

# LYCEUM

IDÉFORUM TILLÄGNAT AYN RAND OCH HENNES FILOSOFI OBJEKTIVISMEN

*GRUNDERNA FÖR EN KVINNAS ABORTRÄTT*  
AV JERRY NILSON



*WHY RENT CONTROL IS IMMORAL*  
BY MICHAEL S. BERLINER



*DICK TRACY – EN KORT INTRODUKTION*  
AV PETER GUSTAFSON



*DICK TRACY: MORALITY IN BLACK AND WHITE*  
*An Objectivist Analysis*  
BY RODNEY SCHROETER



*IS IT INFATUATION ... OR LOVE ?*  
*Some thoughts on the psychology*  
*of romantic love*  
BY MICHAEL J. HURD



*NYHETER*

Volym 3 • Nummer 2 • November 1997 • Lösnummer: 25:-

Allt material (med undantag där särskild copyright finns angiven)  
copyright © *Lyceum* 1997.

**Tryck:** Teknologtryck, Elektro, Chalmers T H, 412 96 Göteborg.

**Redaktion:** Martin Lindeskog, Ola Qvarnström  
och ansvarige utgivare Jerry Nilson.

**Medarbetare:** Peter Gustafson.

**Adress:** Pl. 987, 438 35 Landvetter (Sweden).

**E-mail:** [lyceum@tripnet.se](mailto:lyceum@tripnet.se)

**Hemsida:** [home1.swipnet.se/~w-10005/trader/lyceum.html](http://home1.swipnet.se/~w-10005/trader/lyceum.html)

En prenumeration kostar 120 kr/sex nummer.

Lösnummer kostar 25 kr/st.

Inom övriga Norden 180 kr/år

(150 kr om betalning sker i kontanter på egen risk).

Utanför Norden \$ 30/år.

**Postgironummer:** 41 52 01 - 3.

Betalningsmottagare är 'Föreningen För Objektivismen'.

Artiklar, frågor, recensioner och kommentarer mottages  
tacksamt för eventuell publicering i *Lyceum*.

*Lyceum* stöder The Ayn Rand Institute men är inte  
knuten till ARI på annat sätt. *Lyceum* översätter  
inte engelska artiklar m.m. till svenska.

*Lyceum* utges av Föreningen För Objektivismen (FFO).

## *Från Redaktören*

Jag hade hoppats på att slippa behöva be om ursäkt för att Lyceum kom ut för sent igen. Tyvärr har det kommit andra saker emellan. Ursäkta oss! Skulle det mot förmodan ta lika lång tid att få ut ett nummer igen, kommer vi att göra ett extrautskick där vi meddelar er om förseningen. Vi har dock fortfarande ambitionen att fortsätta ge ut Lyceum med ungefär fyra nummer per år (dock inte detta år). Nu något om allt som hänt sedan förra numret kom ut sent i våras:

### **Konferensen i Bryssel**

Konferensen i Bryssel var förstas huvudhändelsen. Vi som var där fick vara med om den hittills mest lyckade objektivistiska konferensen som ägt rum i Europa. Tre dagar i maj/juni kunde vi höra Leonard Peikoff, Andrew Bernstein, John Ridpath, Michael Berliner och Gary Hull föreläsa om allt mellan enhet i kunskapsteorin till Ayn Rands tid i Ryssland; skillnaden mellan Rousseau och John Locke till Ayn Rands teori om metafysiska värdeomdömen.

Peikoff talade om hur historia och filosofi båda är aspekter av en och samma sak – inget av ämnena "kommer först", de är ömsesidigt beroende av varandra. Filosofi är väsentligen studiet av människan och "history is the laboratory for the study of man" – det ger dig allt material för abstraktionerna om människan (som Peikoff förklarade). All kunskapsinlärning är en "spiralprocess" – man lär sig lite inom ett ämne och förlitar sig på viss "implicit" kunskap från ett annat ämne, detta senare ämnet kan man sedan lära sig ytterligare om på grund av sin nyvunna kunskap ifrån det andra ämnet, osv.

Peikoff talade också om att moral väsentligen är mental, dvs. att vara i fokus, tänka och att använda sitt förnuft till det yttersta för att hålla sig till verkligheten. Att vara i fokus, dvs. att vara redo att göra mentalt arbete, är det främsta kännetecknet hos en moralisk individ.

Gary Hull talade om vikten av metafysiska värdeomdömen. Det är inte helt enkelt att kort här förklara varför de är så viktiga i ens liv. Jag

rekommenderar den som vill veta mer att lyssna på den kassett som finns tillgänglig från Second Renaissance Books istället.

John Ridpath förklarade hur Rosseaus idéer och John Lockes idéer gav upphov till två revolutioner med så extremt olika resultat i Frankrike respektive USA.

Andrew Bernstein talade om flera mindre centrala figurer i *The Fountainhead* och *Atlas Shrugged*: Gus Webb – den moderne vänster-intellektuelle vs. Toohey – gammelvänstermannen, Gordon L. Prescott – hegelianen, Dr. Pritchard, Robert Stadler, Mr. Thompson – den pragmatiske presidenten, m.fl. Bernstein förklarade bl.a. också hur man kan se en människas karaktär på den perceptuella nivån. Dvs. man kan ofta se att en människa har genuin självaktning, att en person är mål-inriktad, värdeinriktad eller om personen saknar dessa egenskaper.

Michael Berliner visade en mängd intressanta foton av Ayn Rand från hennes tid i Ryssland och talade om vad hon gjorde under sin uppväxttid – mycket intressant. Det mesta av detta materialet kommer så småningom att publiceras så att ni andra också får ta del av det!

Konferensen var mycket lyckad. Det fanns dessutom mycket tid att gå ut på Bryssels gator och shoppa choklad och annat, samt att äta utmärkt på Bryssels många fina restauranger. Det blir troligen en ny konferens 1999 någonstans i Europa (kanske London igen) – vi återkommer naturligtvis med mer om detta när vi får besked.

## **Objectivism Through Induction (OTI)**

OTI var en mycket intressant kurs som Peikoff gav under våren (10 ggr samt en extra frågestund i Juni). Kursdeltagare var med på telefon från hela världen och vissa var med via ett videokonferenssystem. Trots vissa tekniska komplikationer gick allt ganska bra. Dr. Peikoff meddelade att han nu har påbörjat en ny bok *Inductive Thinking* som skall komma ut år 2005 – vi får således ha lite tålmod med nästa "stora" bok av intresse för objektivister.

Kursen förmedlade hur man tänker induktivt genom ett antal exempel. Induktion är det enda sättet på vilket man får genuint ny kunskap från verkligheten (fråntaget de axiomatiska begreppen). Induktivt tänkande är således oerhört viktigt om man vill vara oberoende i ens tänkande.

Peikoff diskuterade relationen mellan hans bok *Objectivism: the Philosophy of Ayn Rand* och den kommande boken *Inductive Thinking*:

O:PAR krävde kognition, men den nya boken kräver en *rekonstruktion* av hur man kommer fram till objektivismens idéer; O:PAR är som ett fotografi över en stad, medan den nya boken förklarar "How did you get to the city, how does one reconstruct the city." OTI visade exempel på hur detta senare kan uppnås.

Jag kan inte gå in på detaljer i induktionsprocessen, istället rekommenderar jag intresserade för att delta på den utökade och mer utvecklade OTI-kurs som kommer att ges under år 1999 (en föreläsning varje av årets tolv månader via telefon, m.m.). Jag kan bara skissartat antyda hur induktionsprocessen går till här genom ett av Peikoffs exempel: vad som skulle induceras var principen om förnuftet som människans (främsta) överlevnadsmedel. Peikoff summerade processen så här:

"We need certain physical objects as requirements for survival. We need production for this. We rely on several functions of our minds to produce these things. Thus, reason is man's means of survival." Man utgår ifrån en viss allmän kunskap som "Svensson" besitter – i detta fall en kunskap om att medvetandet är kausalt effektivt (vad vi tänker är viktigt för hur vi handlar) och att förnuftet involverar (och ger upphov till) språk, abstraktioner, långsiktighet och vetenskap. Sedan måste man också integrera nya induktioner med annan relevant kunskap (såsom i detta fall kunskap om hur andra djur överlever).

Andra principer som Peikoff inducerade i kursen var: egoism (människan bör vara självisk), kausalitet (induceras genom perception), dygden att vara rättvis, objektivitet, det godtyckliga som vare sig sant eller falskt, sex som metafysiskt och ondskan i att initiera bruket av fysiskt tvång.

*Jerry Nilson*



# GRUNDERNA FÖR EN KVINNAS ABORTRÄTT

av Jerry Nilson

ENBART OBJEKTIVISTER KAN KONSEKVENT FÖRSVARA en kvinnas rätt att göra abort.

Vänstermänniskor anser att rättigheter är något som inte är grundat i naturen och har därför inget objektiva kriterium att gå efter när de skall definiera en kvinnas aborträtt. De anser också att kollektiv kan ha rättigheter vilket implicerar att kollektivet modern och fostret skulle kunna ha rättigheter gemensamt, dvs. fostret skulle kunna ha rättigheter baserat på dess behov vilka måste tillgodoses av modern eller staten.

Konservativa är oftast för rättigheter för foster, medan liberaler oftast ger pragmatiska försvar för en kvinnas aborträtt. De kan t.ex. tycka synd om en kvinna som blivit våldtagen och kan därför tycka att det är orimligt att vägra kvinnan att göra abort, men de saknar också objektiva argument.

Objektivismen utgår ifrån individen – den separat existerande människan – i sin härledning av rättighetsfilosofin. Människan har rättigheter främst därför att hon besitter en begreppsförmåga. Hon behöver använda denna förmåga för att tillgodose hennes grundläggande behov och det är därför som hon behöver ett skydd från andra människors försök att styra hennes liv mot hennes egna vilja. Rättigheter är alltså något människan behöver ha försvarade i ett samhälle för att hon skall kunna använda sitt förnuft i hennes liv och leva det fullt ut. Människans rättighet till hennes förnuft är inte mycket till "rättighet" om hon inte också har en absolut rätt till sin egna kropp och till produkterna av det arbete hon utför.

Eftersom människan är en integrerad varelse med både kropp och själ är det hela den entitet som hon utgör som är enheten för rättigheter. Individen är det primära rättssubjektet. Ett foster är emellertid inte en separat entitet. Fostret är inget annat än en potentiell människa. Först när barnet föds får det ett "mänskligt liv" – innan hade fostret bara ett liv

såsom en biologisk del av kvinnans kropp. Vid födelsen klipps navelsträngen av och först då har vi en mänsklig varelse som är en separat individ. Först då kan vi tillerkänna barnet rättigheter. Födelsen är den enda objektiva gränsen där rättigheter kan börja tillkomma barnet och döden är den bortre gränsen för rättigheterna.

Människor som på ett eller annat sätt inte kan använda sitt förnuft och/eller kropp tillerkänns ändå rättigheter såsom en människa med eventuell potential till att använda dessa förmågor. I de fall där man vet säkert att en människa aldrig kan komma att ens bli medvetande om något i någon framtid vet jag inte om han bör ha rättigheter. Jag tror dock inte att man kan rättfärdiga att man med nödvändighet måste hålla individen vid liv även om man kanske inte aktivt skall ge personen dödshjälp, förutsatt att han inte tidigare önskat detta.

Att säga att ett foster är en potentiell individ betyder inte annat än vad det betyder att säga att ekollonet är en potentiell ek; att olja är potentiell värme i huset; att 10.000 kronor potentiellt är en dator. En potentialitet är alltså inte det som potentialen är potential till. Endast det som är nu är det som kan ha rättigheter och foster är inte mänskliga individer och har därför inga rättigheter.

Motargument mot detta försvar för kvinnors aborträtt finns ett stort antal av. Religiösa hävdar att livet är Guds skapelse och att man förbryter sig mot Guds plan om man avbryter fostrets väg mot ett mänskligt liv genom att abortera fostret. Sådan mysticism lämnar jag här åt sidan. Ett annat argument består i att det inte finns någon principiell skillnad mellan ett foster och ett nyfött barn: både fostret och barnet har en hjärna, eget blodomlopp, egen uppsättning kromosomer och är båda beroende av sina föräldrar för föda. Det är förvisso sant att somliga aldrig blir oberoende människor. Men människor har rättigheter och man måste bestämma sig för när dessa skall börja gälla. Den objektiva gränsen är den när en människa blir en verkligt perceptuellt separat individ – dvs. vid födelsen.

Ett annat argument för när barn kan tillerkännas rättigheter är det s.k. "viabilitetsargumentet" (livsduglighetsargumentet) – när ett foster kan klara sig utanför livmodern kan fostret vara ett rättssubjekt. Problemet med detta argument är att gränsen för när rättigheter börjar gälla blir flytande och beroende av teknologi. Om man i framtiden kan få ett nyligen befruktat ägg att klara sig och utveckla sig till en fullt fungerande individ,

förlorar kvinnan sin rätt att göra abort. Hur kan några celler ha rättigheter? Argumentet är helt enkelt oväsentligt.

Aborträtten har en moralisk grund som förklarar varför det är så viktigt att värna om denna rättighet. Man måste själv kunna bestämma hur ens egna kropp skall användas om man skall kunna leva sitt liv efter ens egna huvud och uppnå lycka i livet. Om en kvinna tvingas föda ett barn som hon inte önskar sig kan hennes liv bli till ett helvete. Om en kvinna som bär på ett foster blir av med sitt arbete och hennes man ger sig av och lämnar henne ensam, kan kvinnan få det mycket svårt om hon tvingas föda barnet och försörja det. Detta "helvete" är vad abortmotståndarna har att erbjuda kvinnor som inte vill föda de foster de bär på.

Ayn Rand talade om detta i hennes tal 'The Age of Mediocrity':

"[...] parenthood is an enormous responsibility; it is an impossible responsibility for young people who are ambitious and struggling, but poor; particularly if they are intelligent and conscientious enough not to abandon their child on a doorstep nor surrender it to adoption. For such young people, pregnancy is a death sentence: parenthood would force them to give up their future, and condemn them to a life of hopeless drudgery, of slavery to a child's physical and financial needs. The situation of an unwed mother, abandoned by her lover, is even worse. I cannot quite imagine the state of mind of a person who would wish to condemn a fellow human being to such a horror. I cannot project the degree of hatred required to make those women [the so called "Moral Majority" creeps] run around in crusades against abortion."

Nyligen kunde man läsa i tidningarna om hur en 13-årig flicka hade blivit brutalt våldtagen i Irland, där hon inte får lov att göra abort. Myndigheterna hindrar dock inte människor att bege sig till det något mer civiliserade England för att utföra en abort där. Flickan ville förstås göra abort och föräldrarna likaså. Föräldrarna hade dock i TV uttryckt en tvekan inför det rätta i att göra abort och en radikal abortmotståndarorganisation (Youth Defence) hade då uppsökt föräldrarna och erbjudit dem en stor summa pengar om de satte stopp för abortplanerna – de ändrade sig då och vill nu inte gå med på en abort. (Föräldrarna var fattiga och hade lånat pengar ifrån en liga till vilken våldtäktsmannen tillhör.) Här visas klart hur extremt ondskefull den kristna etiken är och varför en

ny etik, objektivismens, är nödvändig om människor skall kunna leva gott och lyckligt.

## Referenser

### **Ayn Rand:**

'The Age of Mediocrity' (Ayn Rand sista tal vid Ford Hall Forum, Boston, 1981), *The Objectivist Forum* (tidskrift redigerad och utgiven av Harry Binswanger 1980-87) – finns tillgänglig i bokform från Second Renaissance Books för \$55 + frakt.

'Of Living Death' (tal vid Ford Hall Forum, 1968), *The Voice of Reason* (New York: New American Library, 1989).

'A Last Survey', *The Ayn Rand Letter* (nyhetsbrev utgivet av Ayn Rand 1971-76, säljs av SRB), vol.4, sid.2-3.

### **Leonard Peikoff:**

*Objectivism: the Philosophy of Ayn Rand* (New York: Dutton, 1991), sid. 357-8.

'Abortion', *The Leonard Peikoff Show* (New Milford: Second Renaissance Books, 1996) – en kassett från Peikoffs radioshow.

**Robert Stubblefield** som ger ut tidskriften *The Intellectual Activist* har skrivit en kort artikel som svar på en läsarfråga: 'Infants, Fetuses and the Right to Life' (TIA, vol.8 nr.1, 1994).

### **Två referenser som jag inte har tagit del av:**

'The Right to Abortion' av Andrew Bernstein (kassett från SRB).

*Doctors of Conscience: the Struggle to Provide Abortion Services Before and After Roe vs. Wade* av Carole Joffe (bok som säljs av SRB).



# WHY RENT CONTROL IS IMMORAL

by Michael S. Berliner

Executive Director, The Ayn Rand Institute

RENT CONTROLS DON'T WORK, and its advocates know it. Rent controls create shortages and decrease the quality of housing. Yet the activists for rent control don't care that it doesn't work. They – and much of the public – think that rent controls are “humanitarian.” After all, isn't the government helping out poor people and keeping them out of the clutches of greedy, gouging landlords? What drives these activists are not issues of practicality but issues of morality. They are possessed by the same moral fervor that still leads leftists to claim that socialism is the best system, despite the collapse of the USSR and all the model socialist economies.

In fact, there is nothing moral about rent controls.

Rent controls violate your rights. They are a gun at your head. As an apartment owner, you have the moral right to decide the price at which you'll offer a unit for rent. The government has no right to dictate to you what rate you can offer. Of course, it has a legal right to do this; it has a legal right to do whatever it can enact into law and get upheld by the courts. But that doesn't make it moral. Slavery was legal at one time, but it was never moral. And rent controls are nothing less than enslavement of the property owner.

In a free society, no government (local, state, or federal) has the right to interfere with the choices of people to do business with each other. It should no more tell a landlord what price to offer than it should tell a prospective tenant how much he can spend on rent. Both the landlord and the tenant have the moral right to “just say no” to the other's offer. That's freedom.

Government is an institution of physical force: police, courts, army. Government has a monopoly on the use of such force: it's the only institution legally empowered to enforce its decisions by the threat of taking your money or putting you behind bars. Rent control is the government putting a gun at the head of people trying to make voluntary contracts with each other. That's why rent controls violate the rights of everyone, not just landlords. It's never “humane” to prevent people from

acting on their own judgments. It's never "humane" to turn people into slaves to someone else's desires.

But from their supposedly high moral plane, the advocates of rent control make a lot of serious charges which do require answers:

**1. "Only the landlord has a choice, because he controls the apartment that the tenant needs and thus he has the tenant over a barrel."**

ANSWER: The tenant controls the rent that the landlord needs; that's always what's involved in a contract: each party has a value the other wants, and they trade their values to mutual advantage. Neither party has a right to the other's values: landlords have no divine right to a customer or to certain levels of rent (they're free to lower their offers or invest their money elsewhere), and tenants have no right to demand housing (they're free to seek alternative housing). Of course, the advocates of rent control recognize the importance of housing (and medicine and food) and thus feel morally justified in forcing people to provide those things to the "needy." But their position is the exact opposite of the moral position. The more valuable and important the product, the more you should be rewarded – not punished – for supplying it! Need is not a claim.

**2. "Human rights are more important than property rights."**

ANSWER: Property rights are human rights, and very basic ones. They are the rights of human beings to use their own property. As Ayn Rand wrote in *Capitalism: the Unknown Ideal*: "Without property rights, no other rights are possible. Since man has to sustain his life by his own effort, the man who has no right to the product of his effort has no means to sustain his life. The man who produces while others dispose of his product, is a slave."

**3. "Rent controls are perfectly legitimate because this is a democracy, and rent controls have been voted in."**

ANSWER: It makes no difference how popular a law is; it can still be a violation of your rights. Just because the majority votes away your property, that doesn't give them a moral right to do so. If a neighbor sneaks into your house and takes some money out of your wallet to help pay his rent, that's theft; well, there's no moral difference if a group of your neighbors get together and vote away your money to help pay their rents; that's merely "legalized theft." If majority rule were the only basis

for deciding what the government can do, then 51% of the people could legitimately vote to enslave or even kill the other 49%. Hitler was voted into office and had great popular support. All tyrannies are wrong, including tyranny by the majority. The voters don't own your life or your property.

#### **4. "Landlords are just being selfish by wanting higher rents."**

ANSWER: Why is it okay for tenants to be selfish by wanting lower rents? In fact, there's nothing wrong with being selfish – rationally selfish. Selfishness means that you live for your own happiness, not that of others. You want the highest rent you can get, and tenants want the best apartment for the least possible rent. Neither party should be altruistic: the landlord shouldn't say "you can have this apartment for less than you're willing to spend," nor should the tenant say "I'll pay you more than you're willing to take, just to make you happy." Being selfish means you don't sacrifice yourself to others or sacrifice others to yourself. It means that you – and everyone – lives independently, trading value for value.

**PROPERTY OWNERS** should not be apologetic for what they do; they should be proud. They should stand up for their right to control their own property. They should reject the claim – inherited from Marxism – that they are "evil exploiters." They should not try to appease their opponents by compromising. It doesn't work; in fact, appeasement of one's enemies just encourages them. "In any collaboration between two men (or two groups) who hold different basic principles," wrote Ayn Rand, "it is the more evil or irrational one who wins." It isn't possible to compromise with people who want to dictate your life. By agreeing to any of their demands, you concede their right to your property and give them a complete victory.

Even the Russians seem to be discovering that an economy run by dictatorial decrees (a "command" economy) destroys freedom. Isn't it about time that our own politicians and tenants learn the same lesson?

©Copyright 1996, The Ayn Rand Institute.

All rights reserved. Reproduction in any form without permission prohibited.

# DICK TRACY – EN KORT INTRODUKTION

av Peter Gustafson

I SLUTET AV 1977 SLUTADE CHESTER GOULD att författa och teckna Dick Tracy efter drygt 46 års oupphörligt arbete med serien. Han berättar att tanken bakom Dick ('Dick', ålderdomligt engelskt slang för detektiv) Tracy var "något i stil med en modern Sherlock Holmes ...", något han lyckats med så bra man kan i en serie. I serien förekommer kriminologiska detaljer och högteknologiska hjälpmedel, exempelvis Tracys armbandsradio. Andra tecknare har fortsatt producera serien efter 1977 och den finns troligtvis än idag. Han efterlämnade sig, vid sin död 1985, en av de mest populära serierna i världen.

Dick Tracys skapare visste tidigt att han ville bli serietecknare. Han föddes med seklet och flyttade vid 21 års ålder från Oklahoma till Chicago för att pröva lyckan som tecknare. Efter tio års ströjobb publicerades serien Dick Tracy i *Detroit Mirror*. Serien fortsatte senare att publiceras i *The Daily News*, en dagstidning på nationell nivå.

Det genomgående temat i Dick Tracy-serien är att brott inte lönar sig, "crime doesn't pay". Serien är medvetet valt svart-vit i två avseenden: dess färgsättning och dess moralsyn. Säkert grundas seriens popularitet i USA på denna syn på moralen. Dess popularitet har gett upphov till Tracy-artiklar i handeln (huvudsakligen leksaker), filmer och radioserier (då radion var huvudmediet).

Främst i seriens persongalleri är naturligtvis Dick Tracy själv (en rättvis civilklädd detektiv med kraftig haka). Hans familj består av fästmon (senare frun), Tess Truehart och adoptivsonen Tracy Jr. Bland skurkarna, som ofta är mycket bisarra, märks Flattop Jones, Flattop Jones Jr och Angeltop (familjen Flattop, alla med en besynnerlig huvudform), Mumbles (nästan omöjlig att förstå), Pruneface (ser ut som ett sviskon). Dessa är all mördare, rånare och i sista fallet även en spion/sabotör. De möter alla sitt rättmätiga öde, ofta i form av en ond, bråd död.

Uppvuxen med serier som prins Valiant, Stålmannen och Tintin, tycker jag att både flertalet av karaktärerna och tecknarstilen är lite för bisarra för min smak. Jämfört med de cyniska moderna s.k. "vuxenserierna" som tecknas idag är den dock en oas av rationalitet med sin kompromisslösa syn på brottslingar. Därför finner jag Dick Tracy underhållande.

# **DICK TRACY: MORALITY IN BLACK AND WHITE**

## An Objectivist Analysis

by Rodney Schroeter

One often remarked-on aspect of Chester Gould's work is his stylistic use of black and white. This refers to his artwork, but it also applies to his view of morality.

My analysis of the "black & white" nature of morality found in Tracy is based on Objectivism, the philosophy originated by Ayn Rand. I am confident in my understanding of Objectivism, but if there are any errors in this article, they are mine alone – if any reader finds such errors, please make them known to me. I am not claiming that Gould was an Objectivist; however, his overall approach to moral matters was one that I, as an Objectivist, am fairly comfortable with.

First, we must define our subject. Morality (or ethics) is a code of values one uses to guide one's thoughts and actions.

Ayn Rand realized that the starting point of a study of morality is not to ask, "What kind of morality is proper?" Rather, it is, "Does man need morality, and if so, why?" But even with this question, other important questions arise, such as: What is man's nature? What is the nature of the world he lives in? And how does he know this?

In other words, ethics is not the beginning. There are two other branches of philosophy – metaphysics and epistemology – upon which ethics depends. Metaphysics is the branch that deals with the nature of existence as such. Epistemology deals with the nature of knowledge, how it is acquired, and validated.

It is metaphysically given that a living thing can die. For a living thing, life is the ultimate value. Just think of any other value, if one has lost one's life. Would it matter to a corpse if it had good food, nice clothes, a warm room to lie in, or fine music playing in the background? No.

Life, the ultimate value, is the standard by which actions are to be judged as good or evil.

An animal is programmed to act to promote its own survival, and the survival of its species. Man has no such programming; he needs to choose to identify that which exists (metaphysics), to discover and validate the means to this knowledge (epistemology), and then – apply these in order to sustain and promote his life (ethics). In metaphysics, Objectivism holds that existence exists, and that it has a certain nature; in epistemology, that reason is the only valid means of obtaining knowledge; in ethics, rational egoism (neither sacrificing oneself to others, nor others to oneself).

Most codes of morality advocate self-sacrifice. But this creates a false and deadly conflict – between the moral and the practical. Consistent, complete self-sacrifice would lead to death. Most people (aside from a few “saints”) choose to be practical – and live – but fail to reject self-sacrifice as an ideal. This leads to various degrees of cynicism, or outright viciousness, in the belief that “It’s either eat or be eaten.”

Productive work is required to sustain human life and is, therefore, considered a virtue by Objectivism. (Note that it is also practical, as all virtues should be.) If a person owns his life, he also has the right to sustain it: the right to produce, and the right to keep that which he has produced. The concept of “rights” is dealt with by a fourth branch of philosophy – politics. As ethics is dependent on the prior two branches, so politics is based on the three branches that precede it. As differences in metaphysics and epistemology will lead to different ethical views, so will different codes of ethics lead to different political systems.

The premise that a person has a right to his own life, the right to sustain his life through productive work, and the right to keep the results of that work, is the basis for the Tracy strip, and a great deal of other popular drama.

The conflict between “good and evil” is between the pro-life and the anti-life; those who hold life as the standard of value and recognize the existence of individual rights, and those who act against their own lives and the lives of others.

The evil, anti-life premises these villains held led to evil actions. The results could have been nothing other than evil; from an evil cause can come only evil effects. This is shown time after time by the terrible deaths these villains, and their victims, meet. Shakey freezing to death; Dr. Plain scorched by his own flame-thrower (remember that closeup of his charred corpse? Ugh!); Jerome Trohs dying of those steam burns. Shudder!

(It's interesting to consider that, of all those protectors of innocent youth in our world, who would demand that newspapers not subject children – or anyone else – to such horrors, some of these same people would eagerly shove photos of rotted stomachs, tumor- encrusted lungs, or abscessed brains into the faces of six-year- olds, hoping to frighten them into refraining from drinking, smoking, or using rusty needles.)

Now, if the evil only destroyed themselves, only violated the rights of other evil people, things would not be so bad. But, as Ayn Rand pointed out, evil is impotent without the good. If it were not for the values produced by the good, the evil would have nothing to take by force. The good has nothing to gain from evil; the evil, however, is like a parasite on the good, and couldn't exist by itself.

It is evil to initiate force against another person, but proper and moral to use the appropriate level of retaliatory force against the attacker. But two problems arise. First, a physically weak person who cannot operate firearms has the same rights as a strong person who is good with guns. Second, if retaliatory force were the responsibility of each citizen, there would be gang warfare, anarchy.

This leads to the need for a police force, backed by objective law; courts to determine what the facts are in complex cases; and a military, to protect the country from aggressors.

Two errors regarding force are common today. The first is equivocating between initiatory force and retaliatory force – to believe that a policeman using force is no better than the criminal he is arresting. The second error is to protest against "violence," in comic strips and in real life, implying that at issue is the form of force being initiated, rather than use of force as such. Non-violent methods of initiating force, such as fraud and censorship laws, are just as evil as violent forms. To condemn Tracy's character because he is as violent as the villains he fights, is to combine these two errors.

The cops who protect the individual rights of the innocent, and capture or neutralize the villains, are the moral good guys. Tracy, and all the cops uncompromisingly dedicated to the principles that a police force properly operate on, are heroic figures.

So we have an absolute demarcation between good and evil, the "black and white." Is there nothing in between? Or, can a person go from one side to another?

Gould populated his strip with various characters who seemed to be neither quite as contemptible as the main villains, but still on the shady side of morality. This does not weaken my view that morality must be judged in terms of absolute principles – rather, it strengthens it.

There were different types of this character. Consider the Summer Sisters, or Charlie Yenom, or the Jenkins kid – the punk who blackmailed Flattop into giving him hush-money, and who drowned with his expensive new skates. This type of person believes he can benefit from the evil. Not by going to extremes and actually becoming evil – oh, no! They think they can make a compromise, or “judge not,” just for a little while, and come out untouched by evil. But this is a false, and therefore destructive, idea. Gould has given us many examples of this kind of person who corrupted himself by deliberately blurring the line between black and white.

Then, there is the villain who realizes that evil leads to destruction, and makes the choice to reform. For this, three things are needed. First, he must face reality and recognize what he has done, renouncing evil and choosing to be virtuous. Second, he must serve whatever punishment he has earned, and make whatever restitutions possible. For a proven murderer, this would not be possible; a life cannot be restored. Otherwise, the third step is to demonstrate over a sufficient time, by words and actions, that he has truly reformed. Steve the Tramp is an example. Contemptible when first introduced, he made a heroic effort to become good. Tracy treated Steve with justice (identified Steve for what he was and acted accordingly) in both situations. When Steve chose evil, Tracy threw him in the slammer. Years later, after Steve’s touching radio speech, where he vowed to go straight, Tracy lent Steve an amount of support that was as strong and as heroic as Steve’s own efforts to choose the good.

Another type of character Gould used was the person who aided the evil through ignorance. Nellie, the little farm girl who assisted 88 Keys, is a memorable example. Infatuated with the piano player, excited by his suave manner but not mature enough to look beyond it, she helps him escape from the law. But when she discovers his true nature, she thinks, “He – he’s a real crook, and I didn’t know it! What can I do?” She is to be applauded for being honest with herself and discarding her illusion. But she makes another mistake, an innocent one. Her “What a fool I’ve been” is misdirected. She attacks herself for not knowing everything – for

making an error. Later, we see the source of that thinking. Her father says something that, unfortunately, many children undoubtedly hear. "Why, it's a wonder you're not in reform school! You – you've disgraced us – that's what you've done." Would it be surprising if a child who heard that enough, were to conclude that morality is beyond his control and cynically stop caring what type of person he is, that he "can't help it," and blindly drift into self-destruction?

Morality is an issue of choice. Choices that are made honestly, with full attention to the facts, are still subject to error. And when an error manifests itself with whatever degree of harm it causes, an honest, moral person takes steps to correct it.

I have briefly indicated what philosophical principles underlie the stylized world of Dick Tracy. For those who are still skeptical about such abstract principles having any practical relationship with real life, I'd like to speculate on what Tracy's world would be like, if it were based on opposite principles.

Tracy is called out on a case. Someone's been murdered. He gives a careless glance at the body and says, "Scum-Bum did it." Sam gapes at him. "But Tracy, how could you know that? You didn't even look at the evidence! What about the facts?" Tracy looks sharply down his nose at Sam. "Facts? Sam, old boy, you're out of touch with the times. We all perceive reality differently, so no one can really know what's a fact and what isn't. In fact, there ain't even any such thing as reality, so reason and logic are an old-fashioned myth. We can't know any facts for certain, so I go purely by instinct, Sam. Instinct! That's the one way of knowing for sure. Let's go!"

Sam, shaking his head, rides along with Tracy to Scum-Bum's place. As Sam is about to knock, Tracy brushes him aside, pulls out his pistol, and empties it through the door. "Tracy!" Sam shouts, after the smoke clears and they knock down the door. "You didn't just get Scum-Bum – look! His wife – his two kids – the dog – ye gods, Tracy! You just slaughtered innocent people!"

"Innocent?" Tracy asks, sneering. "Sam, I'm surprised at you. Don't you know we're all guilty, from the day we were born?"

There's no difference between any of us, no one's better or worse than anyone else. And if these people really are innocent, well, they'll be rewarded in the afterlife. This material, earthly life is not the ultimate

value, you know. And if a few individuals have to be sacrificed for the good of society, in the name of justice, well, they should be glad to make that sacrifice. It's not individuals who matter, Sam, but society as a whole. Remember that."

"Tracy," says Sam, as the two ride back to headquarters, "you mentioned 'justice' a minute ago. Just what do you mean by that?"

Tracy sighs impatiently. "Words mean different things to different people, Sam," he says grumpily. "Justice? It means whatever one wants it to mean. There are no objective definitions. What's justice for me might be an injustice to a crook. Concepts don't refer to anything in reality, so all human knowledge is cut off from reality – and as you know, there is no reality in the first place. Ah, but justice? I interpret that as the fight against evil."

"Oh," says Sam. They ride further. "Then what is evil?"

"Really putting the old grey matter through the ringer tonight, aren't you, Sam?" Tracy says, chuckling. "Evil is a potent force in this world, which exists independently from man. It's just like electricity or sunlight, which you can protect yourself from with rubber gloves or sun-tan lotion. You can protect yourself from evil if you have the right talisman, or know the right incantation. But as I said, Sam, evil is a part of human nature. Man can't do anything about it. It's man's nature to be evil."

Sam shakes his head in disbelief. "But then, Tracy, if that's the case – whew! If that really were true, then what's to stop a person from just giving in, surrendering to that evil, for someone like you becoming as corrupt and evil as any of the so-called crooks we fight?"

Tracy screechingly pulls up to a curb. He reaches in the glove compartment, pulls out a loaded syringe, and plunges it into his arm. His lips pull back as he grins at Sam. "Why, nothing, Sam," he says. He tosses the syringe out the window, reaches in the back seat, and pulls a towel away, revealing piles of bloody paper money. "Nothing at all!"

Tracy's maniacal laughter fills the car.

Fortunately, this is not Tracy's world. Unfortunately, it is descriptive of a huge amount of depraved literature and movies, the result of philosophical principles that are opposites to those in the Tracy strip.

Chester Gould indicated to his readers that moral choices in life are unavoidable. This made some readers uncomfortable. It implied that a person is responsible for his own moral stature, and that moral judgement

is part of that responsibility. But other readers, facing difficult moral battles in real life, welcomed the encouragement offered by Dick Tracy, or any other character who constantly strove to discover the truth and see justice done. In our culture, such encouragement is all too rare.

In 1977, I traveled to Chicago with the hopes of meeting Chester Gould at the Chicago Comicon. He did make an appearance, but left before I was able to meet him.

I will always regret missing him, that day.

At the time, I would not have been able to express my admiration for his work, and the reasons, as well as I could now. I would not have explicitly understood all the reasons myself. I am saying it now, even though Chester Gould can no longer hear it, and hope that sometime in his life, he had heard the main points I have made, in praise of his work.

That would be justice.



This article written by:  
Rodney Schroeter  
Box 37766  
Milwaukee, WI 53237-0766, USA

Copyright 1992 by Rodney Schroeter  
May be copied & distributed, so long as it is kept unchanged & intact.

# IS IT INFATUATION ... OR LOVE ?

*Some thoughts on the psychology  
of romantic love*

av Michael J. Hurd

OBJECTIVISM PROVIDES AN EXCELLENT FOUNDATION for understanding romantic love in psychological terms. It makes the nature of romantic love (and all love) crystal clear: to love is to *value*. It is impossible to divorce the concept of love from the concept of value and then pretend to call it "romantic love".

Love without reference to reason is no less neurotic than any other emotion detached from reality. As John Galt said in *Atlas Shrugged*, "When a man feels fear without reason, you call him to the attention of a psychiatrist; you are not so careful to protect the meaning, the nature and the dignity of love." Romantic love, if it is to be both long-term and fulfilling, must be based upon *known* qualities about the individual's character. In other words, you must be able to see clearly the reasons why you love your partner and why the feelings you are having are not solely ones of infatuation. In the following sections, the issues of both infatuation and the nature of true romantic love will be addressed.

## **Infatuation**

What is infatuation? According to psychiatrist Aaron Beck, "The perspective of infatuated lovers is an idealization, or positive framing, analogous to the negative framing which occurs when love turns to aversion. The positive frame produces an idealized image of the lover that highlights the desirable features and shades the undesirable ones."<sup>1</sup> Infatuation is a form of "selective focus" made possible by an individual's limited (and in some ways superficial) knowledge of the romantic interest.

---

*Michael J. Hurd, Ph.D., is a psychologist in private practice in Bethesda, MD, and Columbia, MD. He holds a doctoral degree in psychology and specializes in the fields of Anxiety, Obsession-Compulsion, Substance Abuse and Family Problems. Dr. Hurd is also a writer with the goal of integrating Objectivist philosophy into psychological theory.*

Despite the fact that infatuation – by itself – is not a sufficient basis for a long-term romantic relationship, it does not mean that such a relationship cannot eventually develop from infatuation. As proof of this, consider the many long-lasting relationships which began as intense infatuations. According to Dr. Beck, "Infatuation serves a crucial role: it forges a powerful bond that spurs a couple to commit themselves to a relationship. ... The gratification a couple experiences by being together, sharing pleasures and problems, offers a strong incentive for forming such a partnership and perpetuating these pleasures."<sup>2</sup>

It is important to stress that infatuation – as I am discussing it here – is *not* the same as evasion. Evasion, in the romantic context, would involve a refusal on the individual's part to consider negative traits in his romantic partner once they became known to him. Infatuation, on the other hand, involves a subconscious tendency to "downplay" the negative traits one suspects to exist in the partner and to "overplay" the positive traits. Infatuation occurs in the context of not yet knowing the character of one's partner. In the psychologically healthy individual, infatuation does not involve a refusal to know one's partner, but rather an honest desire to see the best in someone. Evasion, on the other hand, would have to occur in the context of knowing with certainty that one's partner has certain character traits (dishonesty, maliciousness, etc.) and refusing to pay attention to them.

Infatuation is the *hope* of a romantic relationship; true romantic love – based upon rational values – represents the actualization of such a hope. Infatuation becomes unhealthy only if the individual loses perspective and begins to evade relevant facts about his partner once they become known to him.

## **Infatuation versus romantic love**

The problem of distinguishing between infatuation and genuine romantic love can be especially difficult. Ayn Rand had some fascinating insights on this issue: "It is with a person's sense of life that one falls in love – with that essential sum, that fundamental stand or way of facing existence, which is the essence of a personality. ... It is one's own sense of life that acts as the selector and responds to what it recognizes as one's own basic values in the person of another."<sup>3</sup>

But Rand goes on to point out that a sense of life is by no means a sufficient condition for the highest form of romantic love. "Many errors and tragic disillusionments are possible in this process of emotional recognition, since a sense of life, by itself, is not a reliable cognitive guide ... . Love is *the expression of philosophy* – of a subconscious philosophical sum – and, perhaps, no other aspect of human existence needs the conscious power of philosophy quite so desperately. When that power is called upon to verify and support an emotional appraisal, when love is a conscious integration of reason and emotion, of mind and values, then – and only then – it is the greatest reward of man's life."<sup>4</sup>

This last statement appears consistent with my idea that infatuation is not a sufficient condition for a genuine romantic relationship. In a sense, infatuation might be viewed as one's attraction to another individual's sense of life – as positive, goal-directed, or benevolent, for example. But it is only through a conscious process of character judgment that one can complete the romantic "circle". In other words, one must be willing to consciously integrate the reasons for loving one's partner into one's subconscious, automatized response. If the two are known to conflict, the issue cannot be ignored without potential long-term consequences.

## **The nature of true romantic love**

True romantic love is possible only when each partner has identified his or her personal values and achieved a sense of self-esteem. Self-esteem requires an understanding – at least implicitly – that love requires rationality.

There are many horrible clichés which contribute to the prevalent idea that love and reason are opposites. "Feelings know no reason" and "Love is the answer" are two particularly destructive examples. When taken seriously, or held subconsciously, such ideas can lead to one of the most tragic false alternatives of all: the notion that romanticism and reality are incompatible. Therapy offices (and television talk shows) are littered with individuals who have concluded that romantic love cannot be reconciled with the realities of day-to-day living. Such persons believe that if they are to experience romantic love, they *must* sacrifice friendship and intimacy, on the one hand, or passion and excitement, on the other. Yet such a belief would be impossible without the premise that love is something other than

an integration of conscious character judgment and subconscious evaluation.

To individuals who hold such false alternatives, one of three options are available to them in the area of romantic love: (1) a life of isolation and celibacy; (2) a life of cynical promiscuity and superficiality; or (3) a life of disillusionment and despair, usually in the context of marriage, accompanied by a conviction that one has "settled" and that romance is impossible. Traditionalists bemoan the movement away from celibacy and disillusionment toward promiscuity, while modernists advocate promiscuity as the only logical alternative to what preceded it. Nowhere (except in Objectivism) is the case made for the integration of romantic love and reason.

Attempting to help my patients see that there is an alternative to the dreadful vision of "romance" portrayed on television and movies is perhaps the hardest task I face as a psychotherapist. Why? Because in order to grasp the nature of romantic love – as an integration of conscious character judgment and subconscious sense of life – requires that one *first* accept that there are objective standards by which a potential romantic partner can be judged. The combined forces of mysticism and militant subjectivism which dominate today's establishment have all but succeeded in destroying the hope for romance many individuals might otherwise hold.

Nevertheless, I am happy to report some success in our romance-starved culture. I will provide two case examples. I recently worked with a man who had been frustrated by a series of intense but short-lived romantic relationships. For six months, I consistently challenged his implicit and explicit premises that sexual passion and love are necessarily divorced. In time, he began to acknowledge that he had chosen attractive partners who "looked good" but did not share his basic value system (which, essentially, was quite rational). Once he began to see how this had hurt himself over the long run, it became much easier for him to reject superficiality and instead "hold out" for a partner who was both attractive to him and shared some of his basic values and goals. In fact, the prospect of a sexual encounter – while delayed until he met the appropriate individual – became much more exciting to him.

In another case, I saw an 18-year old male who was literally obsessed with his very troubled girlfriend of four years. Despite her often cruel and

deceptive behavior towards him, he felt somehow "responsible" for her well-being and virtually crazed by the idea that she might someday have sexual intercourse with another man. At one point I asked him, "Does she share your basic value system?" He thought carefully and said, "No. She doesn't. That's the problem, isn't it?" In a later phone contact with his mother (with whom he had given me consent to speak), she told me that my question had really jolted her son and he seemed to be considering seriously breaking off the relationship for the first time. A later session with the young man confirmed this fact.

## Conclusion

Objectivism provides the philosophical basis for understanding romantic love – indeed, all love – as essentially conditional and value-oriented. One task of psychology with respect to romantic love, then, is to help individuals distinguish between infatuation and genuine romantic love. A secondary and related goal of psychologists should be to help individuals challenge their subconscious assumptions that love and reason are incompatible. Only a philosophy which challenges the ancient idea that love is divorced from reason can provide the basis for a proper psychotherapeutic approach.

(A shorter version of this article was first published in *Reality* magazine (May 1993).)

© 1997 Michael J. Hurd

---

### Notes

1. Aaron Beck, *Love Is Never Enough* (Harper Perennial, 1988), p. 42.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 41.
3. Ayn Rand, 'Philosophy and Sense of Life', *The Romantic Manifesto* (New York: New American Library, 1969), pp. 25-33.
4. *Ibid.*

**The Living Resources Newsletter** is published quarterly by Living Resources, Inc., P.O. Box 221, Columbia, MD 21045-0221, USA.  
(1 year: \$12.00, 2 years: \$20.00, 3 years: \$30.00)  
**Phone:** +(301)-654-3939. **E-mail:** MJHurd@aol.com  
**URL:** www.drhurd.com Learn of Hurd's new book *Effective Therapy*.  
**Phone and e-mail consultations** are available at The Living Resources Psychotherapy Center. Call for an appointment.

# NYHETER

## THE AYN RAND INSTITUTE

### IMPACT

ARIs kampanj emot den Clinton-ledda kampanjen för samhällstjänst i USA har varit framgångsrik. Michael Berliner skriver: "It produced the greatest show of publicity for Objectivism since Ayn Rand's death." I samband med "mötet" (The Summit) i Philadelphia 27-28 april, där president Clinton, Hillary, Colin Powell, Bush, Carter, m.fl. deltog, anordnade ARI en studentdemonstration och presskonferens. John Ridpath höll ett tal intill Independence Hall och de blev intervjuade för tidningar, TV och radio. Kampanjen fortsätter och president Clinton sa i radion den 26:e juli: "I want to talk to you today about what we must do to make citizen service a part of every American's life, for his or her entire lifetime ... . We want to spark a renewed sense of obligation, a new sense of duty, and a new season of service all across our nation." (Låter som om det var någon superskurk i någon roman av Ayn Rand som talade ... .)

ARI har startat en ny avdelning på deras www-sidor: Medialink: the Voice for Reason. Där publiceras en mängd artiklar som ARI har skickat ut (och skall skicka ut) till tidningar runt om i USA. Artiklarna är framtagna av objektivisterna under Peter Schwartz ledning och håller en mycket hög kvalitet. David Harrimans artikel 'The Tobacco Gestapo' har (t.ex.) publicerats i 13 dagstidningar (Harriman är den objektivist som redigerat *Journals of Ayn Rand*). URL: [www.aynrand.org/medialink](http://www.aynrand.org/medialink)

We the Living-filmen har för första gången nu visats på en biograf i Ryssland (på Moskvas internationella filmfestival den 24:e juli). Filmen fick ett mycket positivt mottagande av publiken.

ARI dubblar prissummorna i deras essätävling om *The Fountainhead*.

Leonard Peikoffs radioshow 'Philosophy: Who Needs It' fortsätter sändas varje söndag på ett antal kanaler runt om i USA. Några kristna fundamentalister har försökt att bojkotta Peikoff i Arizona, men utan framgång.

I nästa nummer berättar vi om vad nästa års sommarkonferens i USA kommer att bjuda på. ARI skriver i november-numret av *Impact* om konferensen: "Second Renaissance Conferences will present a summer conference, June 28 to July 11, 1998, in Nashua, New Hampshire (44 miles from Boston). One- and two-week attendance options are available. Faculty members include Harry Binswanger, Andrew Bernstein, M. Northrup Buechner, Gary Hull, Edwin A. Locke, John Ridpath, Peter Schwartz, and Mary Ann Sures. For details, write to 130 Federal Road, Suite 56, Danbury, CT 06811 [USA], or call [0091•] 203-791-1755, or e-mail SchwartzSRC@sprintmail.com."

**ARIs adress** (dit ni skickar era bidrag):

4640 Admiralty Way, Suite 406, Marina Del Rey, CA 90 292, USA.

Fax: 0091•310-306-4925. Tel: 0091•310-306-9232.

E-mail: mail@aynrand.org URL: www.aynrand.org

## THE INTELLECTUAL ACTIVIST

Hela fyra nya nummer har utkommit sedan sist. TIA kommer från och med januari månad att utkomma en gång per månad (16 sidor). TIA kommer därför att kosta \$69 per år att prenumerera på (ifrån Sverige). Möjligtvis kommer TIA att säljas som en "web-tidning" också framöver. TIA har en ny informativ hemsida: [www.IntellectualActivist.com](http://www.IntellectualActivist.com) (Adressen till TIA är P.O. Box 262, Lincroft, NJ 07738-0262, USA.

Fax: 0091•732-842-6381, Tel: 0091•732-842-6610, E-mail: [tia@osg.com](mailto:tia@osg.com))

Huvudartikeln i maj-numret (som kom precis efter förra numret av Lyceum var klart) var 'The Cross and the Curve' av Richard Salsman. Det är en analys av den Keynesianska teorin om Phillips-kurvan som är tänkt att visa på motsättningarna mellan full sysselsättning och hög kapitalavkastning (som Marx menade fanns). Mer precist visar kurvan relationerna mellan inflation och arbetslöshet och Salsman visar att det inte finns någon sådan kurva (jag tycker dock det ser ut som en spiral om man följer årsutvecklingen i figuren som Salsman presenterar...).

Nummer 4, juli-numret, innehåller bl.a. en intervju med åklagare Vincent Bugliosi som skrivit en bok *Outrage* om det mycket uppmärksammade Simpson-fallet. (Bugliosi var f.ö. den som satte Charles Manson i fängelse). Richard Salsman intervjuas också i samma nummer där han

kommenterar hur Phillips-kurvan används i dagens politiskt-ekonomiska skeenden.

Mest intressant var att läsa vad Leonard Peikoff talade om på en av hans radioshower. Peikoff visade hur 'Heaven's Gate'-sekten egentligen bara praktiserade vanlig religion. Det var vad som fick dem att begå ett kollektivt självmord, vilket de hade tänkt skulle föra dem till ett dolt UFO bakom kometen Hale-Bopp. Peikoffs slutsats summerar han så här: "The acceptance of faith, of the supernatural, of miracles, of a soul-body clash, and of self-sacrifice – these five ideas essential to every religion killed thirty-nine people last March in Rancho Santa Fe."

September-numret innehåller en kommentar om Kommunistiska Kinas övertagande av den brittiska kronkolonin Hong Kong – 'The Hong Kong Illusion'.

Peikoffs förord till *Journals of Ayn Rand* (red. David Harriman) finns även här att läsa. Peikoff skriver bl.a.: "Ayn Rand's *Journals* – my name for her notes to herself through the decades – is the bulk of her still unpublished work, arranged chronologically. What remains to be published are two lecture courses on writing, presently being edited, and her old film scripts. The *Journals* contains most of AR's notes for her three main novels – along with some early material, some notes made between *The Fountainhead* and *Atlas Shrugged*, and some notes from her final decades. ... The middle section includes a fascinating transitional statement of her ethics, never finished, and also a vigorous essay on why the House Un-American Activities Committee in 1947 did *not* violate the civil rights of the Hollywood Communists. The final section includes the notes for AR's last projected novel, *To Lorne Dieterling*."

Mycket av intresse att läsa i den boken kan jag lova [JN]. Jag var särskilt intresserad av att läsa hennes intervjuer med Robert Oppenheimer inför den planerade filmen 'Top Secret' om atombomben som Rand hade fått i uppdrag av producenten Hal Wallis (som producerade *Casablanca*) att skriva manus till (strax efter kriget). (Med filmen blev det dock inget av, tyvärr.)

Peikoff skriver också: "If the first value of the *Journals* to us is the evidence it furnishes of Ayn Rand's growth, a second value is the evidence that her growth was a product of *thinking* – in the art of which the *Journals* may serve as a textbook. The subtitle of this book really ought to be: How to Answer Your Own Questions."

I årets sista TIA får man ta del av en intervju med mannen bakom dokumentärfilmen om Ayn Rand's liv – Michael Paxton. Filmen – *Ayn Rand: A Sense of Life* – släpps tidigt nästa år av Strand Releasing i USA. Man kunde bara önskat sig att SF tog in den till Sverige, men hoppet står förstas till köpvideo-alternativet om ytterligare ett år eller så. Annars kan man ju alltid åka över till USA och se den på någon biograf som kan tänkas visa den där. Filmen verkar vara mycket välgjord och är över två timmar lång. Berättare är Sharon Gless (från TV-serien *Cagney & Lacey*). Filmen har mottagits varmt på flera filmfestivaler i USA och vissa i Hollywood har begärt specialvisningar av filmen (såsom Sharon Stone).

## THE ASSOCIATION OF OBJECTIVIST BUSINESSMEN

### AOB NEWS

I juli/augusti-numret beskriver Ken West hur byråkraterna inom 'Food and Drug Administration' försöker krossa den amerikanska tobaksindustrin. Bl.a. vill de införa följande regleringar: "Warning labels on cigarette packs will have to take up a minimum of 25% of the package space. Cigarettes will have to be labeled 'nicotine delivery devices', and, of course, be regulated by the FDA. Print advertising of tobacco products would be censored for content. No human or animal figure would be allowed on any tobacco advertising. The FDA would have full authority over the manufacturing of cigarettes and chewing tobacco."

I september/oktober-numret har Henrik Unné fått med en artikel med rubriken 'Karl Marx, the Art of War, and the Swedish Economy'.

Företagaren T.J. Rogers är en av få kapitalister som vågar säga sin mening: "Cypress stands for personal and economic freedom, for free minds and free markets, a position irrevocably in opposition to the immoral attempt by coercive utopians to mandate even more government control over America's economy."

I november/december-numret är det många artiklar angående USAs 'Justice Department' och deras krig mot Bill Gates och Microsoft.

Richard Salsman säger hur man skall stoppa Washingtons "Robber Barons", dvs. byråkratpamparna: "To reduce the role of money in politics, reduce the role of politics in money-making, i.e., in economics."

## SECOND RENAISSANCE BOOKS

Yaron Brook, vice VD på Lyceum International, har gjort en perfekt serie av sju kassetter, *In Defense of Financial Markets*, där han försvarar finansmarknaden. Bl.a. berättar han sanningen om spekulanten Michael Milken och hans framgångsrika affärsidé med att köpa och sälja "junk bonds". Brook lyckas att försvara finansmannens moraliska rätt till profit. Det enda som jag [Martin Lindeskog] har att invända emot är några av hans kommentarer angående teknisk "trading" analys.

*State of the Economy* är en paneldiskussion med John Allison (viktig finansiär för Dr. Peikoffs radio show), Yaron Brook, Richard Salsman och Leonard Peikoff. Det är en mycket underhållande debatt med bl.a. träffsäkra uttalande om Alan Greenspan! De ger mycket intressanta analyser av det ekonomiska läget och de avslutar diskussionen med att ge värdefulla investeringstips.

På kassetten *Triumphs & Tribulations of a Talk Show Host* berättar Leonard Peikoff på ett underhållande sätt om sina observationer när det gäller det viktiga mediainslaget som en "talk show" utgör. Han ger några exempel på olika shower som har varit lyckade och några som har blivit fiaskon. Peikoff har lyckats bemästra den svåra konsten att framföra ett viktigt budskap på ett intelligent och underhållande sätt vilket krävs om man skall få radiolyssnaren att stanna vid radioapparaten!

En mycket efterlängtd bok är *Journals of Ayn Rand*, redigerad av David Harriman och med ett förord av Leonard Peikoff. Lyceums redaktion välkomnar recensioner av boken från vår läsekrets! Boken är på över 700 sidor och innehåller följande delar: *Early Projects*, *The Fountainhead*, *Transition Between Novels*, *Atlas Shrugged* och *Final Years*. Boken är ett måste för den som vill se hur Ayn Rand utvecklades som författarinna och filosof.

Ayn Rands essäer *The Simplest Thing in the World & Romantic Literature* finns nu på CD-skiva. Det är mycket medryckande att lyssna på Ayn Rands karakteristiska stämma när hon läser historien om karaktären Henry D.s kamp att påbörja författandet av en ny bok och vikten av individens viljefrihet. I en intervju beskriver Ayn Rand romantisk realistisk litteratur och dess koppling till Objektivismen på ett informativt sätt.

I Peikoffs Greklandskryss, i somras efter Brysselkonferensen, ingick bl.a. en kort föreläsning om 'Why Ancient Greece is My Favorite Civilization'.

Denna föreläsning finns nu både på vanlig kassett (utan frågestund) och på video (endast amerikanskt format, men med frågestund). Jag [JN] har sett videon och kan rekommendera den starkt även om föreläsningen bara var 30-35 minuter (med frågestund ca. 55 minuter).

**SRB's adress:** 143 West Street, New Milford, CT 06776, USA.

Fax: 0091•860-355-7160. Tel: 0091•860-355-7164.

E-mail: [inquiries@secondrenaissance.com](mailto:inquiries@secondrenaissance.com)

URL: [www.rationalmind.com](http://www.rationalmind.com)

## THE LIVING RESOURCES NEWSLETTER

I nummer 4 skriver Michael Hurd en artikel om ansvar med rubriken 'You are not your brother's keeper'. Bill Clintons 'Servitude Summit' var ett exempel teorin om "brother's keeper". Hurd skriver att: "Any society where the great majority attempt to practice the ethical code of being their brothers' keepers will ultimately develop into two dysfunctional groups: One, a group of people so busy taking care of others that they neglect their own lives and loved ones; second, a group of people eager to capitalize on others' sacrifices by attaining something for nothing. In short: those who make the sacrifices, and those who collect them."

Michael Hurd har nyligen publicerat en bok som heter *Effective Theraphy* (Dunhill Publishing Co., New York). Boken beskrivs som "The indispensable guide for the consumer in search of self-help techniques that really work."

## HOUSTON OBJECTIVISM SOCIETY NEWSLETTER

I juli-numret finns en viktig passage om hur man skall tillämpa Objektivismen: "By uniting consciousness and reality, 'chewing' helps avoid the floating abstractions of rationalism and the concrete-bound mentality of empiricism. Ayn Rand and other Objectivist intellectuals have provided us with a philosophical map. They have identified many truths, as well as the concretes in reality which give rise to those abstract ideas. But this map can only serve as a guide – the journey is one we must each make individually."

## FÖRENINGEN FÖR STUDIUM AV OBJEKTIVISMEN

AERA

Nr. 3, 4 och 5 av *AERA* har nått Lyceums redaktion sedan förra numret. Nummer tre innehåller en artikel av Vegard Martinsen 'Valgets kvalme'. Nummer fyra innehåller en artikel av Vegard Martinsen '*Atlas Shrugged* fyller 40 år' och en artikel av Harald Waage 'Effektiviser oss icke ihjel!'. Nummer fem innehåller en artikel av Vegard Martinsen 'Immanuel Kants innflydelse', som verkar vara intressant läsning (har inte hunnit läsa den).

FSO har nu också en e-mail lista. Se på deras hemsida för ytterligare information: [home.sol.no/joranli/FSO](mailto:home.sol.no/joranli/FSO)

## LYCEUM CONFERENCES

Peikoff vet var han skall spendera alla hjärtans dag (Valentine's Day) nu i februari. Det blir The Pointe Hilton at Tapatio Cliffs i Phoenix, Arizona. Lyceum Conferences bjuder in dig också! "An Objectivist Conference like No Other!" lovar LI. Konferensen 'Love, Romance & Sex – a Valentine's Weekend Getaway' äger rum den 13-16 februari, 1998. Från konferensprogrammet:

"The Weekend begins Friday, February 13, with an intimate reception under the stars on the Falls Terrace, followed by dinner, soft music and dancing.

Saturday morning we will begin with Ellen Kenner's seminar 'Courting Success in Romance' followed by 'Body and Soul: Romantic Love in Sculpture' with Sandra Shaw. We will break for lunch (on your own) and then depart for a trip to Taliesen West, Frank Lloyd Wright's winter home, studio and architectural laboratory – a site which still serves as a living, working, educational facility with an on-site architectural firm. While at Taliesen West we will take a gentle sunset drive across the desert in four-wheel drive jeeps to the banks of the Rio Verde River to enjoy fine dining riverside – under the stars. We will return to The Pointe in the late evening for conversation and continued good times.

On Sunday, after a leisurely breakfast on your own, either in-suite or at the Pointe In Tyme, we reconvene for another session with Ellen and Sandra, the early afternoon is free, allowing you to enjoy good company and the resort's many amenities. Late in the afternoon Leonard Peikoff will host a Q&A on the philosophic side of the weekend topic. Then, dress for dinner – we will be savoring excellent dining at the Different Pointe of View, with a world-renowned wine cellar and spectacular views above the city lights.

On Monday morning Ellen will conclude her seminar, leaving you with ample of time to extend your stay at The Pointe or spend the afternoon exploring the galleries and shops at nearby Old Town in Scottsdale.”

**Kontakta Lyceum Conferences för bokning och annan information:**

2530 Perry Avenue, Suite 300, Bremerton, WA 98310-5219, USA.

Fax: 0091•360-479-4766. Tel: 0091•360-479-4765.

E-mail: [lyceum@ix.netcom.com](mailto:lyceum@ix.netcom.com) URL: [www.lyceumintl.com](http://www.lyceumintl.com)

## Övrigt

◆ **OBS!** Artikeln 'Diversity and Multiculturalism: The New Racism' var skriven av Michael S. Berliner (Executive Director, The Ayn Rand Institute) **tillsammans med** Gary Hull (Adjunct Professor of Philosophy, Whittier College).

◆ Informationspaket ifrån ARI finns nu tillgängliga från FFO. Skicka oss 15 kr för ett paket (eller sätt in pengarna på vårt postgirokonto). Om ni önskar flera paket – kontakta oss först! (Med reservation för att vissa delar av paketet kan ta slut inom kort.)

◆ Lyceums www-sidor finns tillfälligt på ny web-adress:  
[home1.swipnet.se/~w-10005/trader/lyceum.html](http://home1.swipnet.se/~w-10005/trader/lyceum.html)

◆ Dr. Edwin Locke intervjuades av Dr. Ellen Kenner (psykolog) 15/11 i hennes radioshow (Rhode Island, kan höras över Internet med RealAudio

– URL: [www.follow-reason.com](http://www.follow-reason.com)). Locke avslöjade där att han snart kommer med en ny bok. Edwin Locke skrev till Martin Lindeskog: "The working title is: *Prime Movers: The Traits of Great Wealth Creators*. I will not send it to a publisher until it is finished sometime in early spring. I assume it will be sold by SRB if they like it."

◆ Andrew Bernstein berättade för mig [JN] vid Brysselkonferensen om hans nya bok som han planerar skall komma ut år 2000. Det är en introduktion till Objektivismen och det kommer att bli en 200 sidor lång bok.

◆ Objektivisten och musikern Jeff Flaster har spelat in en CD skiva som heter *Still Time – Symphony for Chorus in G*. Det är skönsång av högsta klass med Jennifer Brown, soprano & alto och Jeff Flaster, tenor & bass. Musiken är mycket upplyftande och om du köper den kommer du att få ett perfekt bränsle i vintermörkret! För mer information: Melodic Music™ <http://www.melodic.com> [ML].

◆ Vi har ett begränsat antal böcker till salu (oftast en av varje) av de flesta Ayn Rand böcker och liknande (dock inte Journals of Ayn Rand – vi kan emellertid ta in den om någon önskar det).

## FÖRENINGSPÅSTÄLLNINGAR

◆ FFO kommer att starta någon ny studieverksamhet i januari. Vi har dock inte bestämt vad vi skall studera ännu. Så om du har något förslag är vi intresserade av att höra det!

◆ FFO kommer att konvertera diverse olika videos som ARI lånar ut till objektivistiska studentföreningar i USA. FFO kommer att kunna låna ut dessa videos till andra intresserade. (I alla fall om vi av någon anledning skulle få dem trots allt....)

## I NÄSTA NUMMER:

- Columbus Day:  
A Time to Celebrate  
av Michael S. Berliner
- Troligtvis en bokrecension  
av Erik Emilson
- Ytterligare någon kort artikel  
över någon filosofisk fråga  
av Jerry Nilson
- Eventuellt en artikel om  
arkitektur och estetik
- Nyheter