rational animal; therefore all men and women have the same right and deserve to be free to make their choices in life, without initiating forces against one another. Rand buttresses this in the character of Dominique in “*The Fountainhead*” and Dagny in “*Atlas shrugged*”. Here, Dominique was free to marry different men in order to see that Howard Roark gets vengeance and victory. Also Dagny was also given free hand to manage Taggart Transcontinental Rail lines amidst all obstacles.

Rand also rejects all traditional restrictions on women, especially the idea that men are more powerful than women and places men above women, thereby limiting the freedom of women to make choices. Rather, she encourages a productive work, which she sees as a virtue and value for women as well as merit hence, she admonishes women to engage in “hero worship”, like having at least one man whom women should look up to, as Dagny in *Atlas Shrugged* did to Hank Reardon and as she admired many great men in history like Aristotle.

Further, Rand’s emphasis on human right promotes her support on woman’s right to abortion, especially as a respect of one’s right to control the uses of his or her own body or reproductive choices. It is also pertinent to observe that she has and presents an individualist concept of

feminism, where a woman should exercise her own rational self-interest to pursue her happiness without relying or clinching to any group for protection or help. This makes her an anti collectivist feminist, where a group fights for every woman's right. Accordingly, Thomas buttresses that objectivism believes that "a woman is free to make any place she chooses to be her place. And as a rational being she ought to pursue her relationship based on mutual respect and an honest exchange of value for value. Also, a woman may need to engage in a productive career, friendship and love. They may also engage is in child rearing or not. Therefore, there is no objective basis to restrict women choices based on their sex." <sup>29</sup>

Furthermore, Ayn Rand sees sex as an expression of a man's self-esteem and his own self value. No wonder she would always say tell me what a man finds sexually attractive and I will tell you his entire philosophy of life. She believes that sex is a physical capacity, but its exercise is determined by man's mind and his choice of values, held consciously or subconsciously. Thus for Rand, to a rational man sex is an expression of self-esteem and a celebration of himself and of existence.



But, to the man who lacks self-esteem sex is an attempt to fake it, to acquire its momentary illusion.

Further, Rand sees sex as one of the most important aspects of man's life and must not be approached lightly or casually. Hence she buttresses:

The man who is proudly certain of his own value, will want the highest type of woman he can find, the woman he admires, the strongest, the hardest to conquer- because only the possession of a heroine will give him the sense of an achievement, not the possession of a brainless slut.<sup>30</sup>

So for Rand a sexual relationship is proper only on the ground of the highest values one can find in a human being. Therefore, she buttresses that sex must be seen as a response to value. And considers promiscuity as immoral, because sex is too good and important which ought to involve a serious relationship whether it leads to marriage or not.

## Endnotes

1. A. Rand, "Individual Rights", Ayn Rand Lexicon, <https://aynrandlexicon.com//individual-rights.html>, (30/08/2014).
2. A. Rand, "Man's Rights", *The Virtue of Selfishness*, (New York: New American Library, 1964), p. 92.
3. L. Peikoff, *Objectivism: The Philosophy of Ayn Rand*, (New York: Dutton, 1991), p. 351.
4. A. Rand, "Man's Rights," *The Virtue of Selfishness*, p. 93.
5. A. Rand, *Atlas Shrugged*, (New York: Random House, 1957), p. 986.
6. L. Peikoff, *Objectivism: The Philosophy of Ayn Rand*, p. 353.
7. A. Rand, *For the New Intellectual*, (New York: Random House, 1961), p. 25.
8. A. Rand, *The Ayn Rand Lexicon: Objectivism from A to Z*, (New York: NAL Books, 1986), p.215.
9. A. Rand, "Collectivized Rights" *The Virtue of Selfishness*, p. 101.
10. A. Rand, "The Nature of Government", *The Virtue of Selfishness*, p. 108.
11. A. Rand, *Atlas Shrugged*, p. 985.
12. L. Peikoff, *Objectivism: The Philosophy of Ayn Rand*, p. 367.
13. A. Rand, "What is Capitalism," *Capitalism: The Unknown Ideal*, (New York: New American Library, 1966), p.17.
14. Ibid. p. 23.
15. A. Rand, "Man's Rights," *The Virtue of Selfishness*, p. 95.
16. P. Mc Keerer. "What is Objectivism", [www.mondopolitico.com/ideologies/](http://www.mondopolitico.com/ideologies/), (3/04/2015)
17. L. Peikoff, *Objectivism: The Philosophy of Ayn Rand*, p. 2.

18. Ibid. p. 389.
19. Ibid. p. 410.
20. Ibid. p. 202.
21. Ibid. p. 370.
22. A. Rand, "America's Persecuted Minority: Big Business", *Capitalism: The Unknown ideal*, p. 47.
23. L. Peikoff, *The Objectivism; The Philosophy of Ayn Rand*, p. 372.
24. Loc. Cit.
25. A. Rand, "The Lessons of Vietnam" *The Ayn Rand Letter*, 111, 25, (1974), p.1
26. A. Rand, "The Anti- Industrial Revolution" *Return of the Primitive: The Anti-Industrial Revolution*, P. Schwartz, (ed.), (New York: Meridian, 1999), p. 277.
27. Ibid. p. 280.
28. N. Branden, "Was Ayn Rand a Feminist?" *Feminist Interpretations of Ayn Rand*, M. Gladstein, and C Sciabarra, (Eds.), (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1999), p.223.
29. W. Thomas, "Feminism and Objectivism" *The Atlas Society*, <http://www.atlassociety.org/feminism-and-objectivism>, (30/01/2015)
30. A. Rand, *Atlas Shrugged*. p. 490.

# CHAPTER FIVE

## Ayn Rand Political Objectivism: A Philosophical Analysis

### 5.1 A Philosophical Appraisal of Political Objectivism

Taking cognizance of chapters three and four of this dissertation, the main objective of this chapter is to appraise Ayn Rand political objectivism. Following this, an attempt has been made to show an absolute individual freedom, whereby in peaceful pursuit of personal fulfillment and happiness, everyone has an absolute right and freedom to his own life, liberty and property. And that the role of government is to protect this right, while laissez-faire capitalism becomes the only moral social system that is compatible with rational nature and which can protect the individual rights and life. Now let us examine Rand's political objectivism, starting with her concept of right.

Rights are moral concept that provides a guiding principle of individual action and his relationship with others. It is that which can be exercised without anybody's permission. It entails freedom from physical compulsion, coercion or interference by other men. It protects and preserves individual morality in the society. Hence, individual rights become a means of subordinating society to moral law. According to Rand, man's right is an inalienable individual right, whereby this right is

held individually by every man, all men and at all times, and which cannot be violated by anyone. This right becomes a right to live, to be free and to choose one's own happiness. Here, man has right to live for himself and to make a free choice to what constitutes his own private personal, individual happiness and work towards its achievement without violating other peoples own right. Rand also opines that one cannot be forced to sacrifice his life for another man. Likewise, no group can decide or sacrifice for one's choice of happiness. In fact one can derive the central thesis of Rands concept of right, when she writes:

The source of man's rights is not divine law or congressional law, but the law of identity. A is A and man is man. Rights are conditions of existence required by man's nature for his proper survival. If man is to live on earth, it is right for him to use his mind, it is right to act on his own free judgement, it is right to work for his values and to keep the product of his work. If life on earth is his purpose, he has a right to live as a rational being. Nature forbids him the irrational. Any group, any gang, any nation that attempts to negate man's rights, is wrong, which means: is evil, which means: is anti-life. <sup>1</sup>

Here, one may not agree with Rand on his source of man's rights, which is based on the law of nature. This is because some people believe that it comes from God (divine law), the state or even from human mind by consenting among themselves. For instance, Arche observes that "the

source of rights is not from the observable universe, man's nature or from any fact. Rather, it is consequence of human cognition, whereby only the mind conceives of the notion of rights. Hence, the concept of right is determined by mental acuity of man and his emotion, while Rand's claims becomes an 'is ought' fallacy"<sup>2</sup>.

Further, one can easily agree with Rand that man needs right for his proper survival on earth. Also, one ought to appreciate the emphasis Rand places on freedom of one to reason in order to survive in the society. Thus she writes:

Since knowledge thinking and rational action are properties of the individual, since the choice to exercise his rational faculty or not depends on the individual, man's survival requires that those who think be free of the interference of those who don't. Since men are neither omniscient nor infallible, they must be free to agree or disagree to cooperate or to pursue their own independent course, each according to his own rational judgement. Freedom is the fundamental requirement of man's mind.<sup>3</sup>

In as much as one commends Rand's concept of reason and freedom to make use of his mind, her idea of rational self interest is highly problematic. This is because she is of the view that it is rational and moral to promote one's self interest against the common interest which is the hallmark and essence of living in the state.

Also worthy of appreciation is Rand's concept of individual rights which encourages and inspires an individual to be productive and hardworking. Thus Machan writes;

The choice to learn, to judge, to evaluate, to appraise, to decide what he ought to do in order to live his life must be each person's own, otherwise he simply has no opportunity to excel or fail at the task. His moral aspirations cannot be fulfilled if he is not the source of his own actions, if they are imposed or forced upon him by others.<sup>4</sup>

With this, Rand empowers one with moral and intellectual ammunition to stand up and take control of his or her own destiny, through self actualization and productive work; through this too she promoted individualism which is problematic. This is because; she is of the view that each individual's happiness is his highest purpose of life. But one may ask, is this ought to be one's highest goal in life?

Accordingly, one may observe that Rand in her theory of rights attaches a lot of importance to property rights which she reduces to right to life. Whereby an individual has the right to do anything he feels best, in as much as there is no initiation of force in his interactions with others.

Thus she writes;

The right to life is the source of all rights-and the right to property is their only implementation. Without property rights, no other rights are possible. Since man has to sustain his life by his own effort,

the man who has no right to the product of his effort has no means to sustain his life. The man who produces while others dispose of his product is a slave.<sup>5</sup>

Here one observes that Rand reduces human right to property right and her idea that without property right no other right is possible becomes fallacious because human right override the right to property. Also within her property right Rand implies that no individual should be restricted from seeking material good, provided that there is no coercion. This makes Rand to have lopsided view of human person, whereby she sees man as material seeking being against the spiritual aspect among others.

Further, one may observe Rand's ingenuity in her concept of physical force and retaliatory force. Where no man ought to initiate the use of physical force against his fellow man, or even a group, government or society assuming the role of a criminal to initiate physical force against anybody. Thus for Rand, men only have the right to use this physical force in retaliation against those that initiate its use on them, in order to avoid such problem, Rand introduces a principle of voluntary agreement the "principle of trade", which becomes the operative principle for exchanging value for value among men. The problem becomes the question of how can one who have rational self interest bargain with



another of his like without cheating one another and its resultant effect may be chaos and war among men.

Furthermore, Rand sees a government as an institution that has an exclusive power to enforce certain rules of social conduct in any given geographical area. For her the task of government is to protect the rights of men under an objective code of rules. Thus, government becomes the means of placing the retaliatory use of physical force under objectively defined laws: here, the government functions as a police man to protect one from criminals; the army to protect one from foreign invaders, and the courts, to protect ones property and contracts from breach or fraud from other men, and to settle these problems through her objective laws.

Accordingly, Rand makes the consent of the governed the source of governments authority, where the government is no longer the ruler, but a servant of then citizens. One may see this Rand's idea as plausible, because government ought to serve its citizens rather than the agents of the government annihilating morality by becoming criminals, stealing from the people and becoming the enemy of the state. On the other hand, Rand can be referred as mini-anarchist by narrowing down the function of government to protection of individual rights alone. So, her view on government may be seen as lopsided view that needs to be reversed.

Hence, granted that there are complications about Rand's theory of rights, which may be seen as implausible and ought to be reexamined. She is mainly interested in providing an overall view of the proper social system than working out its details.

Furthermore, one may observe that Rand's theory of rights informs her view on capitalism. Thus, she writes that capitalism is a social system that is based on the recognition of individual rights, including property rights in which all property is privately owned. Rand tried to justify capitalism from individual right perspective rather than economic or social product. Thus, she writes.

The moral justification of capitalism does not lie in the altruist claim that represents the best way to achieve the common good"... the moral justification of capitalism lies in the fact that it is the only system consonant with man's rational nature that it protects man's survival qua man, and that its ruling principle is justice.<sup>6</sup>

Hence, in capitalist society men are free to deal or cooperate with one another or not depending on their individual convictions, interests and judgments. In fact, capitalist system for Rand gives men freedom to choose their work, trade, to specialize and achieve anything as far as he has the ability. Following this, Rand's idea can only promote free trade, encourage self actualization and guarantee individual freedom. Contrarily,

it may cause chaos, anarchy, unhealthy competition among individuals; exploit the surplus labor of workers, the suppression of the poor and the worst of all encourages immorality, since Rand extols the pursuit of self-interest of oneself and absolute freedom.

Moreso, Rand berates, and relegates the idea of collectivism in the society. Thus she captures collectivism as the subjugation of the individual to a group in terms of race, class or state. And she holds that man is chained to a collective action or thought for the sake of common good. Thus, she denounces that there is nothing like collective right. Here, Rand deprives people the right to form unions, associations and groups in order to fight for their collective interest and common good.

Further, in rejecting collectivism Rand also discourages mutual aids and sacrifice for one another. Consequently, this sacrifice that stems from willingness to consider the needs of society and promote it is rejected by Rand. One may ask what the essence the society is. Thus one may see Rand's ideology as anti-human and society that encourages monopoly, selfishness, alienation, depression and underdevelopment.

In addition, Rand conceives statism as a system that concentrates power in the state at the expense of individual freedom. She sees it as the politics of the unreason, where some rulers regard thought as useless and

control citizens action through force and brutality. For her, it makes man irrational and hopeless, since it has no concern on individual rights. It is also seen as a gang rule, that results to dictatorship and exhausting the country's economy and attacks their neighbours in order to extend their oppressive rule to them. Thus, Rand has a negative view of statism this is because of their historical failure for instance, communism as form of statism was supposed to solve the problem of poverty, inequality, lack of medical care among other problems experienced in the society. But, the situation became worst; there was a lot of poverty, lack of medical care and even government class became better than others. Here, one may justify Rand's view on statism because; it is an unwise and immoral government, since it neglected the citizen's freedom to reason and to act. Rather it promoted plunder, brutality, horror, destruction, starvation, slave-labor camps among others.

Further, Rand does not justify anarchism as a political principle. She sees it as a political believe whereby the society does not require any government. This accounts for lawlessness, social and political disorder in the society, because it results to the idea of everyman should defend himself by using physical force against whoever he feels so. Therefore, Rand buttresses the need of objective laws that necessitates the

establishment of a government. This government for Rand must be a capitalist one, which will guarantee the safety, freedom and right of an individual in the society. Here, one may not be comfortable with Rand suggestion of capitalism because it may not guarantee a better socio-political order.

Following the above, Rand sees environmentalism as an ideology that is anti human and capitalism. It is a political and social ideology that seeks to prevent the environment from degradation by human activity. As a result of this, it forms an ecological and environmental movement in order to clean up man's environment for healthy and happy lives. So, Rand sees this movement as an enemy of man because it is against man's freedom of productiveness and is not concerned about man's need and survival. Therefore, Rand suggests that man cannot survive in this situation and calls for an unflinching support for the cornerstone of the environment-laissez-faire capitalism. One may object to Rand's call for total scrap of environmentalism, this is because of the environmental challenges one is facing today in the world. Here, one may recall the issue of global warming, gas flaring, destruction of aquatic resources, habitat destruction, electromagnetic radiation and health, air pollution, nuclear radiation, land degradation, overgrazing, flooding, and bio capacity

among others. Therefore, there should not be an outright neglect of environmentalism, rather the scientist, technologist and the populace should be cautious on how they operate and treat their environment. This is because if one did not preserve his environment, where will one live. So, one may say that Rand is partially justified in her argument on capitalism because she was only trying to promote her ideology of human freedom and productiveness.

On the other, Rand conceives feminism as the doctrine which states that men and women are morally, intellectually and spiritually equal and ought to enjoy full equality of rights before the law. Rand opines that every human being is a rational animal and women ought to have the same right and deserve to be free to make their choices in life without any coercion. Thus, she rejects all traditional restrictions on women and any ideology that places men above women. She encourages a productive work which she sees as a virtue and value for women as well as men. Also, Rand stresses on human right in order to promote woman's right to abortion. This, she did by asserting that one has an absolute right to control her own body or reproductive choices. Following, Rand's argument on feminism, one may commend her for promoting some aspect of woman right. But her support to absolute women control of their

reproductive organs may be problematic since it may promote abortion among other ills. Also, Rand's concept of feminism may be seen as an individual feminism, where she promoted the course of an individual woman person rather than a collective feminism, where a group or movement fights for every woman's rights. Also, her advice to women to indulge in hero worship is problematic, because it will promote foolishness, selfishness, immorality and sycophancy among others ills, if not checked. But, her concept of sex as an expression of man's self-esteem and his own self value discourages promiscuity and unserious sexual relationship. This view of Rand must be commended because it serves a moral guideline to our present immoral society.

From the foregoing, one will observe that Ayn Rand political philosophy is centered on absolute individual freedom. This makes her to argue on man's essential nature to use his rationality to pursue his happiness and in doing this; the government is strictly restricted to protect man from any initiation of physical force by any other person. By so doing, Rand advocates individualism and capitalism, thereby neglecting altruism and collectivism which are also a necessary condition for proper socio-political system. Hence, one may agree with Branden who writes:

Ayn Rand has an incredible vision to offer-in many respects a radiantly rational one. I am

convinced that there are errors in that vision and elements that need to be changed, eliminated, modified, or added and amplified, but I am also convinced that there is a great deal in her vision that will stand the test of time <sup>7</sup>.

Following the above statement, we shall present universal communalism as an alternative framework to Rand's political objectivism. This is because, universal communalism protects and promotes both individual rights and the rights of the society and makes a peaceful coexistence in the society and state. Universal communalism is an altruistic system, because it is concerned with the welfare of others as against individualism and capitalism.

## **5.2 Universal Communalism an Alternative Framework**

Universal communalism is a systematic and universal application of communalism. It has an underpinning philosophy of "Live and Let Live" and consists of solidarity and subsidiarity. Solidarity, because there is alliance, collaboration, help, compassion, commitment to the cause of the needy, friendship and social charity among one another. Subsidiarity because of the society protects the particular right and competence of individuals and the larger ones. It establishes social justice that impels everyone in the society to promote and advance the cause of common



good in the society. It gives the individual members of the society a sense of belongingness, complementarity and integration in the society. This doctrine places emphasis on the activity and success of the wider society rather than at the expense of, or to the detriment of the individual. On the one hand, it indicates the failures and frustrations of extreme individualism; that in spite of individual talents and capacities, the individual ought to be aware of his or her insufficiency to achieve his welfare through solitary effort. It also indicates the value of collective action, mutual aid, and interdependence as necessary conditions not only for an individual's welfare, but also for the successful achievement of even the most difficult undertakings. Universal communalism insists that the good of all determines the good of each or, put differently, the welfare of each is dependent on the welfare of all. Thus, universal communalism becomes the best moral, social, political system that guarantees individual rights and of a group in the society.

Thus, Gyekye defined communalism as the doctrine that the group constitutes the main focus of the lives of the individual members of that group, and that the extent of the individual's involvement in the interests, aspirations, and welfare of the group is the measure of that individual's work <sup>8</sup>. This philosophy is given institutional expression in the structures

of African societies. Thus, the sense of community and social solidarity that characterizes the social relations of African peoples stems from such communal social structures. Dickson observed this sense of community thus:

Is a characteristic of African life to which attention has been drawn again and again by both African and non- African writers on Africa. Indeed, to many, this characteristic defines Africanness.<sup>9</sup>

This shows that the sense of community and social solidarity define an African life. Also, Wauthier confirms this when he writes that:

Africa is fundamentally communocratic. The collective life and social solidarity give it a basis of humanism which many people might envy. These human qualities also mean that an individual cannot imagine organizing his life outside that of his family, village or clan.<sup>10</sup>

Plainly, communalism holds a most significant place in African social life. This does not necessarily lead to the submerging of the initiative or personality of the individual, because the well-being and success of the group depend on the unique qualities of its individual member.

Therefore, it is implicit in communalism that the success and meaning of the individual's life depend on identifying oneself with the group. This identification is the basis of the reciprocal relationship

between the individual and the group. It is also the ground of the overriding emphasis on the individual's obligation to the members of the group; it enjoins upon him or her, the obligation to think and act in terms of the survival of the group as a whole. Let us examine communalism as major characteristics of the African conception of human nature.

### **5.3 Communalism as a Major Characteristic of the African Conception of Human Nature**

Africans conceive man as a communal being. This is made clear in the concept of communalism. Thus, Iroegbu writes in his book *Communalism*:

By communalism we understand a theory of a just society in which the community is the foundation of political life and in which the autonomy of the members of the community is assured. <sup>11</sup>

Drawing from the above, there is a unity of two poles: the community and the individual. Both are brought into a relationship of mutuality and functional co-existence. In the above definition there are two basic concepts: foundation which the community provides, and autonomy which the individual in the community enjoys. Thus, one may opine that

the individual being emerges from a society, and it comes into being for the sake of and exists for his development and growth.

In light of the above, an individual who is cut off from the communal organism is nothing. Therefore, in the community the members relate to one another in a communal fashion of brotherhood, hospitality and care. Communal living then, becomes the main priority of every African community. They share things together, to promote the spirit of brotherhood. This is what Julius Nyerere calls *UJAMAA* (family hood), it is a political ideology aimed at achieving a just, human and egalitarian Tanzania devoid of poverty, capitalism, and social and racial inequalities caused by colonization by the west. It encouraged all Tanzanians to develop urgently, their own skills and economic activities for the benefit of the society based on the legacies of African communism.

In Igbo land, the thrust of communalism *Umunna* (kinship) applies to the life of Igbo people both at home and abroad. *Umunna* constitutes the centre of interpersonal relationship and it is from *Umunna* that the individual (Igbo man) draws his life-force and contributes his individual talents. This gives him a sense of belonging and provides for him too. Central to this is the common good and as opposed to private interest. Commenting on this, Iroegbu in his "*Metaphysics*" affirms that it is the

“principle of Belongingness” that guides communalism. And it makes sure that all (men) belong and that nobody is marginalized; both contributively (duties and responsibilities) and distributive (sharing of communal cake).

So from the foregoing, Africans view man as a communal being which reflects that community-individual relationship, not western individualism or communism, rather a balanced integration of the values that both the society and the individual present, for the full flourishing of the human person. The Igbos express the real-ideal synthesis of community and individuality in the famous proverb *Egbe bere Ugo bere, nke si n' ibe ya ebela nku kwaa ya* (Let the kite perch, and let the Eagle perch: if one says that the other should not perch, let the one's wing break). The *Egbe* and *Ugo* are the different individuals who must be allowed to perch in the community without unnecessary hindrance. In order to have a clear view of the aforementioned, let us consider complementarity as a major aspect of the African Communalism.

#### **5.4 Complementarity as a Major Aspect Communalism**

Complementarity is the act of making something complete and supplying what is lacking or needed by another or each other for completion. Asouzu captures this idea of complementarity as

“*Ibuanyidanda*” meaning “‘*Njiko aka*’ (togetherness is greatest), ‘*Igwe buike*’ (strength in togetherness) and this though was inspired by the teaching of traditional Igbo philosophers of the complementary system of thought.<sup>12</sup> Affirming this, Asouzu states that “to be” is capacity to be in mutual complementary relationship with all things that exists.

Asouzu’s, *Ibuanyidanda* (complementarity) is another way of saying that anything that exists serves a missing link of reality or that whatever exists has head and tail-end (*Ihe di, nwere isi na odu*). Hence, “one is to be pitied who thinks that a subject can afford to live alone, outside of the legitimacy provided by the mutual complementary relationship between all missing links.”<sup>13</sup> Because of this, Africans so much believe in mutual dependence and interdependence of one another. No wonder the Igbos will say that “*agbako agbako baa mamiri ya agbaa ufufu*” (when things are done jointly, it succeeds) and “*aka nri kwuo aka ikpa, aka ikpa akwuo aka nri*” (when the right hand washes the left, and in turn, the left and washes the right hand), thus there is mutual relationship and inter-dependency among the Africans.

Ozumba’s “Integrative Humanism” captures this “complementarity in the view that all parts of reality constituting matter and spirit, the plant and animal world are an integrated ecosystem of which no part can be

isolated without dire consequences.”<sup>14</sup> Thus, it uses the method of synthesis and is against the principle of “autarky” or isolationism. This methodology seeks to integrate the rich and poor nations by showing why inhuman disparity cannot survive long, why the politics of zero-sum gameness (winner-takes-it-all) is both “unspiritual” and inhuman”. It is also based on the principle of harmony.

Furthermore, this complementarity reflects communalism, solidarity and subsidiarity. Communalism, because in the community the members relate to one another in communal fashion of brotherhood, hospitality and care. Solidarity because there is alliance, collaboration, helps, compassion and commitment to the cause of the needy friendship, and social charity among one another. Subsidiarity, because the society protects the particular right and competence of individuals, and smaller groups against excessive domination by the societies.

Therefore, complementarity is a demand of human brotherhood, based on the fact that no one or group is created an island. Thus, on coming into the world, a person is not equipped with everything he needs for developing his bodily and spiritual life. He needs others, just as others might need him. That is why Africans do things together and this is seen in the teachings of some African philosophers like *Ujamaa* (Nyerere),

Communalism (Nkrumah), *Uwa* Ontology (Iroegbu). *Complementary Ontology* (Asouzu), Communacrcacy (Sekou Toure), *Ubuntu* (Mbigi) and others.

In the light of the above, Nyerere will argue that in Africa it is true then to say that as the glow of a coal depend upon its remaining in the fire, so the vitality, the psychic security, the very humanity of many depend on his integration into the family. He further makes the point that “we are, therefore I am, and since I am, therefore we are”<sup>15</sup>.

## **5.5 Universal Communalism an Alternative Framework to Political Objectivism**

Following the above, one would observe that with universal communalism there will be equality of opportunity and social justice for everyone in the society. This is because the basic content of social justice covers social and economic rights of everybody to adequate food, clothing and housing, health care, welfare services, education among others. This is against capitalism and individualism which discourages sacrifice and fairness, but encourages selfishness, inequality, greediness, and perpetrates social injustice. And, it is only when there is social injustice that most of the unrests and crimes arise in the society. No wonder, Ucheaga buttresses that “there is a limit to which human endurance can be



stretched because of social injustice, and once this limit has been reached, the individual fights back. The impact of this on society is in the wave of crimes.”<sup>16</sup> Thus, capitalist system accounts for the galloping wave of crime in the society.

Accordingly, the acquisitive instinct and excessive competition, which is largely responsible for the vicious excesses, exploitation and inequality under the capitalist system, will be tempered by a sense of togetherness, and a rejection of graft and meanness. This is because there will be loyalty to the society, and it gives the members a sense of security and universal hospitality. For instance, when money was introduced and some Africans came to work for wages abroad. They maintained contact with their native land as the only source of security, to which they could look in old age or in sickness. Thus, communalism became a social security scheme, with no written rules, but with a strict pattern to which everyone adhered. If someone did not take on the obligations inherent in the system, he found that when he next got into trouble, he received little or no attention.

Moreso, universal communalism will bring about the normative conception of personhood on the community. This implies that one acquires personhood by being integrated into the society, and being

morally educated and socially responsible about the communal ways of life and values. This is contrary to individualism that encourages selfishness and absolute freedom to the detriment of the society and creates deficiencies in harmonious coexistence. Thus, this emphasizes the primacy of social responsibility as a precondition for an individual's right, freedom and autonomy. With this, there will be love, human well being, communal peace and harmony.

Further, universal communalism will bring about the psychological well being of individuals in the society. Unlike capitalist system where one is prone to loneliness, hopelessness, depression, suicide ideation and rejects social support. This is because, its intricate web of social relationships tends to ensure the individual's social worth. Thus, this system makes it almost impossible for an individual to feel socially insignificant. In African communal social order, this assurance is already provided; the individual feels socially worthy and important because his or her role and activity in the society are appreciated. Universal communalism affords the individual the opportunity to make a meaningful life through his or her contribution to the general welfare. It is thus part of the doctrine of communalism that the individual can find the highest good- materially, morally, and spiritually, in relationships with

others and in working for the common good. Therefore, there will be no opportunity for any unrest to be carried out in the society.

Importantly, with universal communalism in place in the society there will not be an apparent conflict between an individual (a citizen) and the society (country). This is because, there will not be a meaningful or significant tension between the interest of an individual and any effort to exclude the other is wrong. Thus, the problem of an individual becomes other people's or the community's problem, and in turn, the community's problem becomes the problem of every individual. For instance, when one gives birth to a child, the community will rejoice with the parents of the baby and also contribute in the training of the baby. On the other hand, when one is sick, the whole community comes to the person's aid. If one is not loyal to the society, he will be neglected and ostracized. This is a sharp contrast from the western individualistic and capitalist practice or attitude preached by Ayn Rand, where there is rejection of helps or sacrifice from an individual and the society (government) at large.

From the foregoing, individualism and capitalism are opposed to universal communalism which believes that "to be" is not to be alone and free. Individualism as self preservation in the Western worldview de-emphasizes the communitarian spirit in terms of which society is ought to

be defined. But the communitarian spirit is necessarily dependent on the leadership structure and state of affairs. Where the society deviates from the reflection of this communalism, and political situations are personally motivated, then the Hobbesian thesis of self-preservation and self-gains come to the fore. One may say that the direction of our socio economic state of affairs reflects the aftermath of capitalist ideologies that have been enforced. These capitalist ideologies come from a western metaphysics of a polarist and bifurcatory nature. Because of this; it de-emphasized the communal interest and promoted the private interest. No wonder, some western developed world were interested in undeveloped countries for economic value and not to alleviate their problem. Therefore, in order to have a peaceful coexistence and development in the society. It is pertinent for every society to embrace and practice universal communalism as a way of life as against capitalism.

## Endnotes

1. A. Rand, "Galt's Speech" *For the New Intellectual*, (New York; Random House, 1961) p. 182.
2. Arche, "Rights: Ayn Rand Got it Wrong" *The Philosopher's Stoned*, [www.intothosphere.blogspot](http://www.intothosphere.blogspot), (23/04/2015).
3. A. Rand, "What is Capitalism?" *Capitalism: The Unknown Ideal*, (New York: New American Library, 1966), p. 17.
4. T. Machan, *Human Rights and Human Liberties*, (Chicago: Nelson Hall, 1975), p.119
5. A. Rand, "Mans Right" *Capitalism: The Unknown Ideal*, p.322.
6. Ibid. p. 20.
7. F.C. Ofoegbu, *Live and Let Live: A Philosophical Cum Historical Reflection on Nigeria @ 100*, (Owerri: Applause B Multi-sects Ltd, 2014), p. 84.
8. K. Dickson, *Aspects of Religion and Life in Africa*. (Accra: Ghana Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1977), p. 4.
9. C. Wauthier, *The Literature and Thought of Modern Africa*. (London: Heinemann, 1978), P. 173.
10. P. Iroegbu, *Communalism*, (Michigan: UMI diss. Serv, 1989), p. 136.
11. ---. *Metaphysics: The Kpim of Philosophy*. (Owerri: International University Press, 1995), p. 350.
12. I. Asouzu, *Ibuanyidanda, New Complementary Ontology: Beyond World Immanentism Ethnocentric Reduction and Impositions*. (U.K: Transaction Publishers, 2007), p. 11.
13. Ibid. p. 10.

14. G. Ozumba, *Philosophy and Method of Integrative Humanism*. (Calabar, Jochrisam Publishers, 2010), p. 23.
15. J. Nyerere, *Ujamaa: The Basis of African Socialism*, (Dar-es-salaam: Oxford University Press, 1968), p. 3.
16. D. Ucheaga, "Social Justice, Corruption and Criminality in Nigeria" *International Journal of Social Science and Public Policy*, 4, 2, (2001), p. 218.

# CHAPTER SIX

## Evaluation and Conclusion

### 6.1 Evaluation

This dissertation is an attempt to examine Ayn Rand's Political Objectivism, a philosophy that is based on absolute freedom of an individual. In the course of the work, it exposed and analyzed Rand's concepts of rights, government, and initiation of force, capitalism, collectivism, statism, anarchism, environmentalism and feminism. We also reviewed some relevant literatures that dealt on political objectivism of Ayn Rand. The work examined the philosophy of Rand, especially her political objectivism. Here, Rand emphasizes on the individual right to life, liberty and property, as she believe that laissez-faire capitalism is best socio political system compatible and conducive to man. This is because it is only system that can guarantee an individual's right in the society. And as a result of this, she promoted individualism and capitalism. On which she argued that it is man's essential nature to use his rationality to pursue his happiness and in doing this; the role of the government is only to protect man from any initiation of physical force by any other person. In fact, the right to life becomes the right to a process of self preservation, not giving other people food, medicine or job when they need it. Thus, she

devoid the society of any kind of helps or sacrifice, even the government has no right to help or assist any one in her capitalist system except to protect him or her from initiation of physical force. So, she rejected altruism and collectivism which are also a necessary condition for proper socio-political system.

Further, the work commends some ideas of Rand, but observes some errors in the ideas of her that needed to be changed, eliminated and modified. Thus, this dissertation suggested and explored universal communalism as a better social political system and an alternative platform for Ayn Rand's political objectivism. Universal communalism places emphasis on the activity and success of the wider society rather than at the expense of, or to the detriment of the individual. On the one hand, it indicates the failures and frustrations of extreme individualism; that in spite of individual talents and capacities, the individual ought to be aware of his or her insufficiency to achieve his welfare through solitary effort. Thus, it indicates the value of collective action, mutual aid, and interdependence as necessary condition not only for an individual's welfare, but also for the successful achievement of even the most difficult undertakings. So for a peaceful coexistence in the society, it is important



for everyone to embrace and practice universal communalism as a way of life.

## **6.2 Conclusion**

In conclusion, this dissertation sets out to examine Ayn Rand's political objectivism with a view to showing that it does not guarantee a necessary condition for moral socio-political system and development. In the course of the study, one affirmed that Rand's idea that man in peaceful pursuit of his fulfillment has an absolute right to his life, liberty, and property; the government has only the duty to protect man's rights; and capitalism is the only social political system conducive and compatible to man, is erroneous and needed to be changed. This is because Rand's idea promoted individualism and capitalism, rejecting any form of altruism and collectivism to the detriment of moral socio-political system and development. Accordingly, the author argued that the direction of our socio economic state of affairs reflects the aftermath of capitalist ideologies that have been enforced by western ideologies.

Consequently, there is the urgent need for the restructuring our society from the capitalist ideology. This is necessarily required to give everybody a sense of belonging as a positive motivation to participate in

the nation building. Following this, the work suggests an alternative framework, which has to do with the universal communalism. Because any society that deviates from the reflection of this communalism or any developmental programme that marginalizes the community is heading for a failure. For peaceful co-existence with everyone makes for the harmony of creation and happiness of humanity.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Asouzu, Innocent. *The Method and Principles of Complementary Reflection in and Beyond African Philosophy*. Calabar: University of Calabar Press, 2004.
- Barr, Emily, J., "Sex and the Egoist: Measuring Ayn Rand's Fiction Against her Philosophy", *The Journal of Ayn Rand Studies*, 12,2 (2012), 193-206.
- Bass, Robert H, "Egoism Versus Rights", *The Journal of Ayn Rand Studies*, 7(2), 2006, pp.329-349.
- Berliner, M. (ed), *Letters of Ayn Rand*, New York: Plume, 1995.
- Bissell, Roger, J., "The Logic of Liberty: Aristotle, Ayn Rand and the Logical Structure of the Political Spectrum" *The Journal of Ayn Rand Studies* 12, 1 (2012) pp. 56-75.
- Block, Walter, "Ayn Rand, Religion and Libertarianism", *The Journal of Ayn Rand Studies*, 11, 1 (2011), pp. 63.
- Bostaph, Samuel, "Ayn Rand's Economic Thought", *The Journal of Ayn Rand Studies*, 11, 1, (2011), pp.19-44.
- Branden, Barbara, *The Passion of Ayn Rand*. Garden City, New York: Double day & Company, 1986.
- Branden, Nathaniel,"The Benefits of Hazards of the Philosophy of Ayn Rand: A Personal Statement, *Journal of Humanistic Philosophy*, 24 (1984), pp. 39-64.
- Brownmiller, Susan, *Against our Will: Men, Women, and Rape*. (New York: Simeon and Schuster, 1975).
- Burns, Jennifer, *Goddess of the Market, Ayn Rand and the American Right*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Childs, R. "Objectivism and the State: An open Letter to Ayn Rand" in *Liberty*. San Francisco: Fox and Wilkes, 1994.

"Conversations with Ayn Rand: Part 1", *Liberty*, 3,6, (1990), pp.23-26.

Den Uyl, Douglas and Rasmussen, Douglas (eds.). *The Philosophic Thought of Ayn Rand* (Paperback ed.) Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1986.

Doherty, Brian. "She's Back!", *Reason*, 41,7, (2009), pp. 51-58.

..... *Radicals for Capitalism: A freewheeling History of the Modern American Libertarian Movement*. New York: Public Affairs, 2007.

Dykes, Nicholas, "Ayn Rand in England", *The Journal of Ayn Rand Studies*, 5, 2, (2004), pp. 365-400.

....., "The Facts of Reality: Logic and History in Objectivist Debates about Government", *The Journal of Ayn Rand Studies*, 7, 1, (2005), pp. 79-140.

Feminism, Merriam-Webster Dictionary, ([www.Merriam-webster.com/.../feminism](http://www.Merriam-webster.com/.../feminism)) 2014

Gladstein, Mimi, Reisel & Sciabarra, Chris (eds), *Feminist Interpretations of Ayn Rand*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1999.

Gladstein, Mimi, Reisel, & Sciabarra Chris Mathew, *Feminist Interpretations of Ayn Rand*, ([www.nyu.edu/fem/femdspt](http://www.nyu.edu/fem/femdspt)).

Gladstein, Mimi. *The New Ayn Rand Companion*. West Port, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1999.

Glennon, L. *Women and Dualism: A Sociology of Knowledge Analysis*. New York: Longman, 1979.

Gotthelf, Allan. "On Ayn Rand", *Wadsworth Philosophers Series*. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing, 2000.

- Heller, Anne. *Ayn Rand and The World She Made*. New York: Double day, 2009.
- Hoberek, Andrew, *The Twilight of the Middle Class*. Princeton N.J: Princeton University Press, 2009.
- Hospers, J. “Conversations with Ayn Rand: Part 11”, *Liberty* 4,1, (1990), pp.42-52.
- Long, R. and Machan, T., (eds), *Anarchism / Minarchism: Is a Government Part of Free Country?*. Aldershort: Ashgate, 2009.
- Mack, E. “The Fundamental Moral Elements of Rand’s Theory of Rights”, in Den Douglas and Rasmussen Douglas (eds). *The Philosophic Thought of Ayn Rand*. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1984
- Maurone, Joseph, “The Trickster Icon and Objectivism” *The Journal of Ayn Rand Studies* 12, 1 (2012) pp. 229-258.
- Mbaegbu, Celestine. *Hermeneutics of God in Igbo Ontology*. Awka: Fab Educational Books, 2012.
- Merrill, Ronald, E. *The Ideas of Ayn Rand*. La Salle, Illinois: Open Court Publishing, 1991.
- Murray, Charles. “Who is Ayn Rand?” *The Claremont Institute*. 2010.
- Ofoegbu, Francis, C. *Live and Let Live: Nigeria: A philosophical Cum Historical Reflection on Nigeria @ 100*, Owerri: Applause B Multi-sects Ltd, 2014.
- Oxford Dictionary. ([www.oxforddictionaries.com/defintion](http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/defintion)) Retrieved on 01/09/2014.
- Parrish, Stephen, “God and Objectivism: A Critique of Objectivist Philosophy of Religion”, *The Journal of Ayn Rand Studies* 8,2 (2007), pp.169-210.

- Peikoff, Leonard. *Objectivism: The Philosophy of Ayn Rand*, New York: E. P. Dutton, 1991.
- Rand, Ayn, *Anthem*. New York: New American Library, 1961.
- Rand, Ayn, Government Ayn Rand Lexicon (aynrand lexicon. Com /.../ government.html). Retrieved on 30/08/2014.
- Rand, Ayn, Individual Rights, Ayn Rand Lexicon (aynrand lexicon.com//individual-rights.html). Retrieved on 30/08/2014.
- Rand, Ayn, Introducing Objectivism. Retrieved Online on 30/6/2014.
- Rand, Ayn, *The Objectivist*. Palo Alto, CA: Palo Book Service, 1982.
- Rand, Ayn, *The Voice of Reason: Essays in Objectivist Thought*, L. Peikoff, (ed.). New York: Meridian, 1990.
- Rand, Ayn, *We The Living*, (New York: New American Library, 1959)
- Rand, Ayn. *Atlas Shrugged* (35<sup>th</sup> anniversary ed) New York: Dutton, 1992.
- Rand, Ayn. *Capitalism: The Unknown Ideal*. New York: New American Library, 1967.
- Rand, Ayn. *Major Conservative and Libertarian Thinkers Series*. New York: Continuum, 2009.
- Rand, Ayn. *The Fountainhead*, Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1943.
- Rand, Ayn. *The Virtue of Selfishness: A New Concept of Egoism*. New York: New American Library, 1964.
- Rand, Ayn. *The Voice of Reason: Essays in Objectivist Thought*. Peikoff Leonard (ed.). New York: Meridian, 1990.
- Rand's, Ayn, *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Retrieved online 11/6/2014

- Reisman, George, "Ayn Rand and Ludwig Von Mises", *The Journal of Ayn Rand Studies*, 6, 2, (2005), pp. 251-258.
- Rights, Wikipedia, ([www.en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/rights](http://www.en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/rights)/Retrieved on/09/2014).
- Rothbard, R. "Confessions of a Right-Wing Liberal" *Ramparts*, 6(4), 1968, pp. 48-52.
- Seddon, Fedd. *Ayn Rand, Objectivists, and the History of Philosophy*. Lanham: University Press of America, 2003.
- Share, Cade, "A Defense of Rothbardian Ethics via a Mediation of Hoppe and Rand", *The Journal of Ayn Rand Studies*, 12,1,(2012), pp.117-150.
- Shermer, M. "The Unlikelist Cult in History", *Skeptic*, 2, 2, (1993), pp.748-765.
- "The Rand Transcript Revisited", *The Journal of Ayn Rand Studies*, 7,1, (2005), pp.1-17.
- "The Rand Transcript", *The Journal of Ayn Rand Studies*, 1,1,(1999), pp.1-26.
- Wetten, Martin, Van "Private War: Objectivist Political Philosophy and the Privatization of Military Force", *The Journal of Ayn Rand Studies*, 12, 2 (2012) pp. 263 – 277.
- White, Robert, "Ayn Rand versus Adam Smith", *The Journal of Ayn Rand Studies*, 7, 1, (2005), pp. 171-180.