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INTRODUCTION

Ayn Rand was a moral radical and one of the twentieth century’s most controversial figures. Her own philosophy of Objectivism is hardly approved and usually is overlooked by most academicians, albeit with rare views to the contrary (e.g., Burns, 2009). Rand’s conflict with academe was philosophical and perpetuated by her followers, especially the Ayn Rand Institute, headed by Leonard Peikoff, the most prominent Objectivist scholar. A common ground for understanding can hardly be found and the attempt is only undermined by sometimes acrid remarks from both sides. However, many of Rand’s essays may be interesting for academic research, and a serious look could either help bridge the schism or worsen the standoff. With this in mind and with the various challenges of reconciling such vastly separated views, I have chosen one of Rand’s essays for a more in-depth, rhetorical look. Before analyzing her rhetoric, however, we first need to have a brief survey of her life. The most recent and intriguing biography of Ms. Rand is by Jennifer Burns.

Jennifer Burns’s Goddess of the Market: Ayn Rand and the American Right (2009) is an account of most of Rand’s life. Rand was born Alisa Z. Rosenbaum in the Russian Empire eight days after the beginning of the Revolution of 1905, which started due to social unrest and was a precursor to the Socialist Revolution. At the age of thirteen, Rosenbaum proclaimed herself an atheist. She fell in love with the romantic heroism of Victor Hugo’s novels and perhaps with the heroic acts of the anti-Christian revolutionaries at the time. She also became an anti-communist, following her father’s views, especially after his pharmacy business had been twice confiscated.
Before she immigrated to America and changed her name to Ayn Rand, she studied history and philosophy, among other subjects, at the University of Petrograd (now St. Petersburg), from where she graduated with a three-year degree. The biography shows Rand’s strained and virtually nonexistent relationships with her peers in school, her academic prowess and genius in argumentation, her negative attitude toward her mother and her withdrawn admiration of her father, her inclination to cut ties with her family after she moved to the U.S. (pp. 19ff., 47), and her abandonment of friendships with people who influenced her ideas and whom she met in America. For example, the conflicts she had with Isabel Paterson, a popular journalist who helped Rand and was one of her teachers, caused their relationship to weaken, end, and never rejuvenate again because of Rand’s anti-theistic views, her independence, and self-sufficient nature (pp. 131ff., 138ff.). Isabel Paterson and Ayn Rand greatly inspired the libertarian movement. Rand held that belief in God is inessential, and it is interesting to note that she disregarded her friend’s metaphors and theism and only praised the individualistic qualities of Paterson’s book dealing with political theory (Cox, 2007).

Once Rand became a successful novelist, she quickly lost interest in her previous relationships and tried to differentiate herself as much as possible from previous philosophic influences. Burns shows that Rand wanted to create a rational alternative to religion (pp. 285ff.). Although Burns is somewhat critical of Objectivism—“Objectivism as a philosophy left no room for elaboration, extension, or interpretation, and as a social world it excluded growth, change, or development” (pp. 5ff.)—she nonetheless argues that Objectivism and Rand are historically significant. Rand inspired a large following, helped start new movements, and greatly influenced
other philosophies. Her ideas are now selectively applied by movement conservatives, in particular neoconservatives and the Religious Right.

At the height of her career, Rand created and maintained a “cult” in the 60s, called the Nathaniel Branden Institute (NBI). This “cult” has been criticized in many accounts, two of which were written by former Objectivist members. Murray Rothbard’s *The Sociology of the Ayn Rand Cult* (1972) mainly deals with the negative aspects of Rand’s establishment and how “the grim, robotic, joyless Randian Man emerged.” Rothbard was a libertarian economist who was at first very interested in Objectivism and praised Rand’s genius, but whose conflicts with Rand and her right-hand man at the time, Nathaniel Branden, made him despise these individuals (Burns, p. 184). Rand also had a falling out with Branden and consequently closed the institute they both formed. Branden’s *The Benefits and Hazards of the Philosophy of Ayn Rand: A Personal Statement* (1984) was published after Rand passed away. It deals with the flawed psychology they employed at the institute—how they caused their followers to repress emotions, encourage dogmatism, and follow Rand’s “scientific conservatism, a suspicion of novelty.” Nonetheless, he defends the positive nature of her philosophy, “a powerful message of hope in her work,” affirmation of existence, and glorification of human potential.

Objectivism is a philosophy expressed in Rand’s two major novels, *The Fountainhead* (1943) and *Atlas Shrugged* (1957), her non-fiction (1964, 1966, 1982, 1990), and in the books of her leading follower (Peikoff, 1991, 2012b). Although Objectivism is based on abstract axioms, it is portrayed as being human-centered and individualistic. Objectivism’s moralism drives its practitioners to strive for virtues and to oppose altruistic, selfless duty. The Objectivist ethics was summarized by Ayn Rand in one of her editions of *Atlas Shrugged*:
Reason is man's only proper judge of values and his only proper guide to action. The proper standard of ethics is: man's survival qua man—i.e., that which is required by man's nature for his survival as a rational being (not his momentary physical survival as a mindless brute). Rationality is man's basic virtue, and his three fundamental values are: reason, purpose, self-esteem. Man—every man—is an end in himself, not a means to the ends of others; he must live for his own sake, neither sacrificing himself to others nor sacrificing others to himself; he must work for his rational self-interest, with the achievement of his own happiness as the highest moral purpose of his life. (Rand, “Essentials”)

Rand boldly called her ethics egoism but differentiated it from common perceptions of subjective egoism by concentrating on rational self-interest. She accepted Aristotle’s definition of man as a rational animal, reason as an absolute, and happiness as the goal of life. In order to live happily and survive, an egoist has to accept natural reality as absolute and non-theistic (the axiom of existence), use his or her faculty of identifying aspects of reality that pertain to his or her life (the axiom of consciousness), be able to use and value objects so identified for productive purposes (as required in laissez-faire free-market capitalism), and know that any object, including a human being, has a nature derived from its own identity (the axiom of identity). Each individual thus can find his or her purpose in life without any dependence on an outside authority. Examples of such productive, independent, and creative individuals abound in Rand’s fiction.

In addition to Aristotle, Rand praised the political system of capitalism and the original United States as being the prime example of it. Her conflict with other philosophies strengthened her defense of capitalism, a defense now used by modern conservatives. Rand (1982) said in her speech to the West Point graduates in 1974:

Not all philosophies are evil, though too many of them are, particularly in modern history. On the other hand, at the root of every civilized achievement, such as science, technology, progress, freedom—at the root of every value we enjoy today, including the
birth of this country—you will find the achievement of one man, who lived over two thousand years ago: Aristotle. (p. 9, original emphasis)

Aristotle was indeed a great inspiration for Rand, and so were the founding fathers. Rand et al. (1966) interpreted the meaning of the founding fathers’ belief in the right of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness as “the freedom to take all the actions required by the nature of a rational being for the support, the furtherance, the fulfillment and the enjoyment of his own life” (p. 288). Rand praised the original founding principles of the United States and painted them as the only moral principles in the world. Her approval of the founding fathers was not absolute, however. She alluded to contradictions of the founding fathers, such as their belief in God and their omission of selfishness, because, to her, selfishness is essential for survival, and the belief in God is not essential. Similarly, she criticized the conservative argument from faith in defense of capitalism (pp. 197ff.). To persuade, Rand not only used stories and appeals to emotions, but she also wanted to convince her audience of “the truth,” thus attaining absolute adherence. To help her in this, she used metaphors to reshape her audience’s views.

The learning process consists of grasping something unknown by comparing it to something known. Playing a key role in this process to assist in understanding, metaphors are widely used. Although metaphors were mostly understood as stylistic devices for poetic expressions, the ancients found additional uses for them. Aristotle stresses, in his Rhetoric, metaphor’s powerful effect in public speeches but also that it “most brings about learning” and helps in perceiving things (1411.a2). For Cicero, when it is not “far-fetched,” metaphor can be used “in order to make the meaning clear” in “the plain style for proof” (Bizzell & Herzberg, 2001, pp. 339ff.). In the modern era, metaphors have been conceptualized as fundamental to experiencing the world.
Cognitive scientists George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, in their *Metaphors We Live By* (2003), explain how metaphors can be structural, ontological, or orientational. They show that the conceptual metaphor Argument Is War is structural, since argument is expressed in terms of war (pp. 3ff.). Argument is used as if it were a weapon and fought as if with weapons--it can hurt or even kill. Argument can be won or lost as on a battlefield and conducted as during a war. When argument is partially structured in terms of war, our common concept of argument, argumentation itself, and language of argument as hostile rather than cooperative are metaphorically structured. This partial mapping of features from the known source domain to the to-be-known target domain is at the core of the theory of conceptual metaphors.

Another way to look at the same metaphor is ontologically (Lakoff & Johnson, 2003, pp. 25-32). An argument becomes an entity and is equated with being. It has a cause, a time frame, and a point of reference. You can refer to an argument, quantify it, and set goals for it as if it were a substance or an entity. It could also be metonymically personified. The concept of an argument can come into existence by conceptually entailing some tools or generals of war, if this is a common experience of an argument. When viewing the concept of an argument, its ontological emergence may become inseparable from war,1 its conceptual source domain, and indeed may be enriched by it (cf. Lakoff, 2002, p. 256).

Another type of metaphor is orientational (Lakoff et al., 2003, pp. 14-21). An example that Lakoff and Johnson give is Happy Is Up metaphor. They explain that orientational metaphors have a spatial reference based on our physicality. When we think about happiness, we experience it in terms of our bodies. When it is up, it is higher, taller, bigger, and thus more and

---

1 This cultural frame screens out another frame of argument as dance or love, in which argument emerges as a beautiful and cooperative experience attained by understanding rather than fighting each other.
better, and it relates to our posture during this state as well as to the position of the main perceptual organ--our brain. Therefore, Lakoff and Johnson conclude that metaphors are conceptual and directly relate to the way we experience the world, the way we think about it and express it in words. This new understanding of metaphors shows that conceptual metaphors are conventional and mostly unconscious and that they are embodied, i.e., reflected in connecting neurobiological and cognitive levels (Lakoff & Johnson, 1999, pp. 94ff., pp. 476-481).

The rhetorician Chaim Perelman (1982) defines metaphors as condensed analogies:

From the analogy \( a \) is to \( b \) as \( c \) is to \( d \), the metaphor takes one of these forms: \( a \) of \( d \), \( c \) of \( b \), \( a \) is \( c \). From the classical example of analogy, ‘old age is to life what the evening is to the day,’ we derive the metaphors ‘old age of the day,’ ‘evening of life,’ or ‘old age is an evening.’ (p. 120)

For Perelman, the most general meaning of a metaphor is any type of speech “in a context which excludes its literal meaning” (p. 121). However, Perelman would agree with Lakoff and Johnson that metaphors even permeate our most objective endeavors. In the sciences, metaphors play an important role--a role that helps scientists orient their investigations and construct their theorems. For example, the “imaginary fluids” metaphor helped James Clerk Maxwell create his mathematical theorems (Berggren, 1963), and the “typing monkeys” metaphor is used by Seth Lloyd (2006), one of the leading quantum engineers at MIT, to understand the origins of the Universe. Perelman (1982) compares scientific metaphors to “scaffolding” that can be taken off once an objective methodology is reached (p. 115). In philosophy, metaphors similarly play a role to promote a rationalistic ideology. The Allegory of the Cave helped Plato in structuring his philosophy. Similar metaphors persuade other thinkers of the primacy of consciousness.

On the other hand, some philosophers, like Descartes and Locke, are opposed to metaphors and rhetoric in general. Rene Descartes used a metaphorical expression, “the chain of
ideas,” in his reasoning without realizing that it can be interpreted quite differently in other languages. His “Knowing Is Seeing” and “Seeing Is Touching” metaphors convinced many to interpret them literally (see Lakoff & Johnson, 1999, pp. 330-3). Today, the axiomatic philosophy of Objectivism created by Ayn Rand proclaims, similar to Descartes, that metaphors “cannot give philosophic answers” (Peikoff, 2012a, Ch. 1, “Integration as Man’s Means of Knowledge”). However, it is my contention that even Rand used conceptual metaphors to reframe the experience of her audience and persuade them to follow her philosophy. In particular, I will show how conceptual metaphors Mind Is Computer, Life Is a Battle, and Philosophy Is War can be derived from Rand’s worldview based on her speech and essay, “Philosophy: Who Needs It,” along with some other writings by her and her main follower, Leonard Peikoff. Additionally, their worldview is connected to the conceptual metaphors used by movement conservatives, specifically Capitalism Is God’s Will and the Strict Father morality (Lakoff, 2002, 2014), and this will be shown to play a key role in the conservative response to Objectivism.
METAPHORICAL ANALYSIS

“Philosophy: Who Needs It” is based on the speech Rand gave to the graduating class of 1974 at the United States Military Academy at West Point. This essay is included in her last work to be published and was one of her favorite essays, from which the book takes its name. In Leonard Peikoff’s introduction to *Philosophy: Who Needs It* (1982), as well as in the essay itself, Rand is portrayed as the greatest “salesman of philosophy” and her ethics as the “means to the rebuilding of New York City and of man’s soul” (p. vii). She was “selling” capitalism—her philosophy—to the men and women who were going to help defend the country from invaders. She considered it an honor to be there and prepared her speech for great impact. To convince her audience, she used several metaphors and an analogy, which is in the form of a story teaching a moral lesson. Thus the story begins: “Suppose that you are an astronaut whose spaceship gets out of control and crashes on an unknown planet. When you regain consciousness and find that you are not hurt badly, the first three questions in your mind would be: Where am I? How can I discover it? What should I do?” (p. 1). For Rand, these questions directly pertain to philosophy. The manner in which the astronaut attempts to answer these questions shows the kind of philosophy that he or she accepts. The analogy, “person is to our planet what the astronaut is to the alien planet,” is expressed in any of the following forms: “person of the alien planet,” “the astronaut of our planet,” or “person is the astronaut.” This metaphor will clarify Rand’s views of human nature and philosophy. Meanwhile, the story continues:

You see unfamiliar vegetation outside, and there is air to breathe; the sunlight seems paler than you remember it and colder. You turn to look at the sky, but stop. You are
struck by a sudden feeling: if you don’t look, you won’t have to know that you are, perhaps, too far from the earth and no return is possible; so long as you don’t know it, you are free to believe what you wish—and you experience a foggy, pleasant, but somehow guilty, kind of hope. (p. 1)

Using personal pronouns, Rand helps project the audience into the astronaut. The environment where you as the astronaut find yourself is somewhat similar to Earth. There is air to breathe, but species of fauna look different. The action of not looking at the sky is chosen because of a blind, “foggy” belief that provides a comfort of hope, a specious short-term reward.

The kind of guilt that comes with believing in hope has a double nature, a mixture of conflicting views that Rand uses to bring in most of her audience, whether theist or atheist. She portrays a person of faith in secular fashion. The guilt she conveys is of not using senses in order not to know: “[I]f you don’t look, you won’t have to know.” This expression denies the structural mapping of “seeing” onto “knowing,” but it also implies the necessity to accept Knowing Is Seeing because of the negative consequences of not accepting this metaphor. For Rand, one is guilty, as if committing a secular fault, in ignoring reality, which is the source of all knowledge.\(^2\)

Being Ignorant Is Being Unwilling to See is the opposite metaphor used to describe how some become ignorant of reality. They do not see reality because they close their eyes to it or choose to turn their sight away. This action allows them to faultily believe that, if “you don’t know it, you are free to believe what you wish.” For Rand, this could imply that Deception Is Purposefully Impeding Vision, which explains the reason to distrust people who act like this astronaut by impeding reality with faith in something mystical, or removed from reality, thus deceiving themselves and those who trust them. By using these metaphors in creating the story,

\(^2\) Reality, for Objectivists, is absolute and unchanging and, in this case, could be compared to the all-seeing and hence all-knowing God.
Rand is trying to show how faith seekers decide to ignore facts and rather choose to rely on what their emotions tell them about reality. Faith for them is confused with the solid ground that knowledge should provide. Thus, their rational link to reality is broken.

On this alien world, the sky is real, and the viewer would be guided by interpreting it rationally. The reality of the sky orients the viewer up, toward rational truth, in contrast to down, the ambiguous emotions that are instead chosen by the astronaut. This is an instance of orientational Reason Is Up metaphor. The choice of the astronaut is irrational because the astronaut wasn’t genuinely concerned with looking up at the higher truth. The fact of being far from home is dismissed without investigation by the astronaut in favor of believing in being perhaps not very far. The illusive belief is accepted instead of coming in contact with reality and finding objective evidence of the senses useful in constructing plans to get back home. This major choice by the astronaut is attributed to Rand’s enemies - “the mystics of spirit” with the belief in God, rather than themselves, to explain reality and “the mystics of muscle” with the belief in unconscious and base matter, causing them to deceive themselves by abandoning the guidance of reason as applied to reality. The only correct choice would be to accept reality as it is according to the axiom of existence. The either-or crossroads is a common thread through Rand’s ideology, and it places Aristotelian logic as the best method for people to reason.

Next is another decision--this time it is whether to employ human reason. The exact words are: “You turn to your instruments: they may be damaged, you don’t know how seriously. But you stop, struck by a sudden fear: how can you trust these instruments? How can you be sure

---

3 In a far-reaching interpretation, materialist sciences, the products of “pure” reason, are not as dependable as the nature of reality because they may also be misused for the sake of a false belief. “The mystics of spirit” and “the mystics of muscle” are described in Atlas Shrugged (2009) and in the essay “The Stimulus and the Response” (Rand, 1982, Ch. 13).
that they won’t mislead you? How can you know whether they will work in a different world? You turn away from the instruments” (p. 1). The spaceship instruments are created using scientific theories and logic, so they symbolize science that lies at the root of technology. The fear paralyzes the mind of the astronaut. Although Rand perhaps attempts to associate fear with religious piety, it is secularized by her and made into the fear of the moment, which can be experienced by anyone. The urgency of the situation is overwhelming, and the astronaut cannot appropriately react to resolve the situation. The doubt undermines reason and ultimately results in abandoning science. But, more so, the excerpt shows that science, just like reality, could be ignored or misconstrued, that it is secondary when it comes to what is fundamental to the person.

Philosophy, for Rand (1982), lies at the root of the sciences--it is the soil of the forest where individual sciences are trees (p. 2). This natural view of philosophy opposes the unnatural, or supernatural, view of those who accept fuzzy emotions above reason.

The story ends so:

Now you begin to wonder why you have no desire to do anything. It seems so much safer just to wait for something to turn up somehow; it is better, you tell yourself, not to rock the spaceship. Far in the distance, you see some sort of living creatures approaching; you don’t know whether they are human, but they walk on two feet. They, you decide, will tell you what to do.

You are never heard from again. (p. 2, original emphasis)

The astronaut decides to rely on arbitrary safety of the moment and not to do anything. The astronaut stays at the same location, waiting for something beneficial to happen until some living organisms approach the astronaut. They look like people, but you do not know. Although at this moment you are supposedly paralyzed with fear and uncertainty, you as the astronaut show trust in the strange creatures. Rand suggests through the astronaut that the reliance on emotions causes
one to become unable to discern enemies from friends. Instead of defending oneself or fighting
the situation in any way, you as the astronaut have lost your life—you were literally killed.

The method of this metaphor employed by Rand is to purge her audience from religious
or secular philosophies she considers evil—philosophies that will get you killed. Although
practicing them may seem innocent enough, the actions grounded in such thinking (or the lack of
any kind) directly lead to and cause the most unfavorable results. After Rand told the story of the
astronaut, which provided some necessary frames of her point of view, she started explaining the
features of philosophy in general. By this time, she showed her audience that the choice of
philosophy is the choice of life or death. It is the choice of utmost importance that, she knew,
convinced her audience to follow her deeper into other visualized abstractions.

The story about the astronaut helps Rand reframe the views of her audience. The surface
frame is the way the story is told and the kinds of words that are chosen, whereas the deep frame
is the long-term, fundamental concepts that drive it. Rand has deeply seated evaluations—
conceptual metaphors—that explain her worldview as depicted in the story. She also makes a
political, metaphorical argument with the story itself. Such arguments can indeed be made (cf.
Fisher, 1984, pp. 290ff.; Lakoff, 2014, p. 158). The story was also told in the form of a parable
but interpreted as an allegory. Teaching moral lessons by telling a parable is in the Christian
tradition, and allegories were used to promote idealism since Plato. But interpreting the story as
an allegory may be inadequate because allegories are too specific. An allegory may be construed
by each person differently. For example, Leonard Peikoff (2013), in his analysis of “Philosophy:
Who Needs It,” interpreted the story and analyzed the speech without relying on metaphors (pp.
42-55).
Motivation plays a key role in Peikoff’s analysis since he thinks that Rand used motivation successfully throughout the speech. She was thinking about the intellectual needs of her audience and what was on their minds. She prepared the beginning of the speech as if the audience was following a competing philosophy, namely, skepticism. The title challenges and entices the audience, and the allegorical story tries to attract more of their attention in order to start bringing them into Rand’s worldview. Peikoff argues that the reason Rand picked the astronaut is that this kind of character is more concrete for the West Point students to grasp. An astronaut is seemingly far removed from the field of philosophy; he or she is a heroic depiction of a common person, who prefers to work physically as well as mentally. People are like astronauts, but sometimes they act in a wrong way and thus do not survive.

Concerning delimitation, Peikoff says that Rand had to limit her speech in order to avoid too many questions in the minds of her audience. She had to allude to the basic statements about her philosophy without delving too deep into her ideas and without being too explicit in criticizing the other side. Without referencing metaphors, Peikoff claims that the reason Rand did not mention that “philosophy is a precondition of human happiness” (p. 42) is that the audience may not have been prepared to accept this from the beginning of the speech. But by the end of the speech, such shadow constructions could come to fruition. Rand could only say some things implicitly throughout her speech, but then she could have mentioned them directly at the end, such as that “[y]ou will be miserable without [philosophy]” (p. 47). However, these constructions

---

4 Peikoff was present at the time the speech was given, and he says that the audience was “settled down from the beginning” (p. 43). The use of the personal pronoun “you” is also found salient and effective by Peikoff. This address thus seemed more personal, casual, and easier to follow. Rand also anticipated the audience’s questions and answered them before they were asked.
are only implied and not expressly included in the essay. What helps the audience grasp these ideas, I contend, are the conceptual metaphors underpinning some of her claims.

Continuing, Peikoff maintains: “The astronaut does a bad thing in each of these areas—he is afraid to look, he does not trust his instruments, and he sits there paralyzed while those creatures are coming—and the whole thing is presented in a plausible way” (p. 52). Peikoff argues that all the actions based on religion or emotions are plausible as actions based on fear. However, there can be derived a fundamental conceptual meaning of the story that is more general. The generalized meaning of this story has to do with the survival of the person. The survival depends on making the choice to stay alive, not necessarily physically fighting, but to get oneself involved in a philosophical battle by accepting and faithfully following the true philosophy while opposing subjective and mystic influences, whether internal or external.

Rational philosophy supposedly cannot depend on metaphors or emotions. This is how Peikoff (1974) explains metaphors: “A metaphorical usage represents a loose, extended use of a concept on the basis of some similarities, which it has in the original use, but it is not, insofar as it’s a metaphor, in itself a literal concept, nor is it therefore to be given a formal definition in that usage” (e.g., revolution as sexual/industrial) (Lec. 8). Additionally, Rand (2001) mentions the function of metaphors briefly, which is, again, only to make linguistic, surface comparisons:

The principle is that a metaphor isolates the particular attribute of a given sensory image in order to make the reader fully aware of it. “The snow was white” and “The sugar was white” are merely abstractions. But if you say, “The snow was white as sugar,” you make the reader hold in his mind, for a split second, the two concrete images. He has an image of sugar and one of snow, and he sees what they have in common. It is like reconstructing the process of concept-formation in his mind—of observing what attributes two concretes have in common. (p. 113)
This is an Aristotelian view that is based on inherent similarities. It is also the view of Objectivism on metaphors, but it does not reflect the possible depths of conceiving metaphorically. As for Aristotle, reason for Rand and Peikoff is literal, logical, and directly derived from environment, and thus there can be no mental constructs that surpass strict, non-contradictory logic. Only reality is more fundamental than such pure reason. However, we will see that bridging perceptions and conceptions can indeed involve conceptual metaphors, even in Objectivism.

The philosophy of Objectivism bases capitalism (political philosophy) on egoism (ethics) that in turn is based on reason (epistemology) and lastly on existence (metaphysics). Reason is the “basic means of survival,” man’s “fundamental attribute,” and “necessity of human life” (Rand, 1982, pp. viiff.). Surviving in a hostile world necessarily entails a battle for one’s life, particularly a philosophical battle. “Ethics, or morality, defines a code of values to guide man’s choices and actions—the choices and actions that determine the course of his life” (Rand, 1982, p. 4, my emphases). In Objectivism, while comparing the subconscious to a computer (p. 7), to be moral, a human being must focus and maintain focus in order to survive and succeed in life. In Objectivist philosophy, “The essence of a volitional consciousness is the fact that its operation always demands the same fundamental effort of initiation and then of maintenance across time” (Peikoff, 1991, p. 59, my emphases). This effort is required by Rand and her followers for competence in living.
1. Mind Is Computer Metaphor

Throughout her speech, Rand tried to get her audience to identify the qualities that align with her worldview. One of these qualities is never straying from one’s set path. What helped her maintain this conceptual stance was the way she conceived a Mind as Computer metaphor. In the following passage, Rand (1982) showcases that the element the astronaut missed was the reason he did not survive. The passage starts with a simile:

Your subconscious is like a computer—more complex a computer than men can build—and its main function is the integration of your ideas. Who programs it? Your conscious mind. If you default, if you don’t reach any firm convictions, your subconscious is programmed by chance—and you deliver yourself into the power of ideas you do not know you have accepted. (p. 7)

Then the simile strengthens into the metaphor:

But one way or the other, your computer gives you print-outs, daily and hourly, in the form of emotions—which are lightning-like estimates of the things around you, calculated according to your values. If you programmed your computer by conscious thinking, you know the nature of your values and emotions. If you didn’t, you don’t. . . . (p. 7, original emphasis)

Rand is thus using Mind Is Computer metaphor. Although she was not the first to use this metaphor, she was probably one of the first to use it in persuading the military to identify with her. Burke (1969) calls an instance of identification "the translation of one's wishes into terms of an audience's opinions" (p. 57). We identify based on our motives and compose consubstantiality with identifications. Before the modern computer era, this was a fairly novel metaphor that could have been popular among the military personnel. Some of the inferences of this metaphor can be seen in its analysis by Gigerenzer and Goldstein (1996): "One of the major concepts in computer programming that made its way into the new models of the mind is the

---

decomposition of complexity into simpler units, such as the decomposition of a program into a hierarchy of simpler subroutines or into a set of production rules” (p. 138). In Objectivism, philosophy is regarded as "hierarchical; it’s a whole structure, with one idea resting on another and another, and so on" (Peikoff, 2012b, p. 35). This could be considered Rand's "hierarchic motive" in rhetorical identification.

Just as Mind as Computer metaphor started with human actors performing specific functions within a hierarchical, communal structure, industrialization quickened the expanding boundaries of human effort into a global context. This was also known as the Computer as a Factory of Workers conception in the 19th century (Gigerenzer & Goldstein 1996, p. 133ff.). From Rand’s point of view, the new world had to be free yet bound by logic inherent in the mind functioning as a fulcrum for the victory of capitalism over the egalitarian and meaningless (i.e., illogical) perversions of collectivists' communal efforts. Identifying mind as a rational actor fighting victoriously against the minds enslaved by emotions was a rhetorical technique Rand used to convince her audience in each of their personal battles.

In the following discussion on knowing what ideas are used, Rand (1982) says: “The ultimate programmer of his [man’s] subconscious is philosophy—the science which, according to the emotionalists, is impotent to affect or penetrate the murky mysteries of their feelings” (p. 7, original italics, my underline). To penetrate something unknown also means “to reach” or “to understand.” Philosophy makes everything clear and helps us see unless it is resisted. It may also be resisted in understanding the opposing side. Philosophy as a programmer moves one’s mind in particular directions and is also moved by one’s mind. Related to this line is Thinking Is Perceiving metaphor, which entails Being Ignorant Is Being Unable to See and Deception Is
Purposefully Impeding Vision (Lakoff & Johnson, 1999, Ch. 12). Seeing murky mysteries of skeptic and similar “evil” philosophies is using the submetaphors of Knowing Is Seeing: Idea Is Object Seen, Knowing an Idea Is Seeing an Object Clearly, Person Who Knows Is Person Who Sees, “Light” of Reason Is Light, and others (Ch. 19). Rand also uses the metaphor that Mind Is Computer to say that, if making choices only based on emotions, one would not survive in the hostile world. But by programming one’s thinking to practice the correct principles, one programs emotions and survives.

Along with Mind as Computer, Thinking Is Mathematical Calculation (with its other submetaphors) is also relevant here. Rand and Peikoff’s (1990) epistemology uses conceptual units that are alike to mathematical ones and are based on perceived objects. Comparing conception to computation, Rand wrote: “The process of concept-formation is, in large part, a mathematical process” (Rand & Peikoff, 1990, p. 14). This is required to be most proficient in philosophy. What the military uses for defense is similar to defending one’s philosophy. One needs technologies that work without interruptions and can always be relied on. Mathematics in programming languages is a method that helps achieve one’s purposes in war, be logically intransigent and objective in set goals. The military uses and generates such technologies that enable it to defeat enemies.

At the human core of philosophy is reason and the compatible Thinking Is Object Construction metaphor. The opposite of reason is mystic emotions and thus false thinking that makes the metaphor False Thinking Is Object Destruction. Life as a Battle serves as an intermediary between Thinking metaphors and Philosophy as War. Overall, philosophy “deals with the most crucial, the *life-or-death* issues of man’s existence” (Rand, 1982, p. 9, my
emphasis). True philosophy proclaims reason, which is “the tool of survival” (pp. 39ff., 88). Here, reason is additionally viewed to imply Thought as Language—a conceptual “tool of protection and survival,” i.e., “language” (p. 106). The axioms of Objectivism are also expressed linguistically.\(^6\) A computer is a rational tool of constructing and maintaining the right “code” in life. A computer uses binary logic, just as the mind is supposed to think. A computer is a clean device and is not associated with animalistic or uncontrollable tendencies. Only intelligent humans are able to use it.

Similarly, reason is an important tool that can be relied upon and trusted. Reason not only can help structure and construct survival, but it can also help in successfully fighting off an enemy, who is considered to be destructive, amoral, and irrational. The enemy uses weapons to destroy reason, and Objectivism uses weapons in order to protect reason and destroy the conflicting emotions and the emotionalists. With reason on one’s side, one can become sure that victory is not far. Reason is a trusty tool that boosts or programs moral strength, while unreason, the savage and “bloody” enemy, cannot be trusted. When the deep conceptual frame of Knowing Is Seeing/Seeing Is Touching (e.g., “print-outs”) is congruent with Morality Is Strength, absolute defense is thus constructed, and the enemy cannot win.

And, as mind is thought to be strictly computational, Rand and Branden (1964) view perfect government, consisting of military, police, and courts, as also to be an “impersonal robot, with the laws as its only motive power” (p. 104). Only this type of government can protect the rights of its subjects. And while each mind is autonomous, independent, and individualistic, it ought to follow the ultimate personal authority, the trinity of Objectivist axioms based on

\(^6\) Cf. this linguistic rationalization: "[T]here is something I am aware of. There is—existence; something—identity; I am aware of—consciousness" (Peikoff, 1991, p. 7).
objective reality and the three principles (i.e., Reason, Purpose, Self-esteem). This is not Kantian, collectivist Universal Reason, but Reason that is selfish and in contact with reality. However, there are similarities in these concepts of Reason. Lakoff and Johnson (1999) discuss metaphors for mind that they call faculty psychology or the Society of Mind:

Since society is structured hierarchically with an executive giving orders, so too the mind has a hierarchical structure and an executive in control. Just as a society has unruly and uncontrollable individuals, so there are specific isolatable faculties of the mind that can be unruly and uncontrollable. Just as a well-ordered society should not be governed by people out of control, so a properly functioning mind should be governed in a calm, rational, methodical manner. (p. 345)

What needs to be understood is that Objectivists are not against emotions per se; they are only against emotions that are without reason. Once emotions are subdued and disciplined by being determined, or “programmed,” by reason, the emotions can help achieve the same goals that they share with reason. Moreover, these passions can amplify the will to use reason and help more vigorously fight against the enemies of reason. The passion for one’s Mind as Computer transforms into qualities necessary for battle. Rand teaches battle-readiness and prepares the audience for war.

Rand is teaching her ideology rhetorically, although she uses Aristotelian logic at the core of her argument. Her metaphysics has to be taken as a rhetorical (and already ultimate) rather than a dialectical, or hierarchical, truth. She uses hierarchy of mind to dominate rather than transcend reality. She does not accept Platonic ideal forms or Aristotelian intrinsic essences. Instead, she depends on the primacy of existence as completely secular in contrast to systems based on the primacy of consciousness. This move helped Rand in her rhetoric. The truth is absolute and thus requires absolute adherence. The teaching of truth means the universal audience must accept the truth completely rather than reach for its partial attainment.
Kenneth Burke (1969) conceived of identification to be within a group of associates or extending to those who are supposed to be persuaded, and “consubstantiality” is the substance of what’s being individually shared. Rand identifies some features that she shares with the military tradition of West Point. Burkean identification with an audience is done to persuade them to join in one’s cause or, in our case, philosophy. Rand’s identification of what’s necessary for her Mind as Computer metaphor to work bridges her view with her audience’s by the means of her compliments and praise.

In her speech, Rand (1982) compliments cadets for their virtues. She admires “the posture of West Point graduates, a posture that projects man in proud, disciplined control of his body” (p. 10). Rand praises virtues that the cadets have: “earnestness--dedication--a sense of honor” (p. 12), to show that they are on her side. Rand shows her appreciation by promoting the “glorious” virtues that the West Point establishment upheld throughout the centuries of its existence. She points out that the cadets are virtuous when they defend their country selfishly and not from selfless duty. And the tradition was of the former quality rather than the latter. To bring the audience to her side, Rand praises the qualities of her audience that specifically conflict with the selfless duty-based ethics of her opponents. She says: “I will not insult you by saying that you are dedicated to selfless service” (p. 12). Being selfless is deemed immoral by Rand and thus she attributes selfishness to her audience while counterposing it to the immorality of selflessness. At the end of her speech, Rand thanks them for being as she described them. She

7 Rand chooses the Ciceronian wording used in Against Verres, I: “It is true that with you on this bench, gentlemen, with Manius Aciilius Glabrio as your president, I do not understand what Verres can hope to achieve” (III, 7). In this part of his speech, Cicero used to “assassinate” the character of the person he was attacking, namely that of rich Verres. He did it by praising the virtues of his audience, implying their characters to be greater than the defendant’s and playing off their vanity against clear judgments.
chose a positive and powerful closure to her memorable speech, but it needs to be remembered that she started with negative illustrations of her audience, the illustrations she used to attack the philosophy she perceived them to have. Now she was convinced that she gave all the necessary reasons to persuade her audience, and she thought they identified with her by accepting her definition of philosophy. She left as a strict yet friendly figure admonishing the non-Objectivist cadets to follow the cause she shared with them.

The appeal to the dominance of mind does not necessarily lead to the rational perception or evaluation that Objectivists value. This may be one of the reasons many ignore this philosophy. Objectivism’s first principle is indeed Reason, and the frequent mention of the words “reason,” “mind,” “rational,” “objective,” etc., used in Objectivist works and among Objectivists (e.g., on their online forums) provides evidence for the Objectivist language and rhetoric of reason. Reasonable rhetoric is then not only about thinking independently from others, but it is also about trying to think like others in order to persuade them to fit into the community of like-minded individuals. Identifying Mind as Computer works as a rational means of persuasion. And persuasion by means of framing has been shown by Lakoff to be mostly unconscious and unanalyzed. Thus, even for Objectivists, in-group thinking becomes common or “consubstantial.” By sharing the conceptual metaphors inherent in their worldview, they would find “objective” means that help unite their axioms with the minds of their audiences.

Rand wanted to persuade her audience to join her in fighting the irrational enemies of capitalism, and so she provided a moral system that could correctly program their minds and drive them to victory, although the importance she gave to reason and morality was all too similar to the collectivists’, even if more virtue-based than deontological. Lakoff and Johnson’s
(1999) analysis of Kant’s moral theory (pp. 348-51) is in some respects similar to Rand’s own moral theory, as both claim to be based on reason, even if that reason is conceived differently.

Kenneth Burke’s (1941) astute description of Hitler in “The Rhetoric of Hitler’s ‘Battle’” shows some similarities in strategy with Rand. A related passage of his essay is the following: “[I]f one can hand over his infirmities to a vessel, or ‘cause,’ outside the self, one can battle an external enemy instead of battling an enemy within” (p. 243). This can be applied to the current philosophical paradigm, when the enemy is displaced by those who believe in God, race, or society, and the goal becomes laissez-faire free-market capitalism. In Hitler’s own words: the military’s defeat was the “consequence of moral poisoning, visible to all, the consequence of a decrease in the instinct of self-preservation” (qtd. in Burke, 1941, p. 244). This militaristic moral philosophy was shared among Rand and her enemies. But Rand also used it to gain identification of her audience of military cadets.

Rand’s enemies were always external. Killing the external enemy in battle is a means of transforming one’s inner motives, which Rand identifies through her metaphors. Rand’s first act was to get the audience to identify with the mistaken astronaut in order for her to later show the nature of the enemy. Then, in order for the audience to rationally choose to identify with the victor, Rand expressed the consubstantial qualities that she and her audience shared, and this derived from the fact that she and her audience were really fighting the same enemy. One commonality with the audience was the use of reason in bridging the gap between the subject and the objective reality. This concept of reason is defined by Rand as (epistemological) identification, and this epistemological process also served as the means for others to identify with and follow her philosophy. This reason is objective, and moreover, classically logical. And
in addition to valuing the role of consciousness in external reality, she compared mind to a computer.

Rooted in division, Rand's rhetoric strived for an understanding independently attained by each person in her audience. This ultimate state, based on the commonality of reason, was perceived to be without conflict. The utopia became the goal for all practical people of reason. Rand proclaimed the essence of man to be his mind. But rather than “eulogize” reason, Rand first “dyslogized” anti-reason. She provided a way for her audience to “transcend” their meaningless struggles by identifying with her group. And the audience that accepts her philosophy hears the promise of “transcendence” and joins in her vision of living toward the perfect political state. She had to be adamant about her view being absolute in truth and objectivity and had to be disciplined by programming herself logically. After all, “[t]he ultimate programmer of [man’s] subconscious is *philosophy*” (Rand, 1982, p. 7, original emphasis).

She started with divisiveness and individual autonomy, but by criticizing the opposition and thus purging the audience as if by Aristotelian “catharsis,” she was able to implicitly stress her own position and have her audience identify with it in their own minds, despite her position’s controversial nature. She provided her analysis of the global political climate as the context and field of philosophical activity. The negative details that she brought to the attention of her audience quickly dissipated to give way to her own philosophy in the minds of her audience. She did not concentrate on her philosophy, but it happened naturally that her manner of attack motivated the audience to independently derive her rationale and decide for themselves whether hers was a better position in contrast to the one she was criticizing. But, of course, the rhetoric
was structured to leave them no better choice and thus impel them to accept her philosophy completely.

Because she starts with individualistic and objective division of matter and subjects into opposing entities, her ultimate goal has to be a war. Rather than viewing war as divisive and evil, Rand identifies with war against evil, a righteous war that was the quintessence of her philosophy. Yet, this type of war becomes the struggle shared by all, regardless of inclinations or duty. But the mind, the computer made for war, and the philosophy, the programmer of war, have to defeat those who are fighting against objective meaning. And under the guidance of the absolutely logical philosophy, the attractive outcome was a calculable act impossible to dismiss—the victory for the philosophy of Objectivism.

2. Life Is a Battle Metaphor

Rand often wrote of “fighting,” “struggling,” and “battling” for the freedom and goodness in life, whether through the strike of major industrialists in *Atlas Shrugged* or the demolition of a building in *The Fountainhead*. However, her audience at West Point was not necessarily like-minded, so she began her speech concentrating on how non-Objectivists fight for their lives. She carefully prepared the grounds for acceptance before leaping to her final conclusions. In an essay titled “Philosophical Detection” (Rand, 1982, Ch. 2), she describes people who make mistakes similar to the astronaut:

Most men can give themselves only some primitively superficial answers—and they spend their lives struggling with incomprehensible inner conflicts, alternately repressing their emotions and indulging in emotional fits, regretting it, losing control again, rebelling against the mystery of their inner chaos, trying to unravel it, giving up, deciding to feel nothing—and feeling the growing pressure of fear, guilt, self-doubt, which makes the answers progressively harder to find. (p. 21)
She contrasts her own aggressive stance with the numb resistance to conflict that stems from repressing rather than resolving contradictory emotions. This way she identifies what she hates and what could potentially belong to her audience. One can infer that people who “spend their lives struggling” can only win the battle by internalizing the Objectivist ethics and by becoming masters of their own lives. Thus, the conceptual metaphor Life Is a Battle is also implied in Rand’s speech at West Point. She would teach the cadets her ethics by using this metaphor and having them identify with the need to fight their common enemies. This metaphor has, with entailed structural and/or ontological mappings, various inferences (Fuhrmann, 2013), such as: life is lived individually by fighting or struggling for survival; a hostile environment requires life to be fought courageously; an honest life is moral and necessary for an individual’s survival; principled life is led in protection of its ideals; the individual is strengthened by life’s experience in order to continue fighting; one can either be active or give up life; planning life strategically for the long term is necessary to survive; using the mind and being rational is an indispensable tool for survival; life can lead to either success or failure, win or lose; death is the end that concludes life; life can be peaceful or it can be difficult and unfair; and throwing life away is a sign of wasting strategic resources.

Conceiving of Life as a Battle reflects how Rand thought and acted. Although the specific constructions of fighting are not always explicitly stated, Rand did not convey a very peaceful personality. She led a life filled with arguments, was sometimes seen as a warrior, if not a battlemaster, and often showed her radical, rebellious nature. While sometimes being very aggressive with her own followers, Rand also impressed others with her battle-hardiness in arguments, even being visualized by her opponents at the scene of battle, such as: “Many are the
people who laughed at my description of [Rand’s] dialectical invincibility, only later to try their hands and join me among the corpses on the Randian battlefield” (qtd. in Burns, 2009, pp. 149ff.). Her always-winning argumentation developed from a very young age and from her love of arguments (Burns, 2009, pp. 13, 21). Even while she used some language of battle, she used identification with battle-worthy qualities to have her audience participate in her worldview.

Although life means also survival, survival does not necessarily mean life, since one can live without even thinking about survival. Thinking about survival, though, is the essence of Objectivist reasoning and thus equates survival with living philosophically. Introducing Philosophy: Who Needs It, Peikoff writes that “[r]eason, according to Objectivism, . . . [is the] basic means of survival . . . [and requires] a necessity of human life” (Rand, 1982, p. vii). Objectivists promote their own survival by sharing their worldview and convictions. Their minds are independent, but their knowledge can persuade and thus “change” others like “changing” nature (p. 39). In her speech, Rand expressed the need for persuasion because of the urgency she felt her entire life, the urgency of which she warned her audience when she said that there is a philosophical “battle for man’s mind” and therefore for his life (p. 9). For this reason, Objectivists must be fighting to promote not only their philosophy but also their way of life. “Survival is life” is related to the conceptual metaphors in the Lakovian sense and involves other conceptual metaphors (such as Argument Is War) in building the Objectivist worldview as well as helping reframe the worldviews of others. An important implication of this is the Objectivist political position and how it affects contemporary right-wing politicians in thinking about and defending capitalism and reinforcing their own non-Objectivist worldviews.
An astronaut is also one of those figures who needs to fight for his or her life in order to survive. If an astronaut relies on mere hope or faith, he or she will probably not survive. The astronaut trusted the alien place instead of making effort to survive. Ayn Rand (1982) believes that acting like the astronaut in the story is “the way most men live their lives” (p. 2). She implies, however, that, whether or not they survive based on their philosophical choices, all people are like astronauts. Individuals live in a hostile environment, and the perception of an environment and others in it as hostile reinforces individualistic traits. You might have heard from rebellious teenagers, when they speak against admonishments of their parents, something along the lines of: “Leave me alone! I just want to live my life!” To live or wanting or trying to live is usually stressed, but, importantly, “living” correlates to the self-interested “I” who says so. And when in a truly dangerous situation, an individual who values his or her life will say: “I will fight for my life!” And a similar line that Rand uses to promote her vision of capitalism—the laissez-faire (i.e., hands-off) free-market capitalism—is: “Give me liberty or give me death” (Rand, “Essentials”). A battle is resolved when a soldier receives either liberty or death. And in Rand’s sense, individualists must fight to make capitalism a reality.

This battle aggressiveness, however, is only in self-defense or in defense of one’s independent way of life. Rand opposed physical force with force only if it was initiated against her life. Rand had been a great debater, and so the battle for life is also conceptual and philosophical. She preferred to see herself surrounded by enemies who were destined to fail because of their philosophical choices, and this difficult stance only strengthened Rand’s life in battle. Acting on the principles of one’s true philosophy is “not easy,” as she said (Rand, 1982, p. 6). Yet, she also preferred to see the enemy’s side as difficult because false. Even the rational
failures of the astronaut become a struggle. Rand explains how this character relates to a common person: “Most men spend their days struggling to evade three questions, the answers to which underlie man’s every thought, feeling and action, whether he is consciously aware of it or not: Where am I? How do I know it? What should I do?” (p. 2, my emphases). These questions span the most important parts of Rand’s philosophy and philosophy in general. They correlate with reality (existence), reason (relationship to existence), and life (a code of conduct and values). The third is studied by the field of ethics, which “may be regarded as [philosophy’s] technology” (p. 3, my emphasis). Using such “technology,” one can visualize the course of the moral battle. Then, ethics, like a computer, “defines a code of values to guide man’s choices and actions—the choices and actions that determine the course of his life” (p. 3, my emphases). This definition is grounded in the common mental imagery of men in battle—as soldiers—who have strength to follow such codes that help guide them through the courses of their battles.

However, most people, even though they understand the questions, provide an unacceptable answer, as Rand portrayed it: “Where am I? Say, in New York City. How do I know it? It’s self-evident. What should I do? Here, they are not too sure—but the usual answer is: whatever everybody does. The only trouble seems to be that they are not very active, not very confident, not very happy—and they experience, at times, a causeless fear and an undefined guilt, which they cannot explain or get rid of” (p. 2, my emphases). The answer to the question about life is without confidence. These men say that they imitate others; they do whatever everyone else does. They are not very active or happy. These people are generally called by Rand “whim-worshippers,” for they do not favor reason, and hence their struggle is not for victory. Their struggle is a losing battle. And, besides, they are not properly “equipped.” Since
Rand portrayed the astronaut, a common person, as a failure in battle, she meant to show that resisting true philosophy is similarly an ultimate failure—it leads to the loss of one’s life. Such struggles conflict with Rand’s cause. Emotions against reason are the enemy and should be gotten rid of. The emotional struggle against reason leads to war with reason. But reason is the right side to be on. Reason provides certitude based on the absolute nature of existence, and without certainty—you are “doomed to perpetual doubt,” to “failure and disaster” (p. 3ff., my emphases) in the hands of the enemy. Rand pitches these ideas to her audience, knowing that they would identify with them, in order to attack and get rid of these ideas, thus preparing the audience to accept her philosophy. The proper code will be programmed by the proper philosophy for the success in battle.

Consequent to Rand’s reasoning, creatures with unknown morals must be distrusted, especially in unclear situations, such as an alien planet or New York City during the Cold War. The aliens in the astronaut story may as well symbolize the enemies who try to morally weaken you by dismantling your code of values. But rather than fearing the enemies, you must trust reason and be independent of others, i.e., be self-reliant and not rely on others’ help. In Objectivism, society is not more important or fundamental than the individuals who compose it. In fact, society may be viewed as an alien place where others are being immoral and spread bad influences. Another analogy used in Objectivism to illustrate the nature of society is that “the independent man is as alone in society as on a desert island” (Peikoff, 1991, p. 381, cf. pp. 202, 252). A society is compared to a desert island in order to promote the idea of self-made people and competitiveness. One needs to survive one’s life, i.e., one’s battle, in order to continue waging a total war.
3. Philosophy Is War Metaphor

The conceptual metaphor Philosophy Is War is a novel configuration of the well-known Argument Is War or Argument Is Struggle metaphors. It also has structural and ontological entailments in addition to those of its closely related complementary metaphor Life Is a Battle and the hierarchical configuration provided by Mind Is Computer metaphor. Rand’s expressive words in an earlier essay, “What Can One Do?” (1972), remind one of the conceptual frame that she held so deeply: “[A] philosophical battle is a nuclear war” (1982, p. 246). Based on our knowledge of war, we can make the following inferences about philosophy: some philosophy is hierarchical and there are hierarchies made of kings and their followers; philosophers can be viewed metonymically as philosophies (metonymy Subject for Person); philosophers promulgate or propagandize their causes and ideas; philosophy influences cultures and societies; philosophy can spread corrupting influences (e.g., corrupting youth); and the success of philosophy entails great rewards and domineering power over people’s minds (e.g., philosophy can conquer one’s mind). When speaking about minds engaged in conflict, metonymy Mind for Person may be used, e.g., “he was a great mind.”

As we have already seen, a metaphor closely related to Mind Is Computer is the Ideas Are Objects metaphor, which maps physical properties of objects onto ideas. For example, in philosophical war, there are some ideas that you may “feel compelled to use” or that can represent “a grab-bag of notions snatched at random” or that “you would drop like a hot potato if you knew” (Rand, 1982, p. 5ff., my emphases). It is important what ideas or principles one upholds because they “may clash” (p. 6, my emphasis). Thus opposing ethics provide the means and serve as weapons of conflict. This is where the “battle” of philosophy emerges. Philosophy
is fought conceptually by using appropriate tools in structuring its ideas and attacking others with criticisms in order to “dismantle” them, as we will see later. A philosophy can be sharp, and such philosophies are dangerous.

Rand stood in front of many cadets of West Point as a general teaching them important strategies to use in succeeding in all their battles. She showed that the evil influences of altruistic philosophers, especially Hegel and Kant, permeate much of our language and thoughts (Rand, 1982, p. 15ff.), and they have to be resisted and fought against at all costs. But how could one resist or fight while not knowing one’s own philosophy or not being sure of one’s truth? A common man “does not know whether its programming is true or false, right or wrong, whether it’s set to lead him to success or destruction, whether it serves his goals or those of some evil, unknowable power. He is blind on two fronts” (p. 7, my emphasis). That is why he needs philosophy. Those who choose to depend on emotions rather than on rational “programming” do not know whether their set paths will lead them to “success or destruction,” and thus they are “blind on two fronts.” Those who do not want to resolve their situation and are not interested in philosophy are “most helplessly in [philosophy’s] power” (p. 8). Like the astronaut in the story, they cannot escape it but have to choose sides if they want to survive. But they have to be careful, since philosophers influence culture and the world around them. Thus, philosophies can be superior or inferior just as the sides of conflict; many lives and even generations can be given for the cause of some philosophy; philosophy uses ideas and conceptual techniques as tools or weapons to attain its goals and to clearly see the goals of its enemies; philosophy can be wasteful or righteous, significant or meaningless, clear or murky; the end of a philosophical argument entails a loss of one side and a win of the other; and philosophy has areas or territories of interest
that it covers. Rand portrays this imagery of war with urgency and requires for self-protection the “defense of truth, justice, freedom” against the corrupting influences involved in the “battle of philosophers [--] a battle for man’s mind” (p. 9, my emphases). One has to be perfectly exact in programming one’s strategic actions and being as objective as a computer, and Rand totally accepts that she is in the role of such domineering but protective power, the power being derived from rational truth and objectivity.

At the root of philosophies lie issues that deal with man’s mind, and “some theories struggle to clarify and others struggle to obfuscate, to corrupt” (Rand, 1982, p. 9, my emphases). But Rand admonishes the cadets to “train” and “discipline” their “intellectual posture” of philosophy (p. 10, original emphasis), as if philosophy was an entity. There is also an orientational aspect to this metaphor: philosophy guided by reason, which is seated in our brain, is positioned higher than the rest of the body, and upright posture is the consequence of higher reason and philosophical training. If not prepared, an enemy can corrupt reason and thus lower morality as well as weaken the person physically, i.e., lowering posture.

While teaching them her ethics for proper conduct, Rand advises against surrendering their “moral autonomy to others” (p. 8, original emphasis). They should not give away what rightly belongs to them. They should defend it even to the extent of giving up their lives, if not able to live freely. They should engage in war with their philosophical enemies, and they should learn the enemies’ enslaving arguments, which are “basic arguments [,] and be able to blast them” (p. 10, my emphasis). And all this Rand says in her speech to further the cause of her philosophy.
Rand’s closest follower, even while she was alive, was not afraid to use the word “propaganda” in relation to spreading the messages of Objectivism: “I am an Objectivist propagandist. I go out of my way to spread and push Objectivist ideas publicly for the sake of remaking the country according to the way Objectivism holds it should be” (Peikoff, 1974, Lec.8). And neither did Rand have any qualms about such conduct. To understand this further, we need to look at the context when her speech was given. After the Watergate scandal, Richard Nixon was still in office for about five more months, and there was still lingering in the background the exigency of the Cold War. Compromise, or sharing, is attacked by Rand (1982) and assigned to Nixon in her speech, displaying the pervasiveness of philosophies she opposes (p. 5).

Rand’s successful positioning of counter-socialistic ideas in America and fear rhetoric against socialism go hand in hand. Bitzer (1968) showed that rhetorical situation is fundamental to rhetoric, and the rhetorical situation at the time was the threat of communism. Rand correctly evaluated the exigency of the situation, selected the audience (the West Point cadets), and her constraint was her philosophy, to which she appealed with rational emotions. Her reasoning was two-valued and dichotomized. On the one side was the enemy, on the other, the cadets who are supposed to act and make the appropriate decisions to defeat the enemy. The real situation is reflected in the fictional situation of the astronaut on an alien planet, which is her rhetorical response. She also used the exigency of potential invasion of the United States by the USSR in critiquing the defense of capitalism by conservatives:

In recent years, the “conservatives” have gradually come to a dim realization of the weakness in their position, of the philosophical flaw that had to be corrected [...] . . . arguments used by today’s “conservatives” to justify capitalism, which can best be designated as: the argument from faith [...] . . .
Sensing their need of a moral base, many “conservatives” decided to choose *religion* as their moral justification; they claim that America and capitalism are based on faith in God. Politically, such a claim contradicts the fundamental principles of the United States: in America, religion is a private matter which cannot and must not be brought into political issues.

Intellectually, to rest one’s case on *faith* means to concede that reason is on the side of one’s enemies. (Rand et al., 1966, pp. 197ff., original emphases)

Rand points out that a weakness of conservatives is that they do not have true philosophy to strengthen their cases and help them better fight the enemy. In fact, to her, conservatives do not understand the nature of capitalism. But they are not yet lost, since they have realized, at least *dimly*, that they have been blind to reason. Rand is further trying to convince conservatives, by challenging the foundation of their morality, to accept reason over faith. In the following she once again stresses the exigency of the international situation and criticizes those who have faith instead of reason, even portrays them as contradictory and anti-American, and she repeats her appeal:

The “conservatives’” claim that their case rests on faith, means that there are no rational arguments to support the American system, no rational justification for freedom, justice, property, individual rights, that these rest on a mystic revelation and can be accepted only *on faith*—that in reason and logic the enemy is right, but men must hold faith as superior to reason.

. . . While the communists claim that they are the representatives of reason and science, the “conservatives” concede it and retreat into the realm of mysticism, of faith, of the supernatural, into another world, surrendering *this* world to communism. (Rand et al., 1966, p. 198, original emphasis)

While she was highly critical of religious conservatives, she did try to persuade them to her side because they all had the same goals— to defend capitalism. What she had to do was to bring the conservatives to this natural world, back to reality; she had to take them away from the supernatural and mystical; she had to identify them with capitalist reality, capitalism in the name of reason, not faith. She claimed that the main difference between her and these conservatives
was that she used aggressive, rational philosophy to defend capitalism instead of a mystic philosophy, which is missing rational epistemology and relationship to reality. Thus, she attacked conservatives’ ethics. To repeal Rand’s challenge, the conservatives had to be rebranded and changed from those who were immoral because of weakness from faith to those who chose the guidance of reason to defend capitalism, as taught by Objectivists.

To attain some political representation in our century, Objectivists attempt to influence and teach movement conservatives to defend and advance capitalism. Organized by the Competitive Enterprise Institute and the Ayn Rand Center, a four-hour event called “Intellectual Ammunition Strategy Session” was held in Washington, DC, on September 11, 2009 (CEI/ARC, 2009). Such “ammunition” prerogatives were common to Objectivists, since there was an “Intellectual Ammunition Department” column in The Objectivist Newsletter. But it was the first time that this kind of informational event was created for non-Objectivists. This was due to the election of President Barack Obama, who is considered by Objectivists and movement conservatives to be a socialist and thus a common enemy. They needed to let “the Obama administration hear [their] voices” and “[t]o make the tea party movement an effective weapon in the war of ideas for individual liberty” (“CEI/ARC,” 2009, my emphases). The threat of socialism rising in America and the exigency to fight it by using any available means moved the conservatives to use the Objectivist conception of reason. Although Rand started as a militant atheist, over time she became considerate of similarly minded, idealistic theists when defending capitalism. With theists on their side, Objectivists could inspire others to use reason selfishly and thus motivate them to become atheists in the long run. This tactic would be enough to reinforce Objectivist ranks in order to accomplish the shared goal, the target of their mission. Even in the
past, Rand supported Republicans Wendell Willkie and Barry Goldwater as long as they stayed far on the right without compromising with the left.

To be a good fighter, one should be intransigent and never compromise one’s principles with the enemy. A compromise is a slippery slope that can only lead to lowering of morale, weakness, and the enemies’ victory. Rational moral principles give one moral strength and conviction. Such principles are inevitable if you accept Reason. “You have no choice about the necessity to integrate your observations . . . into principles. . . . [Y]ou have no choice about the fact that you need a philosophy” (Rand, 1982, p. 6). To survive is a need, not a choice. Rand calls “chronic terror” the inability “to grasp reality” or “own motives” (p. 7). She indicates that Immanuel Kant influences “the destruction of man’s mind” (p. 8, my emphasis). Immanuel Kant, an Enlightenment thinker, was surely Rand’s archenemy, and his wide influence helped strengthen her stance. Alongside Kant, she positioned all the others who, she thought, were against capitalism: Nazis and Marxists, or the “mystics of muscle,” and religionists, or the “mystics of spirit.” But even such “evil” philosophies should be studied, Rand argues, in “self-protection” (p. 8). One should know everything about one’s enemy (i.e., his philosophical position and moral code) in order to be able to achieve a strategic advantage over him and “blast” his arguments. This is also true even of one’s friends, since no one can be completely trusted in a critical situation, such as the Cold War. This strategy is well accepted by the military. Being careful might avoid disaster, and taking extra risks that may lead to bad results is surely not desirable. When fighting such powerful enemies one first needs to establish safety at home.

Rand additionally associates the spread and corruption of “evil” philosophies with internal pathological tendencies: the enemies within the United States. She blames the
unprincipled youth for this calamity. Escaping reality, such as through drugs, is alike failing the need of survival and thus life. Once such irrationality destroys one’s connection to reality and a way to survive, one’s life is forfeited. One is not a human being any longer, not a rational animal. A dangerous thing is “to surrender [your] moral autonomy to others,” stresses Rand (1982, p. 8, original emphasis). And in the world where so many have succumbed to the dangerous influences of mind-destroying philosophies, Rand and her followers cannot go on trusting people, since they can no longer rely on all humans to act as rational animals. Their potential companions-in-arms have fallen into a philosophical “booby trap” and are lost to reason. Yet, Rand continues to promote the positive in her message:

In physical warfare, you would not send your men into a booby trap: you would make every effort to discover its location. Well, Kant’s system is the biggest and most intricate booby trap in the history of philosophy—but it’s so full of holes that once you grasp its gimmick, you can defuse it without any trouble and walk forward over it in perfect safety. And, once it is defused, the lesser Kantians—the lower ranks of his army, the philosophical sergeants, buck privates, and mercenaries of today—will fall of their own weightlessness, by chain reaction.

There is a special reason why you, the future leaders of the United States Army, need to be philosophically armed today. You are the target of a special attack by the Kantian-Hegelian-collectivist establishment that dominates our cultural institutions at present. (p. 10, my emphases)

Thus we can clearly see that a false philosophy is a “booby trap,” and reason is a “tool” to help us “defuse” the “booby trap” and live our true philosophy to the fullest. The enemy philosophy has its own hierarchy and army.

Rand was very defensive of the military, and any kind of negative criticism of the armed forces she took very seriously and tried to debunk and attack head on, such as when she wrote: “Something called ‘the military-industrial complex’—which is a myth or worse—is being blamed
for all of this country’s troubles” (p. 10). She understood that the best strategy in war was to
attack rather than defend, and her attacks were often quite penetrating and visual:

. . . _Bloody_ college hoodlums scream demands that R.O.T.C. units be banned from
college campuses. Our defense budget is being attacked, denounced and undercut by
people who claim that financial priority should be given to ecological rose gardens and to
classes in esthetic self-expression for the residents of the slums.

Some of you may be bewildered by this campaign and may be wondering, in
good faith, what errors you committed to bring it about. If so, it is urgently important for
you to understand the nature of _the enemy_. You are attacked, not for any errors or flaws,
but for your virtues. (p. 10ff., my emphases)

The enemies are “bloody” because they are emotional, unpredictable, and thus cause much
(conceptual) death and destruction. Their cause is against reason and thus directly conflicts with
the establishment that Rand promotes. They are undermining the conceptual protection that true
philosophy provides to the learned and common alike. The military is the means of defending the
physical establishment—means of defending capitalism.

Ayn Rand, more than anything, wanted to survive, truly survive, and she made survival
the constant of life. As long as the Eastern Bloc was there, she was going to engage in
philosophical war with them. She lived during an ideological crisis, a conflict of global
proportions, and at the irresolvable core of the conflict, as she believed, was individualism versus
collectivism, reason versus mysticism, life versus death. The conflict was waged on high moral
grounds—it is a conflict of philosophies, a conflict of free minds resisting being undermined,
corrupted, and destroyed. And finally, Philosophy Is War is fulfilled in the following passage,
and the armament is set in motion:

A battle of this kind requires special weapons. It has to be fought with a full
understanding of your cause, a full confidence in yourself, and the fullest certainty of the
moral rightness of both. Only philosophy can provide you with these weapons. (p. 11,
original italics, my underline)
4. Capitalism Is God’s Will Metaphor

Rand rarely speaks about God, but this does not stop movement conservatives from identifying with her messages, especially in *Atlas Shrugged*. Being related to the previously discussed metaphors as well as to the Strict Father morality depicted by conservatives (subsequently discussed), the conceptual metaphor Capitalism Is God’s Will has the following inferences (cf. Lakoff, 2014, p. 128): capitalism is absolutely right; capitalism is a moral system; capitalism should rule; capitalism rewards virtue with power, righteous living with wealth, and punishes sin; capitalism has laws that should be obeyed; capitalist laws define right and wrong; a capitalist is a person who should be rational, morally strong, and self-disciplined; capitalism requires faith and loyalty to follow its ideals; and it requires aggressive defense and needs to be spread globally.

This conceptual metaphor is not used by Objectivists but is rather used by conservatives. However, there are points of contact between the conceptual metaphors both use. Both share the target domain (capitalism) but head toward it while using different terms. The search for Being, or existence, is parallel to the search for God, as Lakoff and Johnson (1999) discuss in the analysis of Aristotle’s philosophy (Ch. 18). Existence is everything, an all-inclusive category that is above any determined existence. In a way, the axiom of existence can be viewed as a secularized version of the prime mover concept. But even though it is meaningless to speak of the “will” of existence, this idea can still be mapped onto capitalism by the concept of God.8

---

8 You would not be able to describe the whole of Objectivism without mentioning its most fundamental concepts, its three unquestionable axioms. Among the three, the first and most important one is simply the state of being that is outside of space and time. Anything is not existence, but only the "being" that is underneath (or above) all other concepts is the widest Objectivist concept—the implicit concept of existence. Existence is eternal but finite; it is, in itself, a causeless entity and the universe as a whole that, by its nature, causes everything else, including space and time (cf. Peikoff, 1991, Ch. 1; Rand & Peikoff, 1990, Ch. 6). However, existence is not consciousness nor
Although for movement conservatives God and man are hierarchically above nature, as depicted in the Moral Order metaphor (Lakoff, 2002, Ch. 5), for Objectivists “nature is existence” (Peikoff, 1991, p. 31) that people can dominate and use for profit, but only if they obey its laws. “In Ayn Rand’s formulation, man ‘knows that he has to be right; to be wrong in action means danger to his life; to be wrong in person, to be evil, means to be unfit for existence’” (qtd. in Peikoff, 1991, p. 306, original emphases). Existence is thus related to life and to Rand’s morality. Reason is what helps people to survive by relating them to existence. After reason and purpose, the first two principles of Objectivism, comes self-esteem, evaluating one’s ability and worthiness to survive. The breach, Peikoff (1991) assumes, comes from evaluating yourself not against one’s life and thus existence but against “relation to others” (p. 308). This is important because individualism is proclaimed by Objectivists to be naturally at the core of capitalism, and this seems congruent with the movement conservative view.

The primary axiom of existence strengthens the belief that everything in the universe is objectively comprehensible and everything can be explained by axiomatic relationships. After all, Objectivism is a fully integrated philosophy that covers a wide spectrum of ideas and fields. Although Objectivists believe that man’s survival is not guaranteed or automatic, their axioms help guide them consistently and systematically. “If he is to succeed at the task of survival ...,’ Ayn Rand concludes, ‘man has to choose his course, his goals, his values in the context and terms of a lifetime’” (qtd. in Peikoff, 1991, p. 217). The course of survival, as we have seen, is the war in defense of capitalism.
Objectivists are spiritualized by heroism in art. It is a concretization of personal metaphysical standards. However, “the role of art is not didactic... To teach... is the task of philosophy” (Peikoff, 1991, p. 422, original emphasis). In her speech, Rand only mentioned the role of art in passing; and here is a greater elaboration on Objectivist art by Peikoff (1991):

Art, one may say, is concerned to “teach.” What it teaches, however, is not a theory, but a technique, a technique of directing one’s awareness, directing it away from the inconsequential and toward the metaphysically essential. Art thereby clarifies a man’s grasp of reality. “In this sense,” Miss Rand writes, “art teaches man how to use his consciousness. It conditions or stylizes man’s consciousness by conveying to him a certain way of looking at existence.” (p. 423)

Art is “a selective re-creation of reality” with the “operative word” being here “selective” (Peikoff, 1991, p. 423, original emphasis). Art provides a fundamental “focus on reality” (p. 423). Although specific tastes in art may differ, the exact nature of relationship to reality through reason can never be in conflict among those who uphold realistic reason. All these conceptions of art help reach a conclusion that art serves as a motivation or inspiration to fight for freedom and capitalism and through the fully integrated philosophy to teach others the need for this fight. And metaphors play a role in this too. In artistic representations of reality, “[t]he purpose of metaphors, or comparisons, is epistemological” (Rand, 2000, p. 141), that is, they “should manipulate properly the consciousness” of your audience (Rand, 2001, p. 112).

Capitalism and morality are related to the movement conservatives in a way similar to Objectivists because both have enemies that are the ideological enemies of capitalism. What the conservatives missed before was that the conflict with communists was waged on philosophical rather than religious grounds. Ethics, as Rand argued, must be grounded in philosophy, not religion. Nonetheless, movement conservatives were able to connect their faith in God with the outcome of individualist ethics, namely, capitalism. “[T]he political division,” George Lakoff
writes about the state of politics today, “is a moral division. . . [and] is ultimately a family-based division” (Lakoff, 2002, p. ix). Lakoff explores how American people view politics unconsciously and conventionally, and how such concepts of government are based on their familial upbringing and child-rearing practices. Lakoff argues that the conservatives follow the Strict Father family metaphor, in which Government Is Strict Father and Citizens Are Children. “The Strict Father model takes as background the view that life is difficult and that the world is fundamentally dangerous” (p. 66). This political frame entails various other metaphors about morality in a particular order, starting with Well-being as Wealth metaphor.

Fundamental to the perception of morality in economic relations and Capitalism as God’s Will is the perception of Well-being as Wealth and the Moral Accounting metaphor (Lakoff, 2002, pp. 44-54). These metaphors involve the Morality Is Strength metaphor that entails being moral as being upright and being immoral as being low. Both use physical orientation of our bodies to visualize the importance of having a sufficient moral will to stand up for what one believes in. It translates into the kind of intellectual posture that is required to grasp reality, which Rand referred to in her speech. The anti-realist drug addicts from Rand’s speech are morally weak and low, lower than human beings in the moral, natural order of things, where the moral order is the natural order, and thus their human qualities can be easily ignored. The retributive correlate to these metaphors is based on the legitimate authority of the police, courts, and the military. Keeping the moral books in this fashion means to increase one’s “gains,” decrease “losses” or “costs,” and equally “pay back” the harm that is done. Applying the same metaphor to corrupt nations, the enemy governments must be justly punished for their tyrannical regimes that enslave their citizens. The problematic individuals and the evil governments are
caused by evil philosophies, such as Kant’s morality. The metaphors that are not accepted by movement conservatives or Objectivists are Altruism and Turning the Other Cheek because they do not fit the aggressive stance that is based on retribution and punishment justly deserved for evil deeds. In the Morality of Retribution, honorable people pay their moral debts, and for this they receive respect. The morality of honor is the consequence of the morality of retribution. Challenged honor must be defended, and harms must be paid back to those who initiated them or assaulted the injured party, and the payment must be given in equal amount in order to rebalance the moral books.⁹

Intransigent, principled integrity in Objectivism equals righteousness. If one has not “sinned” against reason and did not close one’s eyes on reality, one can be considered a moral person. Being such a person requires self-discipline. “Being self-disciplined is being obedient to your own authority, that is, being able to carry out the plans you make and the commitments you undertake” (Lakoff, 2002, p. 68). The father is the literal authority in the Strict Father households, and in Objectivism the father is also the figure of authority favored for his strength. With the type of physical and moral strength this figure entails, Objectivists and movement conservatives see capitalist government as a strict but protective father in charge of the military, courts, and the police. Strictness in disciplining oneself and following legal authority is required to survive in the highly competitive and dangerous world. Government that protects the rights of its citizens and does not interfere with them in any way is the right government. Government must be employed by its citizens and not the other way around. The rational citizens employ

---

⁹ See more in Lakoff and Johnson (1999, Ch. 14).
government that can hold monopoly on the just use of force only in retaliation against criminals and only in defense of its citizens.

Like God holding the moral responsibility for the well-being of its children, government “has to hold such a monopoly, since it is the agent of restraining and combating the use of force; and for that very same reason, its actions have to be rigidly defined, delimited and circumscribed; no touch of whim or caprice should be permitted in its performance; it should be an impersonal robot, with the laws as its only motive power” (Rand & Branden, 1964, p. 104). On the other hand, capitalists behave according to their human natures. Following the law of identity, “[a] person with integrity also acts according to his nature; there is nothing artificial or contrived about him” (Lakoff, 2002, p. 91).

Corresponding to the Objectivist principles of Reason, Purpose, and Self-esteem, the Strict Father model shows that “without the morality of the pursuit of self-interest, there would be no moral link between self-discipline and self-reliance” (Lakoff, 2002, p. 94). Although Objectivists have some common views with liberals, such as being pro-choice on abortion, their metaphorical worldview is much closer to the conservatives’ view. In the Objectivist ethics, morality as a pursuit of self-interest takes an idealistic moral focus. The morality of self-interest (as a means to moral ends) is a priority for Objectivists, and that is why it takes a higher position in the Strict Father model, next to Moral Authority in the general conservative order of metaphors. The morality of self-interest works when one does not conflict with others (by using reason) and does not let others do something for the sake of oneself. Neither government nor other people should interfere with one’s freedom to work for one’s own good. This metaphor is seen in John Galt’s oath from *Atlas Shrugged* (2009): “I swear by my life and my love of it that I
will never live for the sake of another man, nor ask another man to live for mine.” Hence
movement conservatives can use Objectivist arguments for capitalism because Objectivist and
movement conservative worldviews are aligned, even if they are different in details. The link
between free-market capitalism and the Strict Father model is the morality of self-interest

Ayn Rand gave her speech at West Point praising the military’s might. This is salient
because Lakoff (2002) also attributes this to the Strict Father model, when he writes that “the
military represents the strength of the nation, and strength has the highest priority in the Strict
Father model. Moreover, the military itself is structured by Strict Father morality” (p. 193). The
movement conservatives support the military while the militaristic culture is deeply entailed in
Philosophy Is War metaphor. The Strict Father metaphor is also implied in a variety of moral
metaphors involving authority, strength, obedience, self-interest, and others. Moral freedom is
very important, since a person must be self-reliant and no one should be interfering with his or
her goals. Rand upholds the Moral Order and the Strict Father model of the family when asking
the West Point cadets to follow the model of Moral Strength, self-discipline, and natural
dominance. Moral empathy from the Nurturant Parent morality, on the other hand, does not show
in her speech.

Capitalism Is God’s Will combines in conservative mindset the metaphor of Moral Order
Is Dominant Order with the Objectivist metaphor of Morality Is Self-interest. From these ideas,
capitalism is derived as the perfect political system.

It is this religious system of reward and punishment that . . . [is] claimed (through
metaphor) to be the same as laissez-faire free-market capitalism. What conservative
Christians have done is two things. They have given the Bible an interpretation in terms
Thus, the Strict Father interpretation of God as Father (and authority) and Well-being as Wealth, among others, link with free-market capitalism being God’s will. The conservatives’ political motivation was parallel with Rand’s ultimate identification implied in her concept of existence being the supreme axiom. Their consubstantiality was in axiomatic knowledge beyond contradictions, the conviction of reality beyond mind, yet reality that lies at the foundation of the perspective narrowing in on capitalism as the way of life, and this was the unquestionable Truth. As with Objectivists, physical evidence always follows the metaphysical truth (the reality) unless some evidence is given by the enemy in order to deceive and destroy the moral and natural order of things. And the conservatives, identifying with Rand’s authoritative and experiential view on socialism, could not let the enemy do that.

Although critics find much inconsistency in Objectivism, Objectivism has a consistent system of logic and an overall stable philosophical system that is attractive to movement conservatives. The interest in principled rational (objective) over the unprincipled irrational (subjective) beliefs is what’s primarily shared between Objectivists and movement conservatives. In order to strengthen their religious beliefs, these conservatives find in Objectivism a deep philosophical support that draws upon their shared ideals, albeit there are harsh Objectivist criticisms of the conservatives’ religion and even a perceived threat of them ascending to totalitarian power (see Peikoff, 2012a, Ch. 15-16). However, Rand’s vision of capitalism at the end of Atlas Shrugged captivates conservatives’ imagination. While the ascent to God’s state is near, the distrust of the morally weak, motivated by the failure of socialism, is
reflected in the prophetic allegory of reality that Rand so masterfully crafted in her essay and speech.

Orality played an important role in the spread of Objectivism. Many monologues are not only found in Rand’s written fiction, but also the dissemination of much of Objectivism from its beginnings was dependent on speeches or recordings. A series of lectures on tape and in-person rapidly expanded the influence of Rand’s institute in the 60s (Burns, 2009, Ch. 6). The Aristotelian, peripatetic nature of Objectivism shows in various appearances, speeches, and other in-person communications and in the Objectivist lectures that still continue today. The leading Objectivist scholar, Leonard Peikoff, has already given, since the 60s, at least 24 lecture series, some of which individually spanned up to 10 sessions. In addition, over 30 of his other recordings, including from his radio talk show, can be purchased from the Ayn Rand Institute eStore (https://estore.aynrand.org). Peikoff’s official blog posts, on peikoff.com, are also aural (i.e., in the form of podcasts) rather than written. Many of Rand’s and Peikoff’s non-fiction books were based on transcripts of their lectures, and most, if not all, of their books, fiction and non-fiction alike, are also available in accessible audio editions. In the tradition started by Rand, many Objectivists continue giving lectures throughout the United States, and many find listening to Objectivist lectures and books very convenient. Thus, secondary orality is inherent to Objectivist messages.

Even arguments are seen by Objectivists as oral or casual. While among Objectivists only written or oral presentations are considered, “arguing” with non-Objectivists is “an informal process as it takes place in a drawing room, in an office, or at a party,” and this kind of arguing is “more or less chaos” (Peikoff, 2013, p. 217). An argument, therefore, functions as a preview of
Objectivist ideas to interest an opponent without, probably, “converting” him or her. And this “back-and-forth discussion” will only strengthen Objectivist’s convictions and demonstrate the opponent’s “impotence” (Peikoff, 2013, p. 218). Overall, the Objectivist argument is from the point of view of those who know the truth and do not eschew aggressive dissemination of their ideas and judgments. The Objectivist mode of persuasion is similar to that of an oral culture, and it is interesting to note the dependence of Objectivism on orality.
CONCLUDING REMARKS

Ayn Rand has invented a new and powerful view of reality and expressed it through her metaphor that we live in an alien world. Her view of philosophy for living (and surviving) on earth is accepted by many individuals, including those who have political influence. Nonetheless, the intended identification limited the overall success of Objectivism to persuade, while its actual persuasion aims at absolute and universal adherence. Only individuals who support classical, Aristotelian logic are candidates. And another important (unconscious) entailment for acceptance is the conceptual, metaphorical views on life and philosophy. The concentration on pure logic and/or emotion programmed by logic as a computer may have led to society’s partial acceptance of Objectivism, such as by movement conservatives in their own metaphor for capitalism and the Strict Father model. More research could expose the social impact of Rand’s rhetoric and trace the impact through the promulgations of the various groups that were inspired by Rand’s philosophy.

In summary, in her speech and essay on philosophy titled “Philosophy: Who Needs It” (1974), Rand suggests an analogy of an astronaut on an alien planet as a common individual in daily life. By motivating the story with the three conceptual metaphors--Mind as Computer, Life as a Battle, and Philosophy as War--she reframes a person’s experience into her own cognitive interpretation of experience. She positions her philosophy as applicable to any practical issues and able to save a person’s life by teaching him or her how to judge objectively. Aiming at Burkean identification, she shows that the heroic qualities of her audience, such as courage,
honesty, and independence, are considered and upheld by her as virtues necessary for capitalism.\textsuperscript{10} She argues that she draws support from correct premises of her philosophy rather than the faulty premises of the philosophies of others (especially Kant), whose negative effect on life in general is evident to her. This confidence in the correct premises for the right socio-political system underpins the criticisms of conservatives in Rand et al. (1966), thus elucidating the Objectivist position on capitalism. Rand uses a powerful new allegory to convince others of the need for absolute, metaphysical (rather than dialectical) truths and thus reframes our perception of living on earth. The Tea Party conservatives parallel Rand’s position and are thus susceptible to her rhetoric, but they interpret her philosophy by using the Capitalism Is God’s Will metaphor. The rhetoric of Rand’s writings is also directly connected to capitalism—the goal, the motive, and the desire of all Objectivists.

Life as a Battle is used by Rand conceptually to maintain an aggressive stance during the Cold War. Surviving and waging war against false philosophies, even implicitly, is what is meant by “living.” Mind as Computer programmed by philosophy reinforces her stance. Philosophy as War is vividly portrayed by Rand when she impels her audience to blast arguments of her opponents; the competing philosophers are the \textit{army personnel} who attack virtues but support and \textit{defend} duties. This virtues vs. duties war of morals is politically central to Objectivism, “a philosophy for living on earth.”

\textsuperscript{10} In \textit{Atlas Shrugged}, Rand mentions seven virtues: “rationality, independence, integrity, honesty, justice, productiveness, pride” (Rand, 2009). Being a speaker for capitalism, John Galt upholds these virtues, and this means that they pertain to ideal capitalists. These virtues are explained by three principles, from which they follow: Reason, Purpose, and Self-esteem. For example, “[h]onor is self-esteem made visible in action” (Rand, 1982, p. 12).
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