

M. A.  
T H E S I S

ECONOMIC RELATIONSHIPS IN F. SCOTT  
FITZGERALD'S LIFE AND NOVELS

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE SANTA CATARINA  
DEPARTAMENTO DE LÍNGUA E LITERATURA  
ESTRANGEIRAS.

E C O N O M I C   R E L A T I O N S H I P S  
I N F. S C O T T F I T Z G E R A L D ' S L I F E A N D N O V E L S .

TESE SUBMETIDA À UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE SANTA  
CATARINA PARA A OBTENÇÃO DO GRAU DE MESTRE EM  
L E T R A S .

J O S É   L U I Z   M E U R E R

FLORIANÓPOLIS  
SANTA CATARINA-BRASIL  
MARÇO : 1978

ESTA TESE FOI JULGADA ADEQUADA PARA A OBTENÇÃO DO GRAU DE  
- M E S T R E E M L E T R A S -  
OPÇÃO INGLÊS E LITERATURA CORRESPONDENTE E APROVADA EM  
SUA FORMA FINAL PELO PROGRAMA DE PÓS-GRADUAÇÃO DA UPSC.

*Arnold Selig Gordenstein*

Prof. Arnold Selig Gordenstein, PhD

- Orientador -

*Hilário Inácio Bohn*

Prof. Hilário Inácio Bohn, PhD

- Coordenador de Pós-Graduação em  
Inglês e Lit. Correspondente -

APRESENTADA PERANTE A BANCA EXAMINADORA  
COMPOSTA PELOS PROFESSORES:

*Arnold Selig Gordenstein*

Prof. Arnold Selig Gordenstein, PhD

*John B. Derrick*

Prof. John Bruce Derrick, PhD

*John Rodney Meyer*

Prof. John Rodney Meyer, PhD

À ARLETE TERESA

AGRADECIMENTOS:

À Integradoria e aos professores do Programa de Pós-Graduação em Letras da UFSC, opção Inglês e Literatura Correspondente.

Ao Prof. Dr. Arnold Selig Gordenstein, orientador proficiente que teve sempre uma palavra amiga e incentivadora durante todo o desenvolvimento da presente tese.

A todos que de alguma maneira contribuíram, direta ou indiretamente, para que esta dissertação fosse concluída.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Statement of Purpose . . . . .	1
Review of Criticism . . . . .	3
Economic Relationships in F. Scott Fitzgerald's Life . . . . .	21
Economic Relationships in <u>This Side of Paradise</u> . . . . .	39
Economic Relationships in <u>The Beautiful and Damned</u> . . . . .	51
Economic Relationships in <u>The Great Gatsby</u> . . . . .	65
Economic Relationships in <u>Tender is the Night</u> . . . . .	81
Economic Relationships in <u>The Last Tycoon</u> . . . . .	98
Conclusion . . . . .	111
Bibliography . . . . .	115

## ABSTRACT

Money always played a significant role in F. Scott Fitzgerald's life and in all his literary production. The present dissertation reviews the economic relationships present in this author's life and concentrates on Fitzgerald's and his characters' ambivalences toward having and not having money throughout his five novels: This Side of Paradise (1920), The Beautiful and Damned (1922), The Great Gatsby (1925), Tender is the Night (1934), and The Last Tycoon (1941). Most critics who refer to Fitzgerald's literary works mention his concern with the American rich. None of the critics that I know, however, have done exhaustive research on all the economic implications found in this writer's five novels. This thesis makes an economic interpretation of each novel, separately contrasting these novels and attempting to find Fitzgerald's real attitude toward the poor, who he disapproved of and hated, and especially toward the very rich, whom he paradoxically worshipped and hated at the same time. Though some of Fitzgerald's concepts are constant throughout his five novels--mainly his prejudice against the poor--we can see a chronological progression and a transition in each novel. In the first one, though he already criticizes the bullying attitudes of the rich, Fitzgerald's main attitude seems to be one of awe before them, and his hero believes money would be the key to paradise. At the end of the second novel we still believe Fitzgerald's heroes would have found a world of bliss if money had come at the right time. In the third novel the hero is defeated by the rich and by his own money and the general impression is one of disappointment with the rich. In the fourth novel money is definitely a destructive and evil force and in his last novel Fitzgerald shows his own disappointment toward the spenders of money by changing to another main subject: satisfaction through power, work and art.

## RESUMO

Dinheiro sempre exerceu papel significativo na vida e produção literária de F. Scott Fitzgerald. A presente dissertação revê as relações econômicas presentes na vida deste autor e dá ênfase às ambivalências de Fitzgerald e seus personagens sobre ter ou não ter dinheiro, através de seus cinco romances: This Side of Paradise (1920), The Beautiful and Damned (1922), The Great Gatsby (1925), Tender is the Night (1934), e The Last Tycoon (1941). A maioria dos críticos que se referem aos trabalhos literários de Fitzgerald mencionam sua preocupação com os ricos. Nenhum dos críticos que eu conheço, porém, fez uma pesquisa exaustiva sobre todas as implicações econômicas encontradas nos cinco romances deste escritor. Esta tese faz uma interpretação econômica de cada romance separadamente, contrastando-os, numa tentativa de encontrar a verdadeira atitude de Fitzgerald sobre os pobres, a quem ele desaprovava e odiava, e especialmente sobre os ricos, a quem ele paradoxalmente odiava e adorava ao mesmo tempo. Embora alguns dos conceitos de Fitzgerald sejam constantes nos seus cinco romances, principalmente seu preconceito contra os pobres, pode-se perceber uma progressão cronológica e transição em cada romance. No primeiro, embora Fitzgerald já critique as atitudes dominadoras dos ricos, seu comportamento geral parece ser de temor e adoração perante os mesmos e seu herói crê que o dinheiro seria a chave do paraíso. Ao final do segundo romance, ainda cremos que os heróis de Fitzgerald teriam encontrado um mundo de ventura se o dinheiro lhes tivesse advindo no momento exato. No terceiro romance, o herói é derrotado pelos ricos e pelo seu próprio dinheiro e a impressão geral é de desapontamento com os ricos. No quarto romance, o dinheiro é definitivamente visto como uma força má e destrutiva e, em seu último romance, Fitzgerald mostra seu próprio desapontamento com os ricos gastadores, mudando para um outro assunto principal: satisfação através do poder, do trabalho e da arte.



## STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

After having read three biographies of F. Scott Fitzgerald and more than forty essays on his novels, I have observed that many of these critics suggest that money and the very rich, or the economic theme, is an important nuance in the amalgam of Fitzgerald's themes. Most of these critics, however, do not go beyond hinting at the significance of the economic theme in the novels of this author. In fact, the two or three of them who examine this theme more carefully refer only to the best known novels, The Great Gatsby and Fender is the Night; but even these critics do not examine the economic theme thoroughly.

My purpose in this dissertation is to examine the economic theme present in all the novels of F. Scott Fitzgerald: This Side of Paradise (1920), The Beautiful and Damned (1922), The Great Gatsby (1925), Fender is the Night (1934), and The Last Tycoon (1941). Especially, I intend to examine each one separately and then contrast these novels so that I can conclude exactly what Fitzgerald's attitude toward the very rich and the very poor is. Particular attention will be given to Fitzgerald's conception of the influences of money on people's behavior, the consequences of having much or little money, the complications of differences or similarities between old rich and newly rich, the power people derive from money, legal or illegal money, the importance of spending money with imagination, money as a means to escape reality, and, finally, money and the lack of it as a corrupting and destructive force.

Though Fitzgerald seems to be almost always aware of the seeds of disintegration and tragedy which are growing stronger and stronger under the golden and lusty surface of the 1920's, and though there is very clear evidence that Fitzgerald's novels reflect the American economic history from the boom of the gay 1920's through the bankruptcy, depression and suffering of the

1930's, this thesis will not explore this historical parallel, it will, therefore, be limited to the purposes just stated above.

This dissertation is going to open with a review of what biographers and critics have already said of the economic theme present in Fitzgerald's novels. First I will review three biographies and then a series of essays. Essays on each novel will be grouped together, starting with those on This Side of Paradise. The next step will be the examination of the important economic events of Fitzgerald's life as a man and as a writer. This economic biographical sketch will show why money was so important a theme for Fitzgerald and it will lead me to the discussion of the novels, which will support my final conclusion.

REVIEW OF CRITICISM

The economic facts of Fitzgerald's life found in the three biographies--Andrew Turnbull's Scott Fitzgerald, Arthur Mizener's The Far Side of Paradise, and Kenneth E. Eble's F. Scott Fitzgerald--will not be treated in this review, for nearly all of their information concerning dates, places, the quantities of money earned and spent or owed by Fitzgerald, his way of spending his money, and his dilemma between taking real care of his artistic talent and giving in to the enticement of easy success is included in my chapter entitled "Economic Relationships in Fitzgerald's Life." The interpretation of Fitzgerald's attitudes toward money and the influences of money on his behavior, however, is mostly my own.

Practically nothing is said by Turnbull and Eble about the always-present economic details found in Fitzgerald's novels. Turnbull is not concerned with Fitzgerald's artistic production but with "the glow and pathos of his flamboyant life." And, as the publishers summarize on the back cover of Turnbull's book, he makes us "see and feel why Fitzgerald could accomplish what he did as an artist." Eble's F. Scott Fitzgerald is in fact not a biography; the book goes through Fitzgerald's life and all his works in general, with the emphasis placed upon the short stories. What is a little odd is that although Eble points out the difficulties Fitzgerald frequently had with finances, he does not even refer to the economic implications present in Fitzgerald's novels, to which he dedicates one third of the book. Mizener's biography is by far the best one. But his main emphasis is the portrait of "a highly gifted man who ruined himself by pursuing false ideals, who set out to redeem himself and who almost succeeded when he died."<sup>1</sup> Although Mizener includes in his book very good criticism of Fitzgerald's novels too, he is not inclined to emphasize economic relationships

4

in the novels and there are actually few references to this theme.

In Mizener's criticism of This Side of Paradise the only reference to the economic theme does not go further than mentioning wealth to exemplify Fitzgerald's ability to use his imagination:

On almost the first page of the book the fundamental quality of his imagination appears in the description of Beatrice O'Hara, a description which is alive with the fascination and horror of wealth which Fitzgerald fully realized for our period and which is a permanent part of our American feelings.<sup>2</sup>

When Mizener analyzes The Beautiful and Damned, its economic relationships are approached only three times. First Mizener writes that this novel

. . . reveals with devastating satire a section of American society which has been recognized as an entity--the wealthy, floating population which throngs the restaurants, cabarets, theatres, and hotels of great cities."<sup>3</sup>

Then, commenting on the "atmosphere of failure" conveyed by The Beautiful and Damned, Mizener approaches an event that involves complications with money, but again his emphasis is not on the monetary problem but on the sense of deterioration the scene portrays: "It would be difficult to match the scene in which Anthony, penniless and drunk, tries to borrow money from Maury Noble and Bloeckman." And, finally, criticizing Fitzgerald's inability to provide "an adequate cause for [Anthony's and Gloria's] suffering," Mizener says that

. . . in the end you do not believe they ever were people capable of using well the opportunities for grace and mobility that wealth provides; you believe them only people who wanted luxury and stimulation.<sup>4</sup>

Economic relationships are examined a little more carefully in Mizener's analysis of The Great Gatsby, though he never develops any of his comments. Mizener mentions Nick's learning that "the rich are different from you and me in more than their habituation to the appurtenances of wealth which

gave their lives such a charmed air for the outsider like Gatsby." Reference is also made to the expensive string of pearls that Tom gave Daisy, "a symbol of Daisy's surrender to Tom's world."<sup>5</sup> A pearl is a piece of dirt, originally-- thus suggesting that corruption leads to beauty. This image supports Fitzgerald's notion in his first novel that it is better to be dishonest and rich--like the viscera of an oyster, dirty but valuable--than honest and poor. On the other hand, however, the image of the oyster is contradictory for at times Fitzgerald also thinks that money, the pearl, leads to corruption.

Other comments Mizener makes on the economic relationships in The Great Gatsby involve such themes as: the sophistication and culture and corruption of the East--Tom's and Daisy's world; Gatsby's admiration of Daisy's easiness with wealth; Gatsby's losing Daisy because of his lack of money; and Daisy/Tom's habit of retreating into their money.

With reference to Tender is the Night, Mizener is mainly concerned with the novel's sense of deterioration and "Dick's emotional bankruptcy." This economic word has been used by Fitzgerald himself and in my opinion it suggests his dependence upon financial success, which caused his downfall, as will be shown in the next chapter. Mizener's only reference to economic relationships in Tender is the Night is about the pressure that the "corrupting force of Nicole's money" puts on Dick Diver.

Finally, concerning The Last Tycoon, Mizener's only note which approaches an economic reading is about Stahr:

Stahr is the last of the great paternalistic entrepreneurs, in the last, the most complicated, and the most fantastic of nineteenth-century empires. This was Fitzgerald's deliberate and achieved intention, and in the unfinished part of the book, as Mr. Wilson points out, Stahr was to be defeated primarily by the fact that in the modern kind of capitalism enterprise, with its mechanical structure and its split between the highly organized management of the industry and the highly organized employees,

there was no function for the brilliant individual who controlled everything by intelligence and understanding and "held himself directly responsible to everyone with whom he worked".<sup>6</sup>

It is actually a good comment on Stahr except for the fact that Stahr was not only "the brilliant individual who controlled everything by intelligence and understanding," as Mizener says, but Stahr was also too ambitious for money, control and power, as I will also demonstrate in my chapter about this novel.

As I have already said, with reference to the other criticism of Fitzgerald's works which I could examine, there are very few essays dedicated entirely to the examination of the economic relationships in his novels. I am going to start with James E. Miller, Jr.'s "A Gesture of Indefinite Revolt," which very well serves as an example of the several other essays which also refer to this theme, but only secondarily.

James Miller's article treats the implications of money three times in This Side of Paradise, but the article focuses none of the references made to money in the novel and in Amory Blaine's life. The first reference is found in a quote in the opening paragraph, which says that this novel has no beginning, middle or end in the conventional sense. The part of the quote which refers to "beginning" touches an economic fact of Fitzgerald's life, but it does not go beyond the simple mention of the economic fact: "There's no beginning, except the beginning of Amory Blaine, born healthy, wealthy and extraordinarily good looking. . . ." <sup>7</sup>

Miller's main goal seems to be proving his agreement with Edmund Wilson's statement that This Side of Paradise "is really not about anything; intellectually it amounts to little more than a gesture--a gesture of indefinite revolt."<sup>8</sup> Before entering his main point, Miller discusses and disagrees with Percy Lubbock's theory which says that if the novel's subject is not "expressible in ten words that reveal its unity",<sup>9</sup> the critic can proceed no further. Although the subject of

Fitzgerald's first novel is not reducible to a brief statement, Miller says, one can talk about its form and technique. Then, as he discusses this matter, Miller mentions Fitzgerald's lack of an objective point of view and the second reference to money in the essay appears. Miller affirms that although Fitzgerald does not use an objective point of view, his "moral position" is betrayed by the way he describes Rosalind's "excessively pink and luxurious bedroom and the articles laid out for Rosalind's debut."<sup>10</sup> (Part of Miller's paragraph will be quoted in my chapter about This Side of Paradise to substantiate my proof of Fitzgerald's fondness for money.) Fitzgerald's "moral position" that Miller talks about becomes clearer when he adds that it is also revealed by the attitude of Fitzgerald before Rosalind's turning down Amory because of his shortage of money. "Fitzgerald is so entranced by the beauty and riches he has portrayed," Miller points out again, "that he seems unable to comprehend Rosalind's fundamental selfishness and superficiality."<sup>11</sup> I agree perfectly with Miller that Fitzgerald nearly worships his costly creation, but I cannot totally agree that he is unable to comprehend Rosalind's selfishness and superficiality. The fact is that Fitzgerald accepts Rosalind's point of view and he believes that her behavior toward Amory is c o r r e c t: marrying Amory would mean giving in to his present low economic situation and this would lead to unfulfillment of their dream of a rich life and consequently it would lead to superficiality, mediocrity and unhappiness. So I would say that besides understanding Rosalind, Fitzgerald shares her point of view.

In the last third of his essay Miller finally turns to the argument implicit in the title and he implies that there are many gestures of indefinite revolt throughout the novel. Among them we find Miller's third reference to money. He says that "much of the 'revolt' seems on the periphery rather than at the center of the novel. . . ." <sup>12</sup> And Miller explains that "even in the long monologue in which Amory presents the case

for Socialism to the Capitalist and his Sycophant (Mr. Ferrenby and Garvin are more symbols than characters), it is all on the spur of the moment and the theories which Amory expresses are mixed up in his mind with "the richest man [getting] the most beautiful girl if he wants her."<sup>13</sup>

I agree concerning this state of confusion to which Miller refers. Amory's revolt at the end of the novel is in fact quite indefinite, especially because it contradicts his attitude toward the rich in the beginning and middle of the novel. Previously he had also belonged and he wanted to continue to belong to the same class of those who had the privileges of money, but, at the end, as a consequence of his own impecuniousness, he turns against the class that he had admired and envied. Besides, his "gesture of revolt" is indefinite because we do not know whether his revolt is against the Capitalist or against his own unpleasant economic situation.

Another essay which contains considerations about This Side of Paradise is "F. Scott Fitzgerald" by Edmund Wilson.<sup>14</sup> From this essay James Miller quoted Wilson's statement that this novel is "a gesture of indefinite revolt." Wilson defends the novel's vividness and its "gaiety and color and movement"; he also states that the novel "was well-written--well-written in spite of its illiteracies." But, concerning economic relationships, Wilson's attention is fixed upon the influence the Middle West has on Fitzgerald himself and on his work:

Fitzgerald is as much of the Middle West of large cities and country clubs as Sinclair Lewis is of the Middle West of the prairies and little towns. What we find in him is much what we find in the more prosperous strata of these cities: sensitivity and eagerness for life without a sound base of culture and taste; a structure of millionaire residences, brilliant expensive hotels and exhilarating social activities built not on the eighteenth century but simply on the flat Western land.<sup>15</sup>

Now we have one interesting observation of Wilson's about the way Fitzgerald approaches the East; then Wilson turns to



9

The Beautiful and Darned to exemplify his observation:

. . . When Fitzgerald approaches the East, he brings to it the standards of the wealthy West--the pre-occupation with display, the appetite for visible magnificence and audible jamboree, the vigorous social atmosphere of amiable flappers and youths comparatively untainted as yet by the snobbery of the East. In The Beautiful and Darned, for instance, we feel that he is moving in a vacuum; the characters have no real connection with the background to which they have been assigned. . . . 16

Commenting on The Beautiful and Darned, Wilson makes two more references, though secondary ones, to the economic theme in this novel. The first one is when he is discussing Fitzgerald's intention of writing "a shattering tragedy that should be a hundred-percent meaningless." Referring to the way Fitzgerald destroys his characters, Wilson says of Anthony: "The wealthy Anthony Patch has not only to lose his money but, finding himself unable to make a living, abjectly to succumb to drink and eventually to go insane. But the bitterest moment of the story was to come at the very end, when Anthony was to be wandering the streets of New York in an attempt to borrow some money."<sup>17</sup> I will discuss this passage fully in my chapter about the present novel.

In the end of his essay Wilson says that "wherever [Anthony and Gloria] come in contact with institutions, with the serious life of their time, these are made to appear ridiculous, they are subjects for scorn or mirth."<sup>18</sup> Then Wilson's last reference to money is made, but he simply cites it as one more subject among other subjects "for scorn or mirth," without any further comment: "We see the army, finance and business successively and casually esposed as completely without point or dignity."<sup>19</sup>

Still another article which includes economic comments on The Beautiful and Darned is Paul Rosenfeld's "F. Scott Fitzgerald."<sup>20</sup> While referring to the qualities and flaws of "the author of The Beautiful and Darned," Rosenfeld makes a serious foray into the behavior toward money of the youth

portrayed in the novel. What he affirms could certainly also be applied to the characters of This Side of Paradise and The Great Gatsby, though the essay was written before the latter novel was published. Rosenfeld says:

. . . It is undoubtedly physically impossible for any really nice American girl South or North to respond to the desires of a male who does not make the spiritual gesture paralleling the Woolworth Building's. Through either external persuasion or inherited idealism, and which it is we know not, and undoubtedly it is both, the self-respecting damsels early acquire the conviction that splendidly complete orientation onto the business of material increase is the primary characteristic of maleness, and that any offer of love unaccompanied by the tautness for money is the profoundest of insults to the psyche seated in the tender depths of them. And the strapping, college-bred, Brooks-clad youths no less than they share this beautiful innate belief. They too seem unable to face life without having at the back of them the immense upholstery of wealth. Nothing which they might be or do, were they relieved of the necessity of being a worldly success, appears to them capable of making good to the lady the absence of the fur garment and the foreign roadster, and the presence of inevitable suffering. <sup>21</sup>

I totally agree with the ironic Rosenfeld when he says that "even the lightest, least satirical of Fitzgerald's pages bear testimonial to the prevalence of the condition"<sup>22</sup> just referred to in the previous quotation. It is a pity Rosenfeld does not develop his statement, but his saying that "a moralist could gather evidence for a most terrible condemnation of bourgeois America from the books of this protagonist of youth," is also true.<sup>23</sup>

This last idea recurs in another essay--one of the best ones that approach economic relationships in Fitzgerald's works: Edwin Fussel's "Fitzgerald's Brave New World."<sup>24</sup> Fussel starts his essay saying that "the source of Fitzgerald's excellence is an uncanny ability to juxtapose the sensibilities implied by the phrase 'romantic wonder' with the most conspicuous, as well as the most deeply significant, phenomena of American civilization, and to derive from that juxtaposition

a moral critique of human nature."<sup>25</sup> Later in the essay, Fussel makes clear that Fitzgerald's moral critique is represented by his condemnation of "the plutocratic ambitions of American life and the ruinous price exacted by their lure."<sup>26</sup> As for the juxtaposition of the phrase "romantic wonder" with the "phenomena of American civilization," Fussel says that "Fitzgerald's basic plot is the history of the human imagination in the New World," that is, the United States.<sup>27</sup> The human imagination in the New World, Fussel explains, "shows itself in two predominant patterns, quest and seduction. The quest," he adds, "is the search for romantic wonder (a kind of febrile secular beatitude), in the terms proposed by contemporary America."<sup>28</sup> The main goal of this quest is the search for eternal youth and beauty, and, especially, it is the search for money. Edwin Fussel observes in "Fitzgerald's Brave New World" that Fitzgerald is able to make a parallel between the ecstasy of the old Dutch discoverers and Gatsby's ecstasy before the possibility of accomplishing his dream. Gatsby, and Dick Diver too, are, in Fussel's opinion, America itself and this is the reason why he reads The Great Gatsby and Tender is the Night as history. The American quest, Fussel hints, can be suggested by such phrases as "the American dream" and "the pursuit of happiness." In contemporary America, the world of Gatsby and Diver, the great quest is, in fact, for money, because money is the means to buy "all the magic in the world," including youth, beauty and love.

As for the other pattern in which the human imagination shows itself in the New World, that is, seduction, Fussel says that it represents the capitulation to the terms proposed by contemporary America. He explains: "driven by inner forces that compel him toward the personal realization of romantic wonder, the Fitzgerald hero is [seduced and] betrayed by the materials which the American experience offers as objects and criteria of passion."<sup>29</sup> This way Fussel implies that the Fitzgerald hero represents--as another essayist, John H. Raleigh,

also says of Gatsby-- "the irony of the American history and the corruption of the American dream."<sup>30</sup> Gatsby justifies this assertion for he "is essentially the man of imagination in America" with great capacity for romantic wonder and his dream is a pure dream.<sup>31</sup> But this dream "cannot remain pristine given the materials with which the original impulse toward wonder must invest itself"; and Gatsby's capacity for wonder "is obviously corrupted by the meager and vicious nature of American culture."<sup>32</sup> Fussel hints that the same could be said of Dick Diver, and what Fussel adds about Gatsby could be added about Diver too: "potentially, he constitutes a tentative and limited indictment of [the American culture]; actually, he is that culture's thoroughly appropriate scapegoat and victim."<sup>33</sup> Fussel seems to conclude that Fitzgerald ironically rejects "all that this present generation believes in, the immaturity and its lust for pleasure."<sup>34</sup> I would say that one cannot be so sure about that, for Fitzgerald himself certainly shared, at least for a while, the same belief, as I will demonstrate in this thesis.

"Some Notes on F. Scott Fitzgerald", by Leslie Fiedler,<sup>35</sup> is another essay that grasps two or three serious nuances of the economic theme in Fitzgerald's literary work. This happens in the last of Fiedler's four notes. Fiedler tries to find out what exactly Fitzgerald's theme is. After excluding possibilities like love and religion, Fiedler affirms that there are in Fitzgerald "no gods except the Rich." And he states that the Rich "is the proper subject matter of Fitzgerald: their difference from the rest of us, and the meanings of that difference."<sup>36</sup> However, which differences and meanings these are, Fiedler does not let us know.

Another nuance Fiedler observes is that Fitzgerald turned not to money getters, but to spenders. As a whole this is true, yet one cannot forget that though Gatsby comes near the accomplishment of his dream by extravagantly spending piles of

money, it is its source, the way he earned this same money, that leads to the frustration of his dream. This subject will also be properly discussed in the chapter on The Great Gatsby.

As for Fitzgerald's turning to the rich spenders, Fiedler says that it may have come out of the sense that "among the very rich there might be a perpetual area of freedom, like that in which the artist momentarily feels himself in the instance of creative outpouring."<sup>37</sup> But Fitzgerald came to know that if there was splendor there was also doom surrounding these people, and "in this only sense," Fiedler concludes, "the career of the very rich is like that of the artist."<sup>38</sup>

What Fiedler has interpreted as a search for freedom, Tom Burnam, another essayist, sees as a search for order. The main point of Burnam's essay, entitled "The Eyes of Dr. Eckleburg: A Re-examination of The Great Gatsby," is an attempt to account for the symbolism of matters like "the faded blue eyes of Dr. T. J. Eckleburg", the ash-heap, or Jordan's carelessness with automobiles.<sup>39</sup> Basically, Burnam understands The Great Gatsby is a study of carelessness. As he discusses this theme, Burnam refers--secondarily--to the rich in the novel and to the meaning of money for Fitzgerald himself. First Burnam points out a very obvious thing: "to say that Fitzgerald wanted money, and to stop there," he observes, "seems to me to say nothing."<sup>40</sup> But then Burnam reasonably asks: "What did he, [Fitzgerald], seek that money could, he thought, provide? Or perhaps, more accurately, what did he think the rich possessed, because of their money, that he wanted so badly?"<sup>41</sup> And Burnam himself answers by saying that he believes that Fitzgerald wanted order. To prove his argument Burnam cites the "schedule" which Gatsby, as a boy, "had written in the flyleaf of a cheap western novel." Burnam understands that "the 'schedule' is not so important for what [Gatsby's father] thinks it represents, that his son 'was bound to get ahead'; rather, in its boyish effort to reduce the world to terms of

boundaries, the 'schedule' imposes on the haphazard circumstances of life a purpose and a discipline."<sup>42</sup>

Now, I believe Burnam is right when he affirms that Fitzgerald "attempts in his novel the same sort of thing."<sup>43</sup> But I would ask Burnam this question: If Fitzgerald believed money could bring order, why should most of his rich be unorganized and careless?

It seems one can more easily agree with Fiedler, because if for a while Fitzgerald seems to believe the rich are free and have an orderly life, most of the time his attitude fits Fiedler's thesis: there is also disorder and doom surrounding the rich.

Another essay on The Great Gatsby is "F. Scott Fitzgerald's The Great Gatsby," by John Henry Raleigh, to whom I have already referred. Raleigh, besides Fussel, is among the several critics who--like Andrews Wanning, Lionel Trilling, Marius Bewley, Tom Burnam and Arthur Mizener--have repeated the idea that Gatsby stands for America itself and that the novel represents the irony of the American dream. Few of these critics show exactly what this legend is. As for John Raleigh, he tries to explain it by saying that "at the center of the legend proper there is the relationship between the contradictory impulse of Europe that led to the original settling of America and its subsequent development: mercantilism and idealism."<sup>44</sup> Raleigh explains it further, affirming that "at either end of American history, and all the way through, the two impulses have a way of being both radically exclusive and mutually confusing, the one melting into the other: the human faculty of wonder, on the one hand, and the power and beauty of things, on the other."<sup>45</sup> Later in the essay, Raleigh completes his argument with "the basic thesis of the early Van Wyck Brooks: that America had produced an idealism so impapable that it had lost contact with reality (Gatsby) and a materialism so heavy that it was inhuman (Tom Buchanan)."<sup>46</sup> And, like Edwin Fussel, Raleigh repeats that "the novel as a whole is another turn of the screw on this legend,

with the impossible idealism trying to realize itself, to its utter destruction, in the gross materiality."<sup>47</sup>

The main goal of Raleigh's essay, however, is to discuss Fitzgerald's multiplication of the ironies of the whole legend. Some of these ironies which Raleigh points out are: "that the mercantile Dutchmen should have been seduced into the esthetic; that Gatsby's wondrous aspirations should attach themselves to a Southern belle and that in pursuit of her he should become a gangster's lieutenant"; and "that idealism, beauty, power, money should get all mixed up."<sup>48</sup>

One last economic reality in the novel Raleigh rightly points out again is the fact that Gatsby wants to make the wonder of human life actual, but the material way he tries to do it does not fit the purpose: "It is the same urge that motivates visionaries and prophets," Raleigh says, "the urge to make the facts of life measure up to the splendors of the human imagination, but it is utterly pathetic in Gatsby's case because he is trying to do it so subjectively, and, [this is what interests us], with dollar bills."<sup>49</sup>

One of the few critics who make not only secondary references but discuss--though quite briefly--the economic theme present in Fitzgerald's literary works is D. S. Savage in his essay entitled "The Significance of F. Scott Fitzgerald. Unfortunately, Savage too points out economic characteristics only in The Great Gatsby and Tender is the Night. Basically, he says that "both these novels portray the shining world of the rich, and in each there is a critical exposure of the corrupting influence of money upon human values."<sup>51</sup> Then Savage summarizes the plots of the two novels and he concludes that "Gatsby and Dick Diver, fascinated by wealth (and a woman) venture romantically into the world of the established rich and are destroyed."<sup>52</sup>

One important detail Savage observes in Tender is the Night (I should say that I had felt this in all Fitzgerald's other novels before reading Savage's essay) is that money "is

valued, not for itself, but for the entry it purchases to an earthly paradise of leisure far removed from the stresses of real life: an illusory region of eternal youth." <sup>53</sup>

Savage ends his essay with comments on this interlocking of money with vitality. This idea enters Savage's essay specifically through a quotation from Fitzgerald's biography written by Mizener: "Somewhere very deep in (Fitzgerald's) imagination the complicated tangle of feelings he had about the rich interlocked with his feelings about the delight of vitality and the horror of its exhaustion." <sup>54</sup> This same idea has also been used by most of the essayists who have referred to *Gatsby* as a parody of the American dream.

We have seen that most of the criticism on Fitzgerald's work is about The Great Gatsby and Tender is the Night. I have found, I repeat, very little about the other three novels in terms of economic relationships. This dissertation will try to fill this gap.

This thesis makes an economic interpretation of F. Scott Fitzgerald's life and of each novel, separately contrasting these novels and attempting to find out Fitzgerald's real attitude toward the poor, who he disapproved of and hated, and especially toward the very rich, whom he paradoxically worshipped and hated at the same time. Though some of this writer's concepts are constant throughout his five novels, mainly his prejudice against the poor, we can see a chronological progression and transition amongst the novels. In the two first ones the transition is subtle but it exists: While Amory Blaine, the hero of the first novel, is not allowed to live among the rich because of his total lack of money, Anthony and Gloria Patch, the heroes of the second novel, are just one step from a big inheritance which would definitely open for them the doors of the world of the rich. In This Side of Paradise, the first novel, Fitzgerald's hero's main attitude is one of awe before the rich. Though Amory already criticizes their bullying attitudes, he certainly believes



money would be the key to paradise. In the second novel, The Beautiful and Damned, Fitzgerald's heroes again fear the lack of money and hate the poor like Amory Blaine does. At the end of The Beautiful and Damned we still believe Anthony and Gloria would have found a world of bliss if they had gotten their money at the right time. In The Great Gatsby, the third novel, there is a main turning point: the hero, Jay Gatsby, is defeated by the rich Tom and Daisy Buchanan and by his own money, and the general impression is one of disappointment toward the rich, who had been greatly admired in the two previous novels. Yet, the poor are still looked at with dislike and the novel shows Fitzgerald still believes the poor are totally incapable of responding to the "promises of life," and poverty is seen as an unremitting vice. In the fourth novel, Tender is the Night, money and lack of money play once more a catalytic role. It can be affirmed that this novel reinforces Fitzgerald's attitudes put forth in The Great Gatsby and now money is not only an important means to get to the dreamed paradise but it is definitely an evil and destructive force. Yet, one could not say that Fitzgerald is more anti-money than he is in The Great Gatsby. We cannot be completely sure whether Fitzgerald's disappointment is only against the wealthy in general or against wealth itself, but it seems that he ultimately believes that money is necessary, and if it becomes evil it is because man does not use it with honesty of purpose. In his last novel, The Last Tycoon, Fitzgerald shows his own disappointment toward the spenders of money by changing to another subject: satisfaction through power, work, and art. Money is still important in this novel, but it plays only a secondary role.

Generally speaking, this thesis explores the growing ambivalences toward money in Fitzgerald's novels. In the first two the rich are thought to be the owners of a better seat in life's grandstand. In the third novel this vision starts melting away and in the fourth one it definitely vanishes, for

we realize the rich are nearly as pitiful as the poor. The conclusion is ambiguous but it is quite clear that money itself is not enough to open the doors of the paradise that Amory Blaine, Anthony and Gloria, Gatsby, and other less important characters were looking for. Disappointed with his fake rich Fitzgerald tries to move away from the money theme in his last novel. Altogether the five novels show that for the poor, life is unendurable. For the rich life offers gorgeous promises. In the beginning, that is, in the first novels, Fitzgerald's heroes admire the rich because of their privileged position in this world. But, as the rich's real attitudes are disclosed, we are shown that they are corrupt and even all the money in the world cannot free them from disorder and disaster.

## BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

- <sup>1</sup> Arthur Mizener, The Far Side of Paradise, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, Sentry Edition, 1965), back cover, stated by Malcolm Cowley.
- <sup>2</sup> Ibid., p. 116.
- <sup>3</sup> Ibid., p. 152.
- <sup>4</sup> Ibid., pp. 155, 156.
- <sup>5</sup> Ibid., pp. 188, 189.
- <sup>6</sup> Ibid., pp. 300, 301.
- <sup>7</sup> James E. Miller, Jr., "A Gesture of Indefinite Revolt," Twentieth Century Views: F. Scott Fitzgerald, A Collection of Critical Essays, Arthur Mizener, editor (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1963), p. 86.
- <sup>8</sup> Ibid., p. 87.
- <sup>9</sup> Ibid., p. 87-8.
- <sup>10</sup> Ibid., p. 88.
- <sup>11</sup> Ibid., p. 88.
- <sup>12</sup> Ibid., p. 90.
- <sup>13</sup> Ibid., p. 90.
- <sup>14</sup> Edmund Wilson, "F. Scott Fitzgerald," Twentieth Century Views, pp. 80-5.
- <sup>15</sup> Ibid., p. 82.
- <sup>16</sup> Ibid., p. 82.
- <sup>17</sup> Ibid., p. 83.
- <sup>18</sup> Ibid., p. 84.
- <sup>19</sup> Ibid., p. 84.
- <sup>20</sup> Paul Rosenfeld, "F. Scott Fitzgerald," The Crack Up, Edmund Wilson, editor (New York: New Directions, 1945).
- <sup>21</sup> Ibid., p. 319-20
- <sup>22</sup> Ibid., p. 320
- <sup>23</sup> Ibid., p. 320

24 Edwin Fussel, "Fitzgerald's Brave New World," Twentieth Century Views, pp. 43-56.

25 Ibid., p. 43.

26 Ibid., p. 44.

27 Ibid., p. 43.

28 Ibid., p. 43.

29 Ibid., p. 44.

30 Ibid., p. 99.

31 Ibid., p. 46.

32 Ibid., p. 47.

33 Ibid., p. 47.

34 Ibid., p. 46.

35 Leslie Fiedler, "Some Notes on F. Scott Fitzgerald," Twentieth Century Views, pp. 70-6.

36 Ibid., p. 76.

37 Ibid., p. 76.

38 Ibid., p. 76.

39 Tom Burnam, "The Eyes of Dr. Eckleburg: A Re-examination of The Great Gatsby," Twentieth Century Views, pp. 104-11.

40 Ibid., p. 109.

41 Ibid., p. 109.

42 Ibid., p. 109.

43 Ibid., p. 109.

44 John Henry Raleigh, "F. Scott Fitzgerald's The Great Gatsby," Twentieth Century Views, p. 99.

45 Ibid., p. 99.

46 Ibid., p. 101.

47 Ibid., p. 101.

48 Ibid., p. 102.

49 Ibid., p. 102.

<sup>50</sup> D.S. Savage, "The Significance of F. Scott Fitzgerald," Twentieth Century Views, pp. 146-56.

<sup>51</sup> Ibid., p. 149.

<sup>52</sup> Ibid., p. 150. It is certainly not very important, but while summarizing Gatsby's plot, Savage says that Tom and Daisy conspire to "pin the guilt of the manslaughter of Tom's disreputable mistress on Gatsby, as a result of which he is murdered by the dead woman's husband." An attentive reading of this novel shows--when Nick meets Tom the last time--that Savage has misunderstood this passage, for Tom had not been told that Daisy was at the wheel when the accident occurred.

<sup>53</sup> Ibid., p. 150.

<sup>54</sup> Ibid., p. 150.

## ECONOMIC RELATIONSHIPS IN F. SCOTT FITZGERALD'S LIFE

Since Fitzgerald's first days of childhood in St. Paul, Minnesota--where he was born on September 24, 1895--until his late days in Hollywood--where he died on December 21, 1940--he was constantly wavering between two different economic worlds. At the same time that he lived very close to the rich, Scott Fitzgerald was frequently haunted by the possibility of being forced by a lack of money to live among the poor. At the same time as he hated this second possibility, an uncontrollable ambition to share the privileges of the very rich was mixed with envy and the "smouldering hatred of a peasant" against the same leisure class.<sup>1</sup> The opposing parallels persecuted Fitzgerald his entire life and are possibly responsible for the ambivalences toward money present in his five novels. Comparing the economic implications which occurred in his life to those which are approached in his novels, we observe that most of the time Fitzgerald was translating his own experience into his books. Of course this does not imply that all the reactions his characters go through are his own reactions. In general, however, the transposition of his economic experiences to fictitious heroes is his way of trying to understand possible influences of money in his own life.

For F. Scott Fitzgerald the confrontation with dissimilar economic situations started at home and had its first basis in his parents' economic background and their skill or lack of it to handle economic matters. His mother, Mary McQuillan, was a daughter of the Irish emigrant Philip Francis McQuillan, who had come to America in 1843, and after having been a clerk in a clothing store and then a bookkeeper in a grocery store, had started his own business and managed to achieve a great commercial success. By this time, self-made merchants occupied second place in the scale of social status among the rich,

being surpassed only by "those whose parents had brought something from the East, a vestige of money and culture."<sup>2</sup> When Philip Francis died at the age of 43 his family had already been assured a definite place among the rich merchant class of St. Paul, Minnesota. They were the owners of a million-dollar wholesale grocery business besides a fortune of \$250,000.

Scott Fitzgerald's father's family had not been so lucky. Edward Fitzgerald had been born on a farm in Maryland, which--in spite of its geographical location--"was Southern in its sympathies."<sup>3</sup> Among the few things known about Edward Fitzgerald's parents is that his father died two years after Edward was born and his mother descended from Scotts and Keys, families which had given the colonial legislatures outstanding political figures such as Philip Barton Key, a member of Congress under Jefferson. Francis Scott Key, the composer of the National Anthem, is another important name on Edward's mother's side.

Like Philip Francis, Edward left his family and went to another city to try his own fortune. He worked in Chicago for a short period of time and then moved to St. Paul. By the time of his marriage to Mary (Molly or Mollie) McQuillan, Edward was the owner of a small wicker furniture business. Skill to run his firm, however, was something he lacked and about three years after his marriage his business failed. Scott was a year-and-a-half old then. Turnbull gives us a very neat photograph of Edward Fitzgerald at this phase of his life:

That Edward Fitzgerald had been cut out for failure was not altogether apparent at the time of his marriage. There was an air of distinction about this small, dapper man with the Vandyke, the rich, well-cut clothes, the erect carriage, the leisurely gait, the manner courteous yet not without a twinkle. His looks were fine, almost too fine--like a pencil sharpened to the breaking point. One would never believe that this well-moulded head and delicate, sensitive profile could be a mask for dullness or stupidity.<sup>4</sup>

Like Amory Blaine's father he seemed to have been designed to live in the shadow of his wife. Like Dick Diver's father he was "very much the gentleman, but not much get up and go."<sup>5</sup> As Scott Fitzgerald himself said, his father came from tired, old stock, and still like Gatsby's father, who could take no pride in his own accomplishments but only in those of Jay Gatsby, Edward Fitzgerald was not able to acquire the social status which would gain him the admiration of his descendants.

Young Scott's confrontation with his mother's solid economic position and his father's insolvency planted in his early days the seed which would develop into an insecurity which would last for his lifetime. What strongly contributed to this insecurity was his mother's strangeness of behavior.

"Armory Blaine inherited from his mother every trait, except the stray inexpressible few, that made him worthwhile"; this is the first sentence of This Side of Paradise, and, since Amory most of the time is a portrait of Fitzgerald himself, this opening sentence shows us how strongly he, Fitzgerald, resented his mother's flaws. Her manners could not be admired. "Whatever came into her head," Mizener says one of her relatives remarked, "came right out of her mouth."<sup>6</sup> So, living his early days with a beautifully mannered but professionally incompetent father, and with a mother economically self-sufficient and who loved him to the point of irritating him, and at times made him ashamed of her odd manners, Fitzgerald's sense of insecurity developed into the contradictory way he behaved--as a man and as a writer--when he faced economic concerns.

When Fitzgerald was twelve years old his father was discharged from Procter and Gamble, the company he was working for in Syracuse, New York, and Fitzgerald, who had already learned from his father "the code of the southern gentleman,"<sup>7</sup> was given one more proof of his inability as a money maker. Aside from his incompetency in business, Fitzgerald loved his father's "style and breeding"<sup>8</sup> and was sorry for him. At the



same time Fitzgerald feared poverty and he himself later wrote the reaction he had at that time:

One afternoon the phone rang and my mother answered it. I didn't understand what she said but I felt that disaster had come to us. My mother, a little while before, had given me a quarter to go swimming. I gave the money back to her. I knew something terrible had happened and I thought she could not spare the money now.

Then I began to pray, "Dear God," I prayed, "please don't let us go to the poor house; please don't let us go to the poor house." A little while later my father came home. I had been right. He had lost his job.

That morning he had gone out a comparatively young man, a man full of strength, full of confidence. He came home that evening an old man, a completely broken man. He had lost his essential drive, his immaculateness of purpose. He was a failure to the rest of his days.<sup>9</sup>

The fact that he "didn't understand but felt that disaster had come to" them, and the terms "terrible," "broken man," "failure," "lost his immaculateness of purpose," hint at the importance that achieving material success represented for Fitzgerald since his early days. Notwithstanding, his mother's ability to keep the family solvent--exactly like Amory Blaine's mother--did not represent breeding for him and most of the time he was sorry that his father had to draw on her inherited economic resources. Fitzgerald could never forget, for instance, his mother's saying, "If it wasn't for [father McQuillan] where would we be now?"<sup>10</sup> Fitzgerald also gave us an account of his feelings about his origins, his parents' economic background and what it meant for him:

I am half black Irish and half old American stock with the usual exaggerated ancestral pretensions. The black Irish half of the family had the money and looked down upon the Maryland side of the family who had, and really had, that . . . series of reticences and obligations that go under the poor old shattered word "breeding". . . . So being born in the atmosphere of crack, wise crack and counter crack I developed a two cylinder inferiority complex. So if I were elected King of Scotland tomorrow after graduating from Eton, Magdalene the Guards, with an embryonic

history which tied me to the Plantagenets (sic) I would still be a parvenu. I spent my youth in alternating crawling in front of the kitchen maids and insulting the great.<sup>10</sup>

That Fitzgerald would continue a parvenu is perfectly clear from his own way of behaving and spending his money when it started coming, but we cannot very distinctly see the reasons for his insulting the great, especially when we think that he was ambitious too and craved a position on the greats', the riches' side. One obvious reason is that he resented that the "black Irish half of the family looked down upon the Maryland side" of it. This sole fact, however, could not account for Fitzgerald's wanting to insult the great in general as he implies; after all, Fitzgerald certainly did not fail to understand that his father--the Maryland side of the family--was also to blame for being looked down upon by the Irish side. It seems to me that envy and insecurity explain Fitzgerald's animosity against the rich. Despite the fact that his family lived in the vicinity of the McQuillan "imposing Victorian mansion [which] represented [to Fitzgerald] the solidity and permanence of wealth,"<sup>11</sup> his parents' inheritance was not so solid, for they had to economize so that they could keep the principal of this inheritance untouched. This detail, as Kenneth Eble says, "meant the postures of affluence constantly bowing to the necessities for economy. It meant grave family conferences when Scott was sent to Newman School in New Jersey and later to Princeton."<sup>12</sup> For this reason and because of his father's incompetence already referred to, his parents had been moving from one house to another, each time farther away from the fashionable center of St. Paul, until they finally ended at the end of its best street. Fitzgerald certainly resented this. Even though he did not suffer want at either of the places he studied in, he watched the very rich boys attentively--like Reuben Warner, for instance--driving their own Stutz Bearcats proudly and he understood that his family's economic situation could not allow him such excitements. The

best he could do was to imitate the boys richer than he by sitting in the family car. His family gave him "the money he needed, [but it] was only a fraction of the money he wanted, for he dreamed of splurging like a Renaissance prince."<sup>13</sup>

It is quite clear that Fitzgerald envied the position of the very rich young men; at the same time, he was inclined to insult them because he resented being economically inferior. His reaction was similar to that of Amory Blaine at the end of This Side of Paradise: finding himself impecunious, Amory, who had always pursued a place on the side of those with plenty of money, now turns against them.

But Fitzgerald's hope of achieving social and economic success never died. If we analyze his love affair with Ginevra King and Zelda Sayre we will see that losing the game hurt him deeply and his insecurity and inferiority complex were strengthened. However, instead of turning against the class these girls represented, Fitzgerald set out with all his energies to acquire the position which would guarantee his belonging to the same class they belonged to. To a certain extent, what Fitzgerald himself calls an inferiority complex was then responsible for his pretended sense of superiority which urged him to fall in love with girls economically well supported.

Ginevra King was "a celebrity from Chicago."<sup>14</sup> "Born and brought up in the best circumstances in Chicago and Lake Forest [she] moved for [Fitzgerald] in a golden haze of habit, assumption, gesture, made up of a lifetime of wealth and ease, of social position always taken for granted, of country clubs and proms which she dominated as if such authority were her natural prerogative."<sup>15</sup> For a short while she was the materialization of Fitzgerald's dream, but soon she left him mainly because he lacked a stronger economic situation. Again he was certainly in the mood to insult the great and very eager to overcome his present economic condition. What Fitzgerald said of the hero of "Winter Dreams" can most of the time be

also said of Fitzgerald himself: "He wanted not association with glittering things and glittering people--he wanted the glittering things themselves."<sup>16</sup> What frequently happened to Fitzgerald, however, was that he was even unable to secure his place beside the glittering people and experiences like that with Ginevra King left him only with frustration.

The beginning of his affair with Zelda was nearly a repetition of his case with Ginevra. As time passed Fitzgerald discovered in Zelda qualities which made him sure that her main goal in life was very similar to his own, she was ambitious and wanted to have a lot of money, to be famous and socially prominent. This similarity of purposes is to a great extent responsible for their coming to really love each other. The first great appeal came from her being very popular and from the respectful and solid social and economic position the Sayres had among the citizens of Montgomery, Alabama. Besides this, she came "from distinguished forebears on both sides. Her father's uncle, John Tyler Morgan, had been a general in the Civil War and afterwards one of Alabama's most illustrious senators, while her father, Anthony Dickinson Sayre, was a judge on the Alabama Supreme Court. A Jeffersonian democrat and an idealist, this straitlaced old Roman and pillar of his profession had married Minnie Machen, daughter of a Kentucky senator."<sup>17</sup> Such details certainly had a heavy weight in Fitzgerald's balance and we can only imagine how sorry he was when he lost Zelda: analyzing his own economic situation, he had to agree with her that he was not equipped for achieving the purposes they both had in their minds. Once more lack of money had made him lose his beloved girl and the worst of all was the fact that this time he himself was to blame, for now he was an adult and supposed to support himself.

In a way similar to Gatsby's meeting Daisy, Fitzgerald had met Zelda in the Summer of 1918. He was in the Army and

his military unit waited at Camp Sheridan, near Montgomery, to be called into action. When Fitzgerald was discharged from the Army in February 1919 he went right away to New York to try to make the money he had already understood he would need to be able to marry Zelda. Many times she had questioned "whether he was ever going to make enough money for them to marry and live as she wished to."<sup>18</sup> Since the beginning of their affair Fitzgerald knew that Zelda would always be "cagey about throwing in her lot with him before he was a money-maker,"<sup>19</sup> and identifying himself with her desire for "a luxury and largeness beyond anything her world provided" he set out for the "serious business of making a fortune."<sup>20</sup> His job with Baron Collier advertising agency, which paid him \$90.00 a month, served only to make Zelda's apprehensiveness intolerable and to break off their engagement. Their love, Fitzgerald later wrote in The Crack Up, "was one of those tragic loves-- [like Gatsby's and Daisy's was] --doomed for lack of money, and one day the girl closed it out on the basis of common sense."<sup>21</sup>

This period of his life, I think, was possibly the most important for Fitzgerald as a writer. His failure to make money and consequently his loss of his girl were largely responsible for his decision to be a professional writer. In fact, the final version of This Side of Paradise, his first really serious production as a professional writer, came as a result of his lack of money. The novel came out right after Fitzgerald's job at the advertisement agency proved to be a completely inefficient means to achieve his dream of high social position. "During a long summer of despair," Fitzgerald said, "I wrote a novel instead of letters [to Zelda]."<sup>22</sup> I believe that writing a novel was for Fitzgerald the easiest way out of the circle of failure in which he was enclosed. Of course I do not intend to argue that money was the only reason for his becoming a writer. That would be an impossible task, for it is known that Fitzgerald had at least some of the

characteristics of a serious writer who really believes and loves his work. The problem with him was that before meeting Zelda he had already tried to publish a novel and several short stories, but--except for the few short stories put out by the magazines of the schools where he studied and some plays acted by his hometown clubs--he had always been unsuccessful. When Zelda forced him to feel the strain of his impecuniousness, he left behind his facility with words for a while and tried to solve his monetary problem by other means than writing only. It was his failure at this attempt that helped Fitzgerald reconsider his ability as a writer and find his vocation. He went back to St. Paul and with the belief that writing would bring him social prestige, money and give him back the girl he had lost, he devoted himself entirely to his novel, and this time, as in a fairy tale, he succeeded. This Side of Paradise was accepted on September 16, 1919 and from this date until December he wrote and sold nine short stories to the Saturday Evening Post, Smart Set, and Scribner's Magazine. Altogether he made more than \$300, an amount which would take him nearly one year to earn working at his previous job. As an indication of a new attitude which would follow Fitzgerald for almost his whole life, he spent nearly all this money drinking to celebrate his accomplishment.

By the end of the next year, 1920, Fitzgerald had made \$18,000 more, and if we met him when he returned from Europe in August 1921 with his wife--seeing his success she had reaffirmed her love--we would not believe that he had been unable to pay for a coca-cola shortly before. It seems that his old desire to insult the great, however, was still present in the successful writer. Even after having shared the fascination and glitter of the appurtenances of wealth, he could not forget that "he had been penniless and jilted not long before."<sup>23</sup> He felt that he "would always cherish an abiding distrust, an animosity, toward the leisure class." Fitzgerald later wrote: "In the years since then I have never been able to stop

wondering where my friends' money came from, nor to stop thinking that at one time a sort of droit de seigneur might have been exercised to give one of them my girl."<sup>24</sup> Anyhow, for those who watched Fitzgerald coming back to St. Paul and read the news of his arrival in the local newspapers, he was now a happy, successful and moneyed young author returning home for a period of rest from New York and Europe. This false appearance is in fact explored several times in The Great Gatsby, Tender is the Night and in The Last Tycoon. If the people who watched Fitzgerald returning home could see something else beyond what the thrilling news put forth, they would see that he was neither so happy, nor so successful, nor so moneyed as he appeared to be. After a period of indescribable excitement spending all the money that he and Zelda had ever dreamed of, they were now somewhat lost. The period between This Side of Paradise and The Beautiful and Damned "was almost as self-destructive as that of Anthony Patch and Gloria in the novel."<sup>25</sup> Fitzgerald's and Zelda's recklessness and carelessness extorted a considerable slice of their youth. They went to St. Paul because they were tired of the whirl of wild parties, they needed a more solid footing, peace for Zelda's pregnancy, and a quieter place for Fitzgerald's work. For Fitzgerald, it seems to me, this return was something similar to Nick Carraway's going back west.

Besides, Fitzgerald and Zelda had spent too much money: he owed \$1,600 in December 1920 despite the substantial amount that he had made that year. As a matter of fact, spending too much money became a life-long cause of disturbance and distress for Fitzgerald. As Eble very well puts it, "debts harassed him, drove him to work, aggravated the feeling between Zelda's (and his) immediate desires and his dream of being a great writer. [But] almost always, at least until the mid-1930's, money would arrive in time."<sup>26</sup>

If the Fitzgeralds had a peaceful life in St. Paul, it lasted for fourteen months only; in October 1922 they moved

again to a rented house in Great Neck, New York, and the party started again. Fitzgerald's average income from 1920 through 1926--until 1925 he had published three novels and three volumes of short stories--was \$22,000 a year, a quantity of money certainly more than sufficient to support him and his wife. But "paradoxically as it may sound, Fitzgerald did not care enough about money ever to manage it in a businesslike way. What he did care for was the vision of the good life which he had come to feel was, at least in America, open only to those who command the appurtenances of wealth."<sup>27</sup> This way he spent all the money earned and recurrently the money he had not earned yet. For the rest of his life he tried to overcome this problem but was never able to. As an example we can cite Fitzgerald's deep amazement when, while writing The Great Gatsby, he found himself \$5,000 in debt. He put his novel aside for a while and "set to work to write himself out of his financial plight."<sup>28</sup> This was in November, 1923; by April, 1924, he had written eleven short stories and his wallet was awarded over \$17,000, and he could return to his novel. But then money continued flowing like water through his and Zelda's fingers and in May of the same year they decided to go abroad again because their life was economically and socially impossible in New York. This time they intended to live in France "on practically nothing a year" and "to find a new rhythm for our lives, with a true conviction that we had left our old selves behind forever--and with a capital of just over seven thousand dollars."<sup>29</sup> Fitzgerald was able to finish The Great Gatsby--it was published on April 10, 1925--but when they returned to the United States two and a half years later, at the end of 1926, Fitzgerald knew he had not accomplished what they had intended to. Dissatisfied with the low sale of The Great Gatsby they had gone through what Fitzgerald himself called a "1000 parties and no work," and during 1926 he published only seven stories and two articles. They were back home with the same old problem: no money left and wanting to



settle down quietly for a while. The desired quietude never came and as the years passed Fitzgerald's affair of writing himself out of debts became more and more pressing, for each year the debts were bigger. When for the third time he went to Hollywood, in 1937, mainly to solve his economic deficit and he signed a contract with Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer at \$1,000 a week, his debts, according to Fitzgerald's own estimate, were around \$40,000.

Such problems certainly forced the serious writer and the artist who existed in Fitzgerald to bow before the financial muse and, as he had to write what he called "trash," he watched a constant battle going on in his own self. He felt a disturbing sense of guilt as he watched himself writing short stories of little or no value, at the sacrifice of his novels especially, to cope with his debts. At the same time, however, he never stopped enjoying the expensive things of life which meant spending more and more of the money that "trash" gave him. Fitzgerald himself said that he distrusted the rich but for most of his days since This Side of Paradise until The Last Tycoon he worked "for money with which to share their mobility and the grace that some of them brought into their lives."<sup>30</sup>

Together with the desire for money and an outstanding social position, Fitzgerald always dreamed of being a great writer. Nobody can deny that with The Great Gatsby and Tender is the Night he did not make his dream come true. However, he could have produced much more if he were not most of the time under the hand of the man who wanted to enjoy life. As the great writer was frequently defeated--the man who wanted to enjoy life forced him to get the money to pay for the party--Fitzgerald became each day a man more divided and his way out of this situation was through drinking and spending more and more money, a situation very similar to that of Anthony Patch in The Beautiful and Damned. "I was a man divided," Fitzgerald said himself, "[Zelda] wanted me to work too much for her and

not enough for my dream."<sup>31</sup> Zelda was certainly not to blame alone and Fitzgerald was escaping reality. If when his money was spent he felt "so damned tired of living up to [his] income," he himself was to blame because, like the great psychiatrist in Dick Diver, the great writer in Fitzgerald was sacrificed to the bon vivant who existed in his divided self.

It is not my purpose to analyze which of Fitzgerald's works are literarily good and which could be considered "trash," but I would say that not only his less valuable works are largely a product of his need or craving for money. Without any restrictions to his recognized qualities as a writer, I understand that money was what more strongly moved him to produce any literature, good or bad. Of course Fitzgerald resented being paid more money for stories he himself thought were not good than for those he thought were good ones. What he wrote to Ober, one of his literary agents in New York, at the very beginning of his career, serves as an instance: "I am rather discouraged that a cheap story like "The Popular Girl" written in one week while the baby was being born brings \$1500.00 & a genuinely imaginative thing into which I put three weeks real enthusiasm like "The Diamond in The Sky" [The Diamond as Big as the Ritz] brings not a thing."<sup>32</sup> It is quite clear that this situation stimulated and helped him to be "a mediocre care-taker of most things left in his hands, even his talent" and from such carelessness his sense of guilt was derived. It does not mean, however, that when he wrote first rate work this work came only from his big enthusiasm as a writer without any strong intention of getting money for that work. "By God and Lorimer," Fitzgerald pointed out at the end of the letter to Ober, "I'm going to make a fortune yet."<sup>32</sup>

The present argument can be further substantiated if we think of the conditions in which Fitzgerald started his last serious piece of literature, The Last Tycoon. From what he wrote to his daughter he was apparently not thinking of money:

"Look! I have begun to write something that is maybe great and I am going to be absorbed in it for four or six months. It may not make us a cent but it will pay expenses and it is the first labor of love I've undertaken since . . ."<sup>33</sup> It must be made clear that there is no doubt about the praiseworthiness of Fitzgerald's self-reliant enterprise, but we cannot forget that he was actually not intending to write something great for the simple love of art. He had had this novel in the back of his mind since 1931 when he first met Irving Thalberg, the production chief of MGM with a salary of \$400,000, from whom Fitzgerald drew most of Stahr's characteristics. However, Fitzgerald only decided to start the novel in September 1939 when "Littauer at 'Collier's' expressed a real interest in it. Littauer agreed to pay \$25,000 or \$30,000 to the serial rights to this novel if Fitzgerald would submit fifteen thousand words and an outline that they liked." This arrangement was certainly greatly responsible for making him "go to work with the old enthusiasm making notes and arranging the impressions of Hollywood."<sup>34</sup> So anxious was Fitzgerald to get the money that by November he sent "one installment instead of the two Littauer had asked for" and when Littauer refused to advance money "until further development of [the] story" Fitzgerald became so impatient that he decided to deal with another magazine, the Saturday Evening Post, again without success.

Except for Fitzgerald's last years as a writer we cannot say that his economic situation was ever very high or very low for long periods. If he got a substantial amount of money one day, he could have spent it all by the next day. Anyhow if we think of his economic situation just while he was writing The Great Gatsby, Tender is the Night and The Last Tycoon, his best novels, we could say that in general--not as a rule--although he wrote less he wrote better while he had little money. This Side of Paradise should not be considered because Fitzgerald was somehow still learning his "business." In spite of his need of money, it seems that at these periods of low

finances the good writer who existed in Fitzgerald was allowed--out of a sense of guilt--to do his best. This sense of guilt, I repeat, did not come from his profligacy, but it came from the fact that Fitzgerald understood he had wasted too much of his talent writing second-rate literature, and then, at the same time as he wrote for more money, he tried to write something which lifted his morale and really deserved that money.

Like Gatsby, Fitzgerald wanted to give his life a touch of grandeur through spending money. Like Stahr, he wanted to give his life this touch of grandeur through work. However, he was careless with his work and with his money many times and instead of leading a life like that of Gatsby and Stahr, his days became more similar to those of Anthony Patch and Dick Diver, who drank too much and was not able to organize his work. The same time as Fitzgerald drank to celebrate his success he drank to escape low finances and to get out of a highly organized life which included financial and personal responsibility.<sup>35</sup>

## BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

- <sup>1</sup> F. Scott Fitzgerald, The Crack Up (Aylesbury, Bucks.: Hazell Watson & Viney Ltd., 1974), p. 47.
- <sup>2</sup> Arthur Mizener, The Far Side of Paradise (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, Sentry Edition, 1965), p. 14.
- <sup>3</sup> Andrew Turnbull, Scott Fitzgerald (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1962), p. 6.
- <sup>4</sup> Ibid., p. 6.
- <sup>5</sup> F. Scott Fitzgerald, Tender is the Night (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1962), p. 204.
- <sup>6</sup> Mizener, op. cit., p. 2.
- <sup>7</sup> Ibid., p. 11.
- <sup>8</sup> Turnbull, op. cit., p. 17.
- <sup>9</sup> Ibid., pp. 16-17.
- <sup>10</sup> Mizener, op. cit., p. 16.
- <sup>11</sup> Ibid., p. 2.
- <sup>12</sup> Kenneth E. Eble, F. Scott Fitzgerald (New Haven, Conn.: Twayne Publishers, Inc., 1963), p. 19.
- <sup>13</sup> Turnbull, op. cit., p. 97.
- <sup>14</sup> Mizener, op. cit., p. 49.
- <sup>15</sup> Ibid., p. 51.
- <sup>16</sup> F. Scott Fitzgerald, Bernice Bobs Her Hair and Other Stories (Great Britain: Penguin Books, C. Nicholls & Company Ltd., 1974), p. 35.
- <sup>17</sup> Turnbull, op. cit., p. 84.
- <sup>18</sup> Mizener, op. cit., p. 85.
- <sup>19</sup> Ibid., p. 83.
- <sup>20</sup> Ibid., p. 86.
- <sup>21</sup> Fitzgerald, The Crack Up, p. 47.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid.

<sup>23</sup> Malcolm Cowley, "Third Act and Epilogue," Twentieth Century Views: F. Scott Fitzgerald, a Collection of Critical Essays, ed. Arthur Mizener (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963), p. 65.

<sup>24</sup> Fitzgerald, The Crack Up, p. 47.

<sup>25</sup> Eble, op. cit., p. 69.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid., p. 69.

<sup>27</sup> Mizener, op. cit., p. 140.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid., p. 171.

<sup>29</sup> Ibid., p. 175.

<sup>30</sup> Fitzgerald, The Crack Up, p. 48.

<sup>31</sup> Mizener, op. cit., p. 134.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid., p. 102.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid., p. 324.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid., p. 323.

<sup>35</sup> Money had an amazing importance in Fitzgerald's life. It is known that the relationship between the monetary complex and the human being is nowadays one of the most significant focuses of the modern psychoanalytic theory. I do not intend to enter this field at all, nevertheless, I cannot avoid saying that Fitzgerald's fixation on money is somehow similar to the infantile impulse to admire and play with the feces. In fact, some of Fitzgerald's characters--Nick Carraway and Gatsby especially--seem to go through the same process. At their first contact with money they see it as something wonderful, as a kind of very important extension of their own being. As time passes and they understand that money is not what they first thought it was, they feel disappointed and again they behave similarly to a child when he understands what feces are. The difference between this kind of behaviour in Fitzgerald and in a child is that in Fitzgerald's case it is cyclic. For his entire existence as a writer he repeated the process of making a lot of money, playing with it and spending it all quite innocently and then understanding that the same money had been quite harmful to his career as a great writer. But when he had spent it all and had to face the hardness of lack of money, Fitzgerald would once more set out to make money and once more he would go through the same process.

·ECONOMIC RELATIONSHIPS IN THIS SIDE OF PARADISE

When This Side of Paradise was first published, F. Scott Fitzgerald was only twenty-three years old, the same age as his hero Amory Blaine. The novel is nearly an accurate account of the author's real life. A careful examination and analysis of all the references to money in This Side of Paradise has shown that, on the one hand, Fitzgerald, through Amory Blaine, wavers between admiring the power of money and craving a privileged economic position, and, on the other hand, he protests against the ill use of the power which money gives rich people; in the novel, Amory Blaine wavers between hating poverty and fearing being poor himself.

There are many passages in This Side of Paradise that support the theory of Amory's large admiration and craving for material wealth. He himself says that "money isn't the only stimulus that brings out the best that's in man," and he understands that "the idea that to make a man work" it is necessary "to hold money in front of his eyes is a growth (sic), not an axiom."<sup>1</sup> Honor, Amory says, is a better stimulus. He yields, however, to the idea that for this new generation, "dedicated more than the last to the worship of success,"<sup>2</sup> it seems ultimately that many a time the greatest honor is to build up the greatest amount of money. In fact, "almost all normal people want to be rich." It is a "very natural, healthy desire."<sup>3</sup> Amory Blaine is part of this generation.

In such an environment, Amory dreams of "secret cafés where ivory women delve in romantic mysteries with diplomats and soldiers of fortune."<sup>4</sup> This is an environment where money is what really counts, where boys drive "alluring Stutzes" and successful girls also have cars of their own.

Amory's parents' marriage was partly an immediate consequence of Stephen Blaine--his father--growing "wealthy at thirty through the death of two elder brothers, successful Chicago brokers."<sup>5</sup> But Stephen is not able to manage his substantial fortune and it decreases. After Stephen's funeral, Amory discovers that his family had been using his mother's money. Economically Amory's father is a failure and this is the reason why Amory cannot respect him. According to Andrew Turnbull, there is a passage in an early draft of This Side of Paradise where Fitzgerald's hero "tells neighbors that he was discovered on the doorsteps with a label designating him the descendant of Stuart kings."<sup>6</sup> In the short story "Absolution" the boy accuses himself of believing he was not his parents' child, and Jay Gatsby springs "from his Platonic conception of himself."<sup>7</sup> Thus, to a certain extent, Amory Blaine, or Fitzgerald himself, rejects his parents. Amory loves neither his father nor his mother, but there is a detail which causes him to respect her: she is able to run the family and keep it solvent.

Amory's and his contemporaries' eager desire for riches can be pointed out in details such as when Amory and a group of classmates leave Princeton during vacation and play a comedy "to the fashionable," not to people in general, of eight cities; or when they take some days off at the beach and they want to "try the best hotel first"; or when they leave a restaurant without paying the entire bill and as one of the group fears the owner could come after them another of the group answers: "for a minute he'll think we're the proprietor's sons or something."<sup>8</sup> That is, if they had money they would not have trouble, even acting wrongly. The milieu Amory lives in nearly forces him to a passion for money, which comes to be the ruling passion of his life. As John Aldridge said, "wealth for Amory is the gateway to the paradise of his fancy."<sup>9</sup>



The opening stage directions for the Rosalind-Amory meeting scene is one of the clearest examples of Fitzgerald's own fondness for money and his attraction toward the fabulously rich. After describing Rosalind's pink and cream bedroom with all its luxurious and expensive articles and after enumerating dresses begging description, lingeries and other items, Fitzgerald says: "One would enjoy seeing the bill called forth by the finery displayed and one is possessed by a desire to see the princess for whose benefit--"<sup>10</sup> a maid appears and the sentence is broken off. The author is ecstatic before the beauty provided by money. And, as James E. Miller, Jr. said, "Fitzgerald obviously expects the reader to be as awed as he by the expensive scene which he has painted. He seems to expect the material wealth displayed to suffice for the reader to invest the character, not even introduced yet, with intensive interest and glamour. He does indeed seem blinded by the glitter of his own costly creation."<sup>11</sup>

Fitzgerald's admiration for money goes to the point where he seems to approve of Rosalind's and her mother's attitude toward Amory. Fitzgerald says of Rosalind that she "isn't spoiled in her fundamental honesty" and in her "endless faith in the inexhaustibility of romance."<sup>12</sup> The fact that Rosalind turns down Amory just because of his lack of money sounds perfectly reasonable to Fitzgerald.

Amory "dreams of becoming suddenly rich" and having a "background," like Dawson Ryder, the rich boy who marries Rosalind. Although Amory apparently rejects Rosalind's idea that his marriage to her would be a failure, Fitzgerald certainly agrees with Rosalind when she says that marrying Amory she would be "shut away from the trees, and flowers, cooped up in a little flat, waiting for" him.<sup>13</sup> Fitzgerald refers to the attitude of Alec, Rosalind's brother, and he says that in Alec's neutral attitude he believes "that the marriage would make Amory mediocre and Rosalind miserable, but he feels a great sympathy for both of them."<sup>14</sup> Isn't this sympathy

toward their faith in the "inexhaustibility of romance" floating in an ocean of money? And aren't the terms "miserable" and "mediocre" related to the lack of money?

Amory Blaine's admiration for money and rich people, however, is not steady. When he stands closer to reality he seems to believe that money, in a way, destroys man's control of his own will. Simultaneously with his fondness for money he fears the consequences of having it. Discussing with his Princeton friend Thomas P. D'Invilliers, Amory tells him, "Good Lord, Tom, you used to stand out against people. Success has completely conventionalized you."<sup>15</sup> The term success does not imply only material wealth in College life, but in Amory's adult life success is going to stand mostly for the amount of money one has got. Amory perceives Tom has changed because of his success: it has acted upon his will and "conventionalized" him.

Money acts upon Rosalind's will like it acts upon Daisy's in The Great Gatsby. Both of them want to live in an island of money and this prevents them from marrying the men they actually love. And Amory, also influenced by the surrounding world of money, "can't decide whether to cultivate [his] mind and be a great dramatist, or to thumb [his] nose at the Golden Treasury and be a Princeton slicker,"<sup>16</sup> ready to make a lot of money out of his writings. Certainly money would never let Fitzgerald himself decide that his entire life.

Fitzgerald's hero's ambiguous attitude toward money does not stop with his regretting its interference with man's will. He goes further and protests against the abuses of power drawn from money. Referring to publishers, for instance, he says that "any rich, unprogressive old party with that particularly grasping, acquisitive form of mentality known as financial genius can own a paper that is the intellectual meat and drink of thousands of tired, hurried men."<sup>17</sup> At the same time as he protests against the "fact that capital controls printing," he strongly criticises and dislikes the social system "where

the richest man gets the most beautiful girl if he wants her, where the artist without an income has to sell his talent to a button manufacturer."<sup>18</sup>

It is interesting to observe how suddenly Fitzgerald's former admiration of rich people has changed to this harsh criticism and disapproval of their bullying attitudes. Through Amory Blaine he says, "you people never make concessions . . . your class; the class I belonged to until recently; those who by inheritance or brains or dishonesty, have become the moneyed class . . ."<sup>19</sup> Because Amory does not have money of his own at present he feels sick of a system where capital is what commands. Possibly these opinions are a result of Fitzgerald's intellectual ripening process.

At least for a while Amory believes that where there is a lot of money there is also corruption. Talking about what he and his close friends will do after the war finishes, he says in a letter to Tom that Alec can go into the Zinc Company or whatever it is that his people own; then, as Alec tells him it is a brass company, he simply replies that it does not matter, for "there's probably as much corruption in zinc-made money as brass-made money."<sup>20</sup> The tone, however, is not wholly serious and it seems that Fitzgerald is not very much concerned with criticizing honest or dishonest money. What he cannot stand is the exploitation, the utilization of another person for selfish purposes which is the main sin of those who control things and people through money. As an example we could refer back to Fitzgerald's hero's criticism of publishers. Another example is Amory's quitting his advertising job and claiming, "I was rottenly underpaid."<sup>21</sup> Still another minor example is the scene at a restaurant when the waiter brings them the bill and someone in Amory's group says, "rotten overcharge."<sup>22</sup>

Seeing no short-term solution for such a problem, Amory complains disgustedly: "these quarter-educated men [with money and political power [don't think uneducated people should be

highly paid, but they don't see that if they don't pay the uneducated people their children are going to be uneducated too, and we are going round and round in a circle." <sup>23</sup> The rich do not want things changed: poor people will never improve and the rich will always be richer. Amory Blaine says that everyone should have an equal start at least. That is, the "financial geniuses" should stop interfering with other people's opportunities for success, and especially the rich should stop using their "acquisitive form of mentality" to interfere with and corrupt other people's opinions. Amory states that "for two cents the voter, [the common news reader], buys his politics, prejudices and philosophy." <sup>24</sup> Amory implies that unfortunately people do not know that such cheap merchandise is highly expensive for them: they are cheaply buying their part of corruption and alienation. Of course the blame is not on those who buy but on those who sell.

Being himself tortured by the lack of money, it is quite natural that Amory not only protests against the dominating and exploiting character of the rich, but also fears being poor. For a while he has suffered the problem in his own skin as an underpaid worker and a rejected fiancé. Certainly he is not used to such a condition. Although he was never really within the world of the rich, until a few years before, nearly until his father's death, he was still awarded his family's substantial fortune, sometimes in quite extravagant ways, especially during his boyhood. For instance, when Amory had scarlet fever "the number of attendants around his bed was fourteen." <sup>25</sup> Or when Amory's appendix burst, four hours out of land, Fitzgerald says, a great ship returned to New York to leave Amory on the pier. When young, his mother had studied in Rome and "was known by name as a fabulously wealthy American girl." <sup>26</sup> Later on, when she had breakdowns, she had them in fashionable hotels. So, economically it

seemed that Amory would never have any difficulty. But, as already said, his father was not a good manager and the family fortune started decreasing.

By the time Amory Blaine is dating the rich teenager Isabel Borgé, he says: "I wish my girl lived here [in Princeton]. But marry--not a chance. Especially as father says, money isn't forthcoming as it used to be."<sup>27</sup> As the novel progresses from the middle to its end, Amory's finances become a serious problem. Before dying, "in a sudden burst of religiosity toward the end [his mother] left half of what remained to be spent in stained-glass windows and seminary endowments."<sup>28</sup> Besides Beatrice's gesture which deprived him of her money, Amory's lawyer is having problems in renting his inherited house on Lake Geneva. So he is receiving no money from that source. Later on, the same lawyer informs him that he could expect for the present no further remittances from his street railway stocks.<sup>29</sup> Those railroads had been losing money "because of the five-cent fares" and now, the lawyer says, they "have gone into the hands of receivers."<sup>30</sup> Amory writes his friend Tom that "since poor Beatrice has died [he] will have a little money, but very darn little," and having "seen what was once a sizeable fortune melt away," he cannot forget his mother's "burst of religiosity."<sup>31</sup> It is really hard for Amory to face a menacing surrounding poverty.

His fear and anxiety toward poverty increases enormously if we look at him through the eyes of Rosalind and her family. Rosalind, who could certainly be referred to as Amory's alter-ego, "does not want to think about pots and kitchens and brooms."<sup>32</sup> In other words, she does not want to work and struggle for her daily bread. She wants to worry "whether [her] legs will get slick when she swims in the summer."<sup>33</sup> This is the reason why Rosalind is induced to agree with her mother when she says: "You've already wasted over two months on a theoretical genius

(Amory) who hasn't a penny to his name, but go ahead, waste your life on him."<sup>34</sup> Of course, Rosalind prefers to make up for the "lost time." Amory, who is not fond of working either, has to agree with Mrs. Connage's theory and the consequence is that he strongly feels the reality of his present lack of money and he fears its unpleasant further effect. From his recent difficulties in obtaining money Amory has perceived that, in fact, the lack of it "to do the things one wants to do--as his mother wrote him in a letter--makes one quite prosy and domestic,"<sup>35</sup> and, I would add in Amory's case, it sometimes makes one feel unworthy as a human being.

Amory feels poverty even as something unnatural, a sin. Unnatural because poverty prevents man from living as a human being and a sin because it is ugly and shameful. Besides, a priest, Monsignor Darcy, refers to Amory's present economic situation as a calamitous state, which certainly tends to prove my remark. Amory's love affair with Rosalind has already been broken off when he receives from Monsignor Darcy a late letter with these statements: "From what you write me about the present calamitous state of your finances, what you want is naturally impossible."<sup>36</sup> Monsignor is talking about Amory's marriage to Rosalind. Amory not only accepts the idea, but he also reinforces his understanding that there are many other things which it is "naturally impossible" to do without money. And here we certainly have justification for Amory's interior monologue: "Do you want a lot of money? No. I'm simply afraid of poverty."<sup>37</sup> This fear goes to the point where Amory feels he hates poverty. Courageously he affirms: "Poverty may have been beautiful once, but it's rotten now. It's the ugliest thing in the world. It's essentially cleaner to be corrupt and rich than it is to be innocent and poor."<sup>38</sup>

Amory appears to think about poverty only once in the novel. The quote just cited shows how strong his reaction to it is. He really thinks that "the lower classes are narrower, less pleasant . . . and certainly more stupid."<sup>39</sup> At the

beginning of the last part of the novel Amory is standing in front of a theater watching the departing crowd. Fitzgerald starts this last part with a rich description of New York switching on its first lights at night. Then he turns to the people Amory is watching: ". . . a dense, strolling mass that depressed him with its heavy odour compounded of the tobacco smell of the men and the fetid sensuousness of stale powder on women . . ." <sup>40</sup> Fitzgerald's narrative of what passes in Amory's soul is so clear that it needs no explanation:

The rain gave Amory a feeling of detachment, and the numerous unpleasant aspects of city life without money occurred to him in threatening procession. There was the ghastly, stinking crush of the subway; . . . at worst a squalid phantasmogoria of breath, and old cloth on human bodies and the smells of the food men ate--at best just people--too hot or too cold, tired, worried.

He (Amory) pictured the rooms where these people lived-- . . . where even love dressed as seduction-- a sordid murder around the corner, illicit motherhood in the flat above. And always there was the economical stuffiness of indoor winter, and the long summers, nightmares of perspiration between sticky enveloping walls . . .

It was not so bad where there were only men or else only women; it was when they were vilely herded that it all seemed so rotten. It was some shame that women gave off at having men see them tired and poor --it was some disgust that men had for women who were tired and poor.

'I detest poor people,' thought Amory suddenly. 'I hate them for being poor' . . .

Amory saw [in this people] only coarseness, physical filth and stupidity . . . Poverty aroused only his profound distaste. <sup>41</sup>

Amory's varicous and ambiguous attitudes concerning money and all his indecisions and drifting opinions about moneyed people and poor people are a direct product of economic situations related to his own life. But it is really hard to know whether he is a strenuous defender of humanity's equality or an egotist interested only in his own comfort. Is his indignation toward those exploited or toward those who exploit?

How can one be certain about his opinions on having much or little money when Amory says he does not want a lot of it, but then ten pages afterwards the same Amory says: "Of course I want a great lot of money."<sup>42</sup> His opinions vary according to his proximity to the rich or his momentary climbing down to the world of poverty. When he comes closer to the world of the rich he dreams of it as if it were his approaching paradise. Yet, when the whole social structure of the rich world prevents him from entering that paradise he looks at them reproachfully. And when he goes down and approaches the world of the poor he reproaches these people, hates their unnatural condition, and again turns his eyes to the rich with praise.



## BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

- <sup>1</sup> F. Scott Fitzgerald, This Side of Paradise (Great Britain: Penguin Books, Cox & Wyman Ltd., 1974), p. 246.
- <sup>2</sup> Ibid., p. 253.
- <sup>3</sup> Ibid., p. 241.
- <sup>4</sup> Ibid., p. 37.
- <sup>5</sup> Ibid., p. 11.
- <sup>6</sup> Andrew Turnbull, Scott Fitzgerald (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1962), p. 28.
- <sup>7</sup> F. Scott Fitzgerald, The Great Gatsby (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953), p. 99.
- <sup>8</sup> Fitzgerald, This Side of Paradise, p. 76.
- <sup>9</sup> John Aldridge, "Fitzgerald: The Horror and the Vision of Paradise," Twentieth Century Views: F. Scott Fitzgerald, A Collection of Critical Essays, ed. Arthur Mizener (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963), p. 34.
- <sup>10</sup> Fitzgerald, This Side of Paradise, p. 153.
- <sup>11</sup> James E. Miller, Jr., "A Gesture of Indefinite Revolt," Twentieth Century Views, p. 88.
- <sup>12</sup> Fitzgerald, This Side of Paradise, p. 156.
- <sup>13</sup> Ibid., p. 177.
- <sup>14</sup> Ibid., p. 173.
- <sup>15</sup> Ibid., p. 125.
- <sup>16</sup> Ibid., p. 50.
- <sup>17</sup> Ibid., p. 194.
- <sup>18</sup> Ibid., p. 249.
- <sup>19</sup> Ibid., p. 243.
- <sup>20</sup> Ibid., p. 149.
- <sup>21</sup> Ibid., p. 186.

<sup>22</sup>Ibid., p. 75.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid., p. 248. (It is interesting to observe that Fitzgerald does not become a Marxist as other writers did).

<sup>24</sup>Ibid., p. 194.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid., p. 13.

<sup>26</sup>Ibid., p. 11.

<sup>27</sup>Ibid., p. 80.

<sup>28</sup>Ibid., p. 148.

<sup>29</sup>All this happens after the war and Amory is in New York in a situation very similar to that of Fitzgerald himself after being released from the army.

<sup>30</sup>Fitzgerald, This Side of Paradise, p. 248.

<sup>31</sup>Ibid., p. 148.

<sup>32</sup>Ibid., p. 178.

<sup>33</sup>Ibid., p. 178.

<sup>34</sup>Ibid., p. 173.

<sup>35</sup>Ibid., p. 98.

<sup>36</sup>Ibid., p. 199.

<sup>37</sup>Ibid., p. 231.

<sup>38</sup>Ibid., p. 230.

<sup>39</sup>Ibid., p. 243.

<sup>40</sup>Ibid., p. 229.

<sup>41</sup>Ibid., pp. 229, 230, 231.

<sup>42</sup>Ibid., p. 241.

ECONOMIC RELATIONSHIPS IN THE BEAUTIFUL AND DAMNED

In his second novel, published March 3, 1922, wealth is scarcely one step away from Fitzgerald's hero's grasp. Anthony Patch, twenty-five years old at the beginning, thirty-three at the end of the novel, is the only heir of his grandfather Adam J. Patch's estate which "consisted of approximately forty million dollars."<sup>1</sup> But old Patch dies only in the second third of the novel and, though Anthony can feel the breeze of the big inheritance surrounding him, he becomes its owner only at the very end of the novel. The Beautiful and Damned is not so neatly autobiographical as This Side of Paradise is, but Fitzgerald's desire to pull the strings of his characters from outside the scene is sometimes betrayed. He is not always able to manipulate them from a distance and as in the first novel we often see Fitzgerald filtered through his characters, especially Anthony and Gloria. In The Beautiful and Damned Fitzgerald demonstrates he knows money is not the world's panacea, but he pities and disapproves of poor people. He makes Anthony and Gloria fear the lack of money on the grounds that it prevents one from doing what he wants. Most of the time Fitzgerald makes Anthony and Gloria use money as an escape from reality and the hardness of life. At times he seems to get involved with Anthony's and Gloria's admiration of the power of money and their craving for security achieved through the almighty dollar.

With respect to wealth, Anthony Patch is partly a continuation of Amory Blaine at least in the first part of the novel. It seems that the only major differences are that Anthony does not criticize the bullying character of the rich as does Amory; and, while Amory regards money as a key to open the door of his paradise, Anthony uses it as a way to escape hell. At the

very end of the story Fitzgerald says--quite contradictorily-- that Anthony "had seldom in his life been preoccupied with material vain-glory." Nevertheless, we often find Anthony, like Amory, dreaming of the millions which must come to his hands when his grandfather dies. Certainly Anthony's ambition is not purely toward self, and here we can give Fitzgerald credit. What Anthony really wants is security and power; but what does he think would give him power and security if not money?

There are many passages in The Beautiful and Damned where we can see Anthony pursuing the guardian angel he believed money would give him. He frequently goes to his broker just because "the big trust company building seemed to link him definitely to the great fortunes whose solidarity he respected," and also because from the brokers "he derived the same sense of safety that he had in contemplating his grandfather's money."<sup>2</sup> Anthony loves these surroundings. They give him the feeling that "some golden day he would have millions." This idea is so rooted in his mind that in dreams he sees himself "a power upon the earth, [for] with money he might build his own pedestal."<sup>3</sup>

In terms of economic relationships Anthony is not the only one who bears some resemblance to a character in This Side of Paradise. Gloria is in a way the continuation of Rosalind. While Rosalind rejects Amory just because she cannot foresee any sound economic prospect on his side, Gloria accepts Anthony as her husband because, like himself, she believes in their future bliss supported by grandfather's legacy. In this aspect they are twins. They crave the benefits they will derive from riches.

Neither Anthony nor Gloria like to work. When they do something it is always for the sake of funds. An example is Anthony's going to Harvard because someone had told him "it would open the doors [for him]." Or Gloria, once more trying to convince Anthony to let her enter the movies, argues:

"think of the money, Anthony." Most of the visits Anthony pays his grandfather are for money. He even hopes to find the old man dead. If Anthony once or twice tries to get a job or to write short stories, it is always simply because they are hard up and need some more money. If Gloria worries so much about the suit against old Patch's will, which had disinherited them, it is only because of the great amount of money involved. Like Anthony she believes that life would be unendurable without grandfather's fortune.

Gloria thinks that money is what really counts. This is the reason why she once tells Richard Caramel, the writer, to "go ahead and make as much money as possible." One day as Anthony returns home he meets Gloria asleep, "curled in a corner of the sofa with her purchase--a child's doll--locked securely in her arms."<sup>4</sup> She had been out shopping. With money she had bought the doll which gives her a kind of support and allows her to sleep soundly. Money is subtly used as something which can buy peace and security. We scarcely fail to perceive the weakness of the security bought with money when we look at the doll in Gloria's arms. At another passage in the novel Gloria is thinking where to have coffee. Then Fitzgerald says that "her purse decided for her."<sup>5</sup> That is, money commands her. This is very typical of Fitzgerald himself as well as of many other of Fitzgerald's characters like Rosalind, Daisy, Baby Warren or Pat Brady.

Both Anthony and Gloria want to belong to the aristocratic class. Their aristocracy is founded sheerly on money. If we observe Gloria's friends we will see that most of them belong to this kind of aristocracy. Muriel "had originated in a rising family of East Orange";<sup>6</sup> Rachael's family "owned three smart women's shops along Fifth Avenue, and lived in a magnificent apartment. . . ."<sup>7</sup> As for Anthony, Fitzgerald says that he "drew as much consciousness of solid security from being the grandson of Adam J. Patch as he would have had from tracing his line over the sea to the crusaders."<sup>8</sup> While

some people see aristocracy as family tradition; Anthony, and Gloria too, think "a person has to have money to be aristocratic."<sup>9</sup>

It is quite clear that Anthony and Gloria would never feel comfortable outside the world of money. While they wait for the big inheritance they have some money, but not enough to make them belong to what they understand to be the world of aristocrats. As the novel progresses, their economic situation becomes worse. In spite of this they spend prodigally. They could be compared to a girl they see one night in a cabaret. Fitzgerald describes her this way: "By gesture she was pretending that she belonged to a class a little superior to the class with which she now had to do, that a while ago she had been, and presently would again be, in a higher, rarer air."<sup>10</sup> We could still add that so strong is Anthony's and Gloria's craving for a higher position that like the women in the cabaret "they passionately poured out the impression that though they were in the crowd they were not of it."<sup>11</sup>

It is true that "as the grandson of Adam Patch, Anthony was received [nearly] everywhere with courtesy."<sup>12</sup> But this is not enough for him nor for Gloria. Only the real presence of the old man's fortune would make their dreams become reality. They want an actual big sum and the rest is not very important. As the suit progresses, Gloria reports to Anthony that if they could settle "for a million it would be better to tell the lawyer to go ahead and settle; but, she says, it would be a pity."<sup>13</sup> We understand that they believe only the big inheritance would make them "young, and beautiful, and gay and happy for a long time."<sup>14</sup>

When Anthony and Gloria are forced to face their own reality, they usually escape into the money they still have or into the thought of the money they will have when grandfather dies, or when the suit is won. A fine example is when Anthony appears talking to his grandfather for the first time. Adam Patch refers to the fact that Anthony is not working.

Anthony does not have courage enough to face the situation or to discuss the matter and he simply escapes by leaving the room with the argument that "he had an engagement with his broker that afternoon."<sup>15</sup>

Foreshadings of Anthony's enjoyment of escape are shown us from the beginning of the novel. One day walking the New York streets he becomes depressed because of the smell of places such as a bakery-restaurant, a drugstore and a laundry. These places can be related to human work and suffering, thus the reality of life depresses Anthony. But one should notice that "reaching Sixth Avenue he stopped at a corner cigar-store and emerged feeling better--the cigar-store was cheerful, humanity in a navy-blue mist, buying a luxury."<sup>16</sup> This is what he adores: "buying a luxury, in a navy-blue mist," that is, to live outside the reality of life. The growing lack of color in Anthony's days results from his constant escaping, from his lack of creativity, from his general irresponsibility and especially from his yielding to the fantasy of a money which he does not have yet.

Gloria thinks much more of the millions which must come from old Patch's will than of anything else. Fitzgerald says that what she hopes in "the tenebrous depths of her soul, what she expects that great gift of money to bring about, is difficult to imagine."<sup>17</sup> Anyhow, we know that when she is confronted with the fact that they can lose the suit, she sees life as something unbearable. Then it is perfectly logical that she suggests "they should take all their money and go on a real spree while it lasted. Anything seemed better than to see it go in unsatisfactory dribblets."<sup>18</sup> Gloria's will to escape increases as the novel progresses. A hundred pages later Fitzgerald repeats the same idea when he puts in Gloria's mouth these words: "Two hundred a month is worse than nothing. Let's sell all the bonds and put the thirty thousand dollars in the bank, and if we lose the case we can live in Italy for

three years, and then just die."<sup>19</sup> Money would be their last shelter, once it is finished, life should be too.

As their marital life becomes more and more difficult because of a lack of money, or Anthony's hard drinking, or their general dissatisfaction with life, to win the suit against old Patch's will becomes even more important for them. More and more they need to escape. They have to save money, but what they do is the opposite. An example is Gloria's wanting to buy an expensive grey squirrel coat. Anthony tells her they do not have money to spend on such articles. Nevertheless, on a "hysterical party they spend twice what the coat would have cost."<sup>20</sup> Some days later Gloria buys a new dress for fifty dollars--dollars which should not have been spent.

Disorganization increases each day, and more and more we notice they are escaping. What they talk about is "the progress of the will case, or the things they are to do when the money is theirs."<sup>21</sup> After the burial of old Patch the only thing that Anthony and Gloria do is to try desperately to glean presage of fortune. It seems that everything is transitory and provisory while the inheritance does not come. Their life and their happiness are to resume when they get their money. It is, as Fitzgerald says, on such dreams rather than on any satisfaction with their increasingly irregular, increasingly dissipated life that their hope rests. They look forward "to a time when love, springing like the phoenix from its own ashes would be born again in its mysteries."<sup>22</sup> Their entire life depends on the coming money. What maintains them alive and together is the escape into the immutable faith that they will win the suit and money will bring their phoenix to life again.

Fitzgerald does not give us a motive strong enough to account for Anthony's and Gloria's collapse. I do not intend to blame money or lack of it as the only cause of their failure, but there is evidence enough that money greatly influences



their break up. Both of them want to escape from their hell through money, but the money they have before they win old Patch's inheritance is not enough to guarantee their seeking "the moment's happiness as fervently and persistently as possible."<sup>23</sup> As an aftermath, many of their dreams are thwarted. When time comes for them to spend their fortune it seems that time itself has taken away the whole strength they would like to have stored up to spend the inheritance happily. Their escape into money is crippled by time. Paraphrasing Fitzgerald, I would say that it seems they know what they want, but in finding it they have put it forever beyond their grasp. The happiness they look for in their constant escape never comes. Fitzgerald's major irony is that Anthony and Gloria wait for money the whole time but are unfit to use it in the end. Fitzgerald says through one of his characters: "Happiness is only the first hour after the alleviation of some especially intense misery."<sup>24</sup> Gloria's and Anthony's misery, however, has been too intense and when the alleviation --money--comes, even the first hour seems not to be happiness. It is not odd when someone says at the very end of the novel that "Gloria is sort of . . . sort of dyed and unclean."<sup>25</sup> The dirtiness Fitzgerald believes surrounds poorness has touched Anthony and Gloria.

It is amazing the way Fitzgerald continues to disapprove of poor people in his second novel. He frequently associates poorness with dirtiness or vice-versa. In the second part of the first book of The Beautiful and Damned Fitzgerald paints winter entering New York and he refers to people's general belief that they would have better chances "as in a muddled carnival crowd an inefficient pickpocket may consider his chances increased."<sup>26</sup> Although Fitzgerald seems not to believe people will have really better chances, his tone is light and hopeful. But when he turns his eyes to the girls who need to work, therefore not rich girls, his tone becomes depressing. Whether or not he wants to convey his sorrowfulness,

this is the feeling the reader derives from Fitzgerald's saying: "The working girls, poor ugly souls, wrapping soap in the factories and showing finery in the big stores, dreamed that perhaps in the spectacular excitement of this winter they might obtain for themselves the coveted male."<sup>27</sup> At the beginning of book three Fitzgerald is talking about Anthony's infantry company during the war. Notice what an unclean place is compared to: "the latrines which, however well policed, seemed always intolerable like the lavatories of cheap [therefore poor] hotels."<sup>28</sup> Still another scene shows Anthony and Gloria on a trip to General Lee's home at Arlington. Lee's symbolic resistance and failure is mixed up with the image of a bus "crowded with hot, unprosperous people." The general feeling motivated by such people is one of discomfort and disapproval. It seems that Fitzgerald sympathizes with Gloria's calling down "the curse of Heaven upon the passengers of the bus and their perspiring off-spring," and their unprosperousness.

In his deep repugnance for the poor Fitzgerald uses really hard words against these unprotected people. From a train moving through a suburb of New York he makes his heroes watch "poor children swarming in feverish activity like vivid ants in alleys of red sand." Then he describes these animal-like boys' progenitresses: "From the tenement windows leaned ro-tund, moon-shaped mothers, as constellations of this sordid heaven; women like imperfect jewels, women like vegetables, women like great bags of dirty laundry."<sup>29</sup> Anthony says he likes these streets for he watches the scene as if the poor people were actors in a stage. To him they are not quite real. He remarks: "The second I've passed they'll all stop leaping and laughing and, instead, grow very sad, remembering how poor they are, and retreat with bowed heads into their houses."<sup>30</sup> So, poor people themselves pity their own poverty. As for Anthony, he is so concerned with having or not having money that his simple proximity is enough to awaken people's

consciousness of their economic situation.

There is a passage where Fitzgerald describes Anthony imagining himself in Congress. After satirizing incompetent congressmen, Fitzgerald says that "a dozen shrewd men at the top, egotistic and cynical, are content to lead" the rest of the incompetent house.<sup>31</sup> Their contentment, he says, "is compounded of a vague confusion between wealth as a reward of virtue and wealth as a proof of vice."<sup>32</sup> The entire The Beautiful and Damned does not make clear whether wealth is a reward of virtue or a proof of vice. There is something very clear, however: even if it was a proof of vice, wealth is preferable to poverty, which, in the novel, is a symbol of ignorance, incompetence and dirtiness. Of course I do not intend to say that Fitzgerald believes wealth can free people from ignorance and dirtiness, but he certainly believes that poor people can never escape from these imperfections. In fact, money does not prevent Gloria from looking sort of dyed and unclean at the end of the novel, but if she had not won the suit and gotten the big sum she would better have died.

Anthony and Gloria perfectly share Fitzgerald's point of view that lack of money means failure, and so their fear of poverty is natural. The author's thought about this appears clearly in Richard Caramel's words: "You can't do without money."<sup>33</sup> The same way, Anthony believes that without the golden touch even the idea of building "his own pedestal" would inexorably ruin him. The image of misery and failure haunts Anthony and Gloria whenever they find themselves short of money. And why should they not become fearful if they have been for a long time very near the beautiful and glorious (in their and Fitzgerald's conception) side of gold and suddenly they realize they can lose everything? Why should Anthony not fear comparing himself to the apartment's "light elevator man, "a pale, scraggly bearded person of about sixty, a pathetic and memorable figure of failure,"<sup>34</sup> when the same Anthony has dreamed for a long time of being "a Tallyrand, a Lord

Verulam"? And why should Gloria not fear the lack of money if she has dreamed her whole life with her beauty and happiness and suddenly she realizes she is walking by "a raggedy man seated upon newspapers spread on a drying bench, related not to a radiant and delightful afternoon but to the dirty snow that slept exhausted in obscure corners, waiting for extermination"?<sup>35</sup>

All the experiences Anthony and Gloria have with money shortages are painful and once more their fear of poverty is justified. Insufficiency of money limits their freedom and interferes with their power of action. We see Anthony, for instance, saying he cannot get married because he cannot get money enough "to support two people." His consciousness of such limitation is also seen when he and Gloria break off their engagement for some days and Anthony fears her getting married to Bloeckman, a wealthy movie man. The limitations increase as Anthony's money goes. When looking for a nice place to live in, we hear him telling Gloria and his friends: "Unless you have a fortune there's no use considering any place like Newport or Tuxedo. They are out of the question."<sup>36</sup> When we find our heroes suffering with a scarcity of money, we know that many other things are out of the question for them. Gloria cannot buy her dreamed of squirrel coat or her new watch, and there comes a moment when she thinks that everything "is out of her reach," including her own searching for happier days. Anthony's account at the bank is closed because of bad checks. Lack of money makes him resign from his last club. They have to move to a cheaper apartment. Soon their economic situation was so deteriorated that Fitzgerald forces this hypothesis in the novel: "Unable to live with the rich Anthony thought--(Fitzgerald had better say 'would have thought')--that his next choice would have been to live with the very poor."<sup>37</sup> I do not believe Anthony would ever be able to do this and Gloria would certainly prefer to die than to live with the very poor.

The strongest degradation caused by an insufficiency of money is shown in one of the last scenes of the novel when Anthony's failure achieves its amazing depths. Anthony goes out on a Saturday evening to try to arrange a loan of some money from a friend or through the mortgage of his wrist-watch until next Monday. He ends up completely drunk and without a penny in his pocket. After having met Bloeckman in front of a rich club, Anthony offends him. Bloeckman beats him and throws him violently on the sidewalk. Hearing Anthony say he is the rich Adam Patch's grandson, a certain unknown "good Samaritan" in the crowd proposes to get him a taxi and take him home if he fixes the bill. When they arrive at Anthony's apartment front, he says he does not have a cent. He is humiliated again, beaten on the face and left alone lying bleeding on the sidewalk. If he had money none of this would have happened to him. Lack of money seems to be really the source of many troubles, dissatisfactions and sufferings; it is man's worst imperfection. In the next chapters we will observe, however, that abundance of money also has evil effects.

It is difficult to see exactly where Fitzgerald wants to get with his continual ambiguity and often contradictory points of view about moneyed and moneyless people. It is possible that, trying to understand his ideas and feelings about this subject, he is imagining possible situations where Anthony and Gloria would be extensions or projections of himself and his wife, Zelda and their insecurity over money. In this projection, his image--like Anthony's--wavers between the image of the hero who does not want "to compromise with a brutal and stupid world," and the image of the Anthony "who is weak, drifting, full of self-pity," cowardly and not able even to spend money adequately.<sup>38</sup>

Sometimes it seems to me that Fitzgerald is still studying and developing his theme of money, and he is only preparing the field from which he will harvest his actual romance

of money. In this romance his heroes will have all the money they want and then Fitzgerald is just going to try to stand aside and watch the influences and consequences of money on such people's lives. Then his own creation or the projection of his own life will make him understand his theme. The Great Gatsby would be this important romance of money. It would tell Fitzgerald whether money is the world's panacea, a sweet illusion, or simply a hurtful delusion.

## BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

<sup>1</sup> F. Scott Fitzgerald, The Beautiful and Darned (Great Britain: Penguin Books, Hazell Watson & Viney Ltd., 1973), p. 242.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., p. 17.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., p. 50.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., p. 187.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., p. 335.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid., p. 72.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid., p. 72-3

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., p. 9.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., p. 330.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., p. 62.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid., p. 62.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid., p. 185.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid., p. 272.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid., p. 226.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., p. 19.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid., p. 28.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., p. 348.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., p. 249.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., p. 346.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid., p. 317.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid., p. 252.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid., p. 252.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid., p. 188.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid., p. 108.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid., p. 363.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid., p. 31.

<sup>27</sup> Ibid., p. 31.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid., p. 255.

<sup>29</sup> Ibid., p. 232.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid., p. 232.

<sup>31</sup> Ibid., p. 50.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid., p. 50.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid., p. 340.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid., p. 245.

<sup>35</sup> Ibid., p. 327.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid., p. 144.

<sup>37</sup> Ibid., p. 338.

<sup>38</sup> Arthur Mizener, The Far Side of Paradise (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, Sentry Edition, 1966), p. 155.



ECONOMIC RELATIONSHIPS IN THE GREAT GATSBY

Money has always awakened a sense of "haughty rivalry"<sup>4</sup> among rich people, as well as a "promise of mystery and beauty in the world" for those who are outside the world of the rich.<sup>6</sup> Money has been looked at as an easy means of opening the doors of success and shutting the gates of hard life and trouble. Uncontrolled pursuit of wealth has attracted an unutterable number of people who, legally or illegally, have managed to get it. In The Great Gatsby Fitzgerald again confronts rich people with poor people as he did in This Side of Paradise and The Beautiful and Damned. Again the theme of happiness as a privilege of well-to-do people is present. The novelty in this romance of money is the fact that Fitzgerald's main characters are all substantial people. The difference between them is that they are divided into old rich and newly rich, or rich with a past and rich "without a past." Tom Buchanan and his wife Daisy are the traditional rich. Jay Gatsby is the man who has recently climbed the stairs of wealth and presently he hopes he will also "suck the pap of life, gulp down the incomparable milk of wonder."<sup>3</sup>

The newly rich are hardly ever ingenious enough to secure the social position appropriate to their new status. To a certain extent this happens to Gatsby. Despite his luxuriant parties, and perhaps just because of them, he is not free from his guests' questioning the sources of his money. Now that success and apparent wealth are his it would seem that Gatsby had entered the wealthy world of the Buchanans. However, when Tom points out that Gatsby's money has come from illegal alcohol, that he is a "common swindler,"<sup>4</sup> a "Mr. Nobody from Nowhere,"<sup>5</sup> Gatsby is back where he began. In fact, we come to know the actual origin of Gatsby's money only after the climax of the novel, that is, after he meets Daisy. Knowing that

young men do not "drift coolly out of nowhere and buy a palace on Long Island Sound,"<sup>6</sup> it is natural that most people in the novel are curious to discover where his millions come from.

Tom's mistress' sister, Catherine, says: "They say he's a nephew or a cousin of Kaiser Wilhelm's. That's where all his money comes from."<sup>7</sup> Young ladies gossiping during one of Gatsby's big parties comment: "He's a bootlegger."<sup>8</sup> Gatsby himself collaborates in confusing the subject when he tells Nick: "I'm the son of some wealthy people in the Middle West --all dead now."<sup>9</sup> And he repeats: "My family all died and I came into a good deal of money."<sup>10</sup> But not thirty pages later, just before he proudly shows his expensive house to Daisy, he affirms to Nick: "It took me just three years to earn the money that bought this house."<sup>11</sup> Gatsby ends up revealing that he was poor and "had no comfortable family standing behind him"<sup>12</sup> in his youth: he was a "penniless young man without a past."<sup>13</sup>

It is quite clear that the strong interest in the real source of Gatsby's money has its origin in the simple fact that he is "newly rich" and especially because he shows a "heightened sensitivity to the promises of life,"<sup>14</sup> and he tries to use money--somehow extravagantly--to make real "the promises of life." Here we are confronted with The Great Gatsby's dichotomy of true and false use of money as a means to achieve a full life of imagination, excitement and happiness, which is an important theme in the novel. Fitzgerald links sensitiveness in using money with imagination and the newly rich Gatsby. As for Tom and Daisy, the old rich, Fitzgerald watches them prove themselves insensitive to an imaginatively rich life. This fact explains Fitzgerald's disapproval of the Buchanans and his sympathy toward Gatsby, whose behavior and sense of grandeur are often similar to Fitzgerald's.

His sympathy for Gatsby is not steady, however. Nick says at the very beginning of the novel that Gatsby "represented everything for which I have an unaffected scorn."<sup>15</sup> I will

try to compare Gatsby with Tom's mistress, Myrtle Wilson, so that I can easily point out what Nick so strongly disliked in him at first. Myrtle strives to be intimate with upper class people nearly the same way as Gatsby does. When she is together with Tom in his vulgar and tasteless New York apartment, she is momentarily newly rich, too. Ironically, she ascends to the same position as that of the newly rich Gatsby. Her ascent is as illegal as Gatsby's dealings with Wolfshein and his group: Myrtle makes a whore of herself and Gatsby transforms himself into a lawless bootlegger. Like Gatsby, Myrtle becomes snobbish and pretends to feel a non-existent self-confidence based on new money. By her saying "I've got to get another dress,"<sup>46</sup> she intends to show off her fake economic potential; the same way Gatsby wants to impress with his new hydroplane,<sup>41</sup> his "drugstores,"<sup>48</sup> his false "rubies,"<sup>49</sup> his being the "son of some wealthy people,"<sup>20</sup> his elaborate speech which just missed being absurd and his general display of wealth.

Although Jay Gatsby is fiercely ambitious and not rarely competes with Tom's bad taste, Nick says "there is something gorgeous about him."<sup>21</sup> If Fitzgerald criticizes Gatsby, he certainly also reaffirms his sympathy toward the son of the poor Minnesota farmer, Henry C. Gatz. Fitzgerald shows that despite Gatsby's faults, snobbishness and recent illegal money, he "turns out all right at the end."<sup>22</sup> Nick ends up saying that Gatsby is "worth the whole [Buchanan] bunch put together."<sup>23</sup> In fact, Gatsby is "faithful [to his dream] to the end."<sup>24</sup> And what Nick, or Fitzgerald, really appreciates is Gatsby's "extraordinary gift for hope, a romantic readiness such as I have never found in any other person and which is not likely I shall ever find again."<sup>25</sup>

Nick's first reference to Thomas Buchanan shows Fitzgerald's antipathy toward this man with an "enormously wealthy" family behind him.<sup>26</sup> Tom is introduced as "one of those men who reach such an acute limited excellence at twenty-one that

everything afterward savors of anticlimax. Now he was a sturdy man of thirty with a rather hard mouth and a supercilious manner. Two shining arrogant eyes had established dominance over his face and gave him the appearance of always leaning aggressively forward. His speaking voice, a gruff, husky tenor, added to the impression of fractiousness he conveyed." <sup>21</sup>

Fitzgerald seems somewhat resentful toward Tom's wealth. Nick says: "Even in College his (Tom's) freedom with money was a matter for reproach. But now he'd left Chicago and come East in a fashion that rather took your breath away; for instance, he'd brought down a string of polo ponies from Lake Forest." <sup>28</sup> The statement Nick adds to this example shows that Fitzgerald's attitude toward Tom's money is, at the same time, one of awe and disapproval: "It was hard to realize that a man in my own generation was wealthy enough to do that." <sup>29</sup> Possibly this contradictory antipathy comes from Fitzgerald's own resentment of rich people, his smouldering hatred, as shown in his biography.

Fitzgerald's disapproval of Tom's attitudes, however, does not prevent him from looking with static admiration at the shining glamour of the Buchanans' house, "a cheerful red-and-white Colonial Mansion glowing with reflected gold." <sup>30</sup> We could even affirm that the Buchanans' sophisticated life strongly appeals to Nick at the beginning, especially while he observes them from a certain distance: "Across the courtesy bay the white palaces of East Egg glittered along the water . . ." <sup>31</sup> But as the novel progresses and Nick comes closer to the 'sophistication' of these people's life, he stops looking only at the outside glitter of the white palaces and his "sense of the fundamental decencies" <sup>32</sup> is increasingly disturbed. At the end Nick's conclusion is that "they are careless people, Tom and Daisy, they smashed up things and creatures and then retreated back into their money or their vast carelessness, or whatever it was that kept them together, and let other

people clean up the mess they had made."<sup>33</sup>

As for the source of Tom's money, there is no speculation about it. The general belief is that Tom inherited his cyclopean fortune from his family. The important detail is that this money is apparently legal and honest and, especially, it comes from an old economic aristocracy, which contrasts with the illegal and dishonest new economic aristocracy to which Gatsby belongs. Fitzgerald's excellent irony here is that Gatsby, who uses his "first rate executive talent and organizes a large, profitable business with great skill,"<sup>34</sup> makes dishonest and illegal money. Tom and Daisy, on the other hand, who never work and live in total idleness, are the ones who own apparently legal and honest money. Besides, while Gatsby uses his illegal money with honesty of purpose, Tom often does the opposite with his 'legal' wealth.

Although the way people acquire their money is not really important to Fitzgerald, it is clear that this fact has enormously significant consequences in The Great Gatsby. To a certain extent, Gatsby's failure and Myrtle and Wilson's tragedy have their actual origin not only in "Tom's hard malice,"<sup>35</sup> but also in Gatsby's illegal new money. It is true that Gatsby's purity of intention and his romantic pursuit of love and happiness somehow annul the illegality of his business. On the other hand, Tom's rough characteristics and his adulterous behavior toward Daisy contribute to make us think that he does not deserve his gratuitous wealth. Anyhow, we cannot fail to notice that Daisy has already said, at the Plaza Hotel, that she did not love Tom and she was going to leave him. But she abandons this idea very soon. The strongest reason, I believe, which accounts for her change is the fact that Tom maliciously makes her aware of the real sources of Gatsby's fortune. She is terrified when she hears it. And as Gatsby denies everything and defends "his name against accusations that had not [even] been made, she [draws] further and further

into herself"<sup>36</sup> and ends up retreating into Tom's old money once more. Gatsby's illegal new money had betrayed him, and only "his dead dream [fights] on as the afternoon [slips away], trying to touch what [is] no longer tangible."<sup>37</sup> In her terrified run back to Tom's house Daisy kills Myrtle and this accident causes Wilson to murder Gatsby and to commit suicide.

Tom and Daisy fulfill the role of the traditional rich. Accustomed to have freedom with money they have also acquired the habit of solving all their problems through money. They belong to a "secret society," as Fitzgerald refers to it, and Mizener very appropriately interprets it as "the snobbish secret society of the rich who are incapable of living the fully imagined life. Out of ignorance or cowardice they substitute for that life a childish game in which superficial taste takes the place of genuine responsiveness, 'what most people think' takes the place of a seriously imagined purpose."<sup>38</sup>

Money gives people power and a life with many options, but people are hardly ever able to spend their money the way Fitzgerald would like them to: with genuine responsiveness to the promises of life. No one in The Great Gatsby is excused from Fitzgerald's accusation. Tom Buchanan uses his money as a means of dominating people and he egotistically "smashes up things and creatures."<sup>39</sup> Although he seems to derive intellectual and social security from his money, this security actually does not exist, it is only a false façade. Both he and Daisy make of their money a means of defence. Practically the same happens with Wolfsheim, the unknown man who is linked to Gatsby's illegal commercial transactions. While Tom virtually buys Daisy by giving her a string of pearls worth 350,000 dollars before he marries her "with more pomp and circumstance than Louisville ever knew before,"<sup>40</sup> Wolfsheim imperiously and defensively uses money to scare people into shutting their mouths; his insecurity is also shown when he refuses to attend Gatsby's funeral.

Gatsby is highly sensitive, "as if he were related to one of those intricate machines that register earthquakes ten thousand miles away."<sup>41</sup> His "heightened sensitivity," however, does not defend him totally from narrow-mindedness toward the use of his wealth. Nick certainly reproaches Gatsby for having bought his palace with the only purpose of being close to Daisy. In the first chapter of the novel Nick regards with approval and pleasure the romantic Gatsby, "who had emerged from the shadow of my neighbor's mansion and was standing with his hands in his pockets regarding the silver pepper of the stars, come out to determine what share was his of our local heavens."<sup>42</sup> But just after setting, with Jordan, Gatsby's disguised meeting with Daisy, Nick suddenly understands that "it had not been merely the stars to which Gatsby had aspired on that June night."<sup>43</sup> And Nick's sorrow and disapproval are shown: "He came alive to me, delivered suddenly from the womb of purposeless splendor."<sup>44</sup> Yes, for a while that is what Fitzgerald himself seems to think: all the splendor of Gatsby's wealth is purposeless--until Nick realizes: Gatsby has an ambition connected with his money--the same way as Tom's and Daisy's way of spending theirs is stupid.

Although Gatsby's honesty about his dream--to be rich and to marry Daisy--deserves Nick's praise, we observe that, on the whole, the image of the rich which Fitzgerald conveys in The Great Gatsby is a negative one. It is true that a "feeling of defiance, of scornful solidarity between Gatsby and Nick against them all"<sup>45</sup> increases and at the end Gatsby is "exempt from [Nick's] reaction"<sup>46</sup> against the rich. But, if at the beginning of the novel Nick is happy for having found a place to live in at "the consoling proximity of millionaires --all for eighty dollars a month,"<sup>47</sup> at the end the same Nick says tiredly that he "had had enough of all of them."<sup>48</sup> Nick returns to the West wishing the world would "be in uniform and at a sort of moral attention forever."<sup>49</sup>

While Fitzgerald dislikes many of the rich's fake attitudes and reproaches them for their lack of imagination in using their wealth, he also regards the poor with dislike, especially for their total inability to respond to the promises of life. The poor person who remains poor is looked at simply as a pitiable human being. The poor person is powerless and his life is totally optionless. The poor person does not even have the chance to commit the sins the rich commit in The Great Gatsby: to use money incompetently.

Earlier in this chapter I attributed the Myrtle-Wilson tragedy to Gatsby's illegal money. Of course we could approach the occurrence from a different angle. We could say that Tom's dishonest use of his money is the cause of the whole tragedy. Or we could affirm that Wilson's lack of money is ultimately what determines his own death as well as Myrtle's and Gatsby's. Or we could affirm that Gatsby's own lack of money, which prevented him from marrying Daisy in his days of youth, is responsible for his being murdered. Being a penniless young man was his great and unpardonable sin. Had James Gatz been a moneyed man five years before, Jay Gatsby's tragedy would not have happened. It is quite clear that--as happens in The Beautiful and Damned--Fitzgerald still considers the shortage of money as one of the main causes of difficulties, unhappiness and frustration for man. We could even affirm that while Fitzgerald criticizes the rich he regards poverty as the first enemy of man.

Wilson, who had even "borrowed somebody's best suit to get married in,"<sup>50</sup> drifts along his "unprosperous and bare" garage where a "dust-covered wreck of a Ford crouches in a dim corner."<sup>51</sup> He tells Tom: "I need money pretty bad,"<sup>52</sup> and Wilson certainly believes the only thing that can save him is money. Only with money could he try to hold his marriage together. Wilson's low finances make Myrtle withdraw from his company and look for Tom's, especially because she receives financial support from him, and Tom's company makes her forget she is married to a poor man.



Besides young James Gatz, the tired Wilson and his adulterous wife, there are other examples of the limitations caused by a deficit of money. One is Nick's own words when he answers Daisy's and Tom's hint that they have heard he is engaged. Nick understands that the money he presently has would not allow him to get engaged and marry, and he simply says: "It's a libel. I'm too poor."<sup>53</sup> Another less important example is Catherine's account of her being "gypped out of all [her money] in two days in the private rooms" in Monte Carlo.<sup>54</sup> The result is that she had "an awful time getting back" and now she hates Monte Carlo.<sup>55</sup> Catherine's real problem was a lack of money. She would not mind such an unimportant incident had she had plenty of money to go on with her trip.

With all the limitations and discomfort poverty brings about and with the apparent easiness, security and power that wealth produces, it is perfectly natural that the one who has little money must regard the world of the rich as a paradise of endless bliss. Nick, who is "within and without" the world of the rich,<sup>56</sup> is "simultaneously enchanted and repelled by the inexhaustible variety of life."<sup>57</sup> But before he really knows the wealthy people in the novel, wealth for him, too, seems to be a "promise of unfolding shining secrets,"<sup>58</sup> and, more or less like Gatsby's father at the end of the novel, Nick starts his story looking up to the rich with an awed pride. Nick changes as the novel progresses, but it is hard to realize whether his disappointment is toward wealth in general or simply toward the rich.

Since his days of youth Gatsby wants to live a full life and he believes he needs plenty of money to make his dream a reality. As Fitzgerald says, "Gatsby is overwhelmingly aware of the youth and mystery that wealth imprisons and preserves, of the freshness of many clothes, and of Daisy, gleaming like silver, safe and proud above the struggles of the poor."<sup>59</sup> As a poor young man Gatsby stares at Daisy's house in amazement:

. . . he had never been in such a beautiful house before. There was a ripe mystery about it, a hint of bedrooms upstairs more beautiful and cool than any other bedrooms, of gay and radiant activities taking place through its corridors, and of romances that were not musty and laid away already in lavender, but fresh and breathing and redolent of this year's shining motor-cars and of dances whose flowers were scarcely withered.<sup>60</sup>

Like Amory Blaine, Rosalind Connage or Gloria Patch, Gatsby sees money as the golden key to paradise. He dreams of this paradise and "each night he adds to his fancies until drowsiness closes upon some vivid and oblivious embrace."<sup>61</sup>

It is not strange that James Gatz, the son of "shiftless and unsuccessful farm people,"<sup>62</sup> rejects his parents in his imagination, changes his name and becomes Jay Gatsby: "a sort of Jay Gatsby that a seventeen-year-old boy would be likely to invent," a young man sprung "from his platonic conception of himself."<sup>63</sup> "Quick and extravagantly ambitious"<sup>64</sup> and now free from his humble origins, he sets out to strive for money. He believes only money will allow him to have Daisy. From the beginning Gatsby understands that, although he lets Daisy believe "he is a person from much the same stratum as herself," he is "in Daisy's house by a colossal accident."<sup>65</sup> Presently he is nothing more than a poor man, and Daisy vanishes "into her rich house, into her rich, full life, leaving Gatsby-- nothing."<sup>66</sup> But Gatsby feels "married to her [and] commits himself to following a grail."<sup>67</sup>

Fitzgerald's expression "following a grail" would be a clear foreshadowing of Gatsby's failure. But the novel is not narrated chronologically and looking at Gatsby from outside when we first meet him in his mansion, in the very beginning of the novel, we have the impression that this gentleman must be the man who has just gotten everything he ever wished for-- money and security. His house is "a colossal affair by any standard--a factual imitation of some Hôtel de Ville in Normandy, with a tower on one side, spanking new under a thin beard

of raw ivy, and a marble swimming pool, and more than forty acres of lawn and garden."<sup>68</sup> If James Gatz saw how successful in getting money the Jay Gatsby he invented was, he would certainly feel that "he could hardly fail to grasp" his dream now.<sup>69</sup> Paradoxically, however, the reality is that his dream "was already behind him."<sup>70</sup>

Gatsby's almighty dollars are not sufficient to guarantee his total success. Gatsby seems to understand this fact only after the scene at the Plaza Hotel when he is fiercely attacked by Tom Buchanan. Of course it is too late now. And the next day after the accident--as he receives a telephone call from Daisy--Gatsby seems to cease caring for his old dreams:

If that was true--(Fitzgerald says through Nick)--he must have felt that he had lost the old warm world, paid a high price for living too long with a single dream. He must have looked up to an unfamiliar sky through frightening leaves and shivered as he found what a grotesque thing a rose is and how raw the sunlight was upon the scarcely created grass. A new world, material without being real, where poor ghosts, breathing dreams like air, drifted fortuitously about. . . .<sup>71</sup>

Gatsby certainly realizes that in the struggle for social interests his dream had just been destroyed by the contact with the reality he was looking for: the reality of the rich. If he had looked up to the world of the Buchanans in wonder and tried to imitate them, he now looks at this same world disappointed, disgusted and scared.

We have seen Gatsby looking up to the Buchanans. What happens with Tom in reference to Gatsby is the opposite: Tom looks down on Gatsby all the time. In fact, neither Tom nor Daisy accept Gatsby in their "secret society." It is true that Gatsby remains a parvenu to the end of the novel, but for the arrogant Tom he is nothing more than a "crazy fish," a "Mr. Nobody." Thus Gatsby's defeat can be compared to the defeat of Henry James' hero in The American. Both Gatsby's

and Newman's failure are the result of the struggle between social interests. Newman is a self-made man like Gatsby, and remains a newly rich outsider. Newman's fault--in the eyes of the traditional aristocracy--is his lack of social background, his "commercial money." Gatsby's main fault is the same. This social detail accelerates and greatly contributes to his collapse.

As in This Side of Paradise and The Beautiful and Damned, Fitzgerald's attitude toward money is not clear in The Great Gatsby. For him the poor are actually excluded from any possibility of living a worthwhile life. Such a privilege is reserved for the rich. Like Gatsby, Fitzgerald looks up to the very rich, but ends up disappointed with their untruthfulness. We could use Conrad's words to show what Fitzgerald thinks of Tom: "He a man! Hell! He was a hollow sham!" It is clear that this same statement can be applied to the other rich in the novel and Gatsby himself is included in the roll of fake and tasteless tycoons. None of the rich people in The Great Gatsby know how to use money well. On the whole, Fitzgerald seems to think that the wrong use of money--together with poverty--represents a considerable evil on earth.

If The Great Gatsby, Fitzgerald's better romance of money, was intended to clear up its author's own ideas about the effects of money and lack of money, the novel does not completely achieve its goal. For a while the reader stops thinking of Fitzgerald's characters and turns his eyes toward Fitzgerald himself and another doubt arises: he cannot exactly know whether Fitzgerald is simply ironic, a snob, or a moralist. Ironic because he would be showing that the glitter of wealth is nothing more than the gilded refuge of snobbish, lazy or dishonest people; a snob because he cannot stand the poor, and, feeling superior to the rich, he cannot stand the rich, either. The poor are scolded because of their total helplessness, unprosperousness and lack of options in life; the rich because of their limitations in the use of money, which prevent them

from making real the "promises of life." Snobbishly Fitzgerald would be saying that, except for himself, almost the entire class of the rich is unable to spend money with enough imagination. And, finally, a moralist because Fitzgerald would really blame the very poor and the very rich for making the world such a messy place. Contrary to what the Marxists think, Fitzgerald regards the poor as a worthless force to make the world a better place. How can the poor contribute to their brothers' happiness when lack of money prevents them from living their own lives with dignity? Fitzgerald's moralism is visible especially in the fact that he seems to be preaching for the rich nearly the same teachings as the Bible. Of course the rich who knew how to use and spend their wealth would deserve only Fitzgerald's praise, but as I have already mentioned, there are no such rich in the novel. As regards Tom, Daisy, Wolfsheim, Jordan and Gatsby, too, Fitzgerald would be saying: "He that loveth silver shall not be satisfied with silver; nor he that loveth abundance with increase; this is also vanity."<sup>72</sup> Fitzgerald would still add: "Surely every man walketh in a vain shew: surely they are disquieted in vain: he heapeth up riches, and knoweth not who shall gather them."<sup>73</sup> And finally, to these rich people Fitzgerald would be saying that "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God," that is, to be totally happy in this world.<sup>74</sup>

By rejecting the poor and reproaching the rich, Fitzgerald would be possibly trying to suggest that an average economic situation, like Nick's, is the ideal one. It seems this economic situation is the best because Nick is the only one in the novel who is not likely to be corrupted and the only one who never tries to corrupt other people.

## BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

<sup>1</sup>F. Scott Fitzgerald, The Great Gatsby (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953), p. 69.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 69.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 112.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 134.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 130.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 49.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., p. 33.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., p. 61.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., p. 65.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid., p. 65.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., p. 91.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid., p. 149.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., p. 149.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid., p. 2.

<sup>15</sup>Ibid., p. 2.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid., p. 37.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid., p. 47.

<sup>18</sup>Ibid., p. 110.

<sup>19</sup>Ibid., p. 66.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid., p. 65.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid., p. 2.

<sup>22</sup>Ibid., p. 2.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid., p. 154.

<sup>24</sup>Ibid., p. 99.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid., p. 2.

<sup>26</sup>Ibid., p. 6.

<sup>27</sup>Ibid., p. 7.

<sup>28</sup>Ibid., p. 6.

<sup>29</sup>Ibid., p. 6.

<sup>30</sup>Ibid., p. 6.

<sup>31</sup>Ibid., p. 5.

<sup>32</sup>Ibid., p. 1.

<sup>33</sup>Ibid., p. 181.

<sup>34</sup> Arthur Mizener, "F. Scott Fitzgerald's The Great Gatsby," Forum Lectures (Washington, D.C.: Forum Editions, Voice of America), p. 134.

<sup>35</sup> Fitzgerald, op. cit., p. 148.

<sup>36</sup>Ibid., p. 135.

<sup>37</sup>Ibid., p. 135.

<sup>38</sup> Mizener, op. cit., p. 132.

<sup>39</sup> Fitzgerald, op. cit., p. 180.

<sup>40</sup>Ibid., p. 77.

<sup>41</sup>Ibid., p. 2.

<sup>42</sup>Ibid., p. 21.

<sup>43</sup>Ibid., p. 79.

<sup>44</sup>Ibid., p. 79.

<sup>45</sup>Ibid., p. 166.

<sup>46</sup>Ibid., p. 2.

<sup>47</sup>Ibid., p. 5.

<sup>48</sup>Ibid., p. 143.

- 49 Ibid., p. 2
- 50 Ibid., p. 35.
- 51 Ibid., p. 25.
- 52 Ibid., p. 123.
- 53 Ibid., p. 20.
- 54 Ibid., p. 35.
- 55 Ibid., p. 34.
- 56 Ibid., p. 36.
- 57 Ibid., p. 36.
- 58 Ibid., p. 36.
- 59 Ibid., p. 150.
- 60 Ibid., p. 148.
- 61 Ibid., p. 100.
- 62 Ibid., p. 99.
- 63 Ibid., p. 99.
- 64 Ibid., p. 101.
- 65 Ibid., p. 149.
- 66 Ibid., p. 149.
- 67 Ibid., p. 149.
- 68 Ibid., p. 5.
- 69 Ibid., p. 182.
- 70 Ibid., p. 182.
- 71 Ibid., p. 162.
- 72 "Ecclesiastes" 5:10.
- 73 "Psalms" 39:6.
- 74 "St. Matthew" 19:24.



ECONOMIC RELATIONSHIPS IN TENDER IS THE NIGHT

The nine-year gap between The Great Gatsby and Tender is the Night seems to be an indication of Fitzgerald's attempt to move away from his old theme and write about something else other than the effects of money or lack of it. In fact, at a first glance, the main subject of Tender is the Night seems to be a study of psychiatry, a subject completely different from Fitzgerald's previous ones. A more detailed examination of this novel, however, shows that nearly all its main events are pervaded with money; again money and lack of money play a catalytic role and again Fitzgerald is involved with his well known theme.

Many of the attitudes toward the rich and the poor which are expressed in his earlier novels simply recur in Tender is the Night. Through Rosemary Hoyt the rich are once more looked up to and Baby Warren looks down upon the poor. Amory Blaine's complaint against the rich's bullying sense of superiority and the abuse of economic power is subtly present. Fitzgerald's reference to the golden touch as an important means to guard the rich's façade is not new either. Like in The Beautiful and Damned self is again a means of escaping reality and especially it is a destructive force; the treatment of money as an evil and destructive force receives the main emphasis in Tender is the Night.

The very first chapter of the novel "on the pleasant shore of the French Riviera"<sup>1</sup> implies that we are going to deal with "notable and fashionable people."<sup>2</sup> Soon we meet Rosemary and we are faced with her admiration for the Divers. It is quite evident that her fascination with them has its source in their easiness with money. Fitzgerald clearly affirms that "Rosemary envied their fun, imagining a life of leisure unlike her own."<sup>3</sup> It is not hard to perceive that Rosemary's

awe of the Divers is a consequence of her own goal in life. As her mother tells her, "economically you are a boy, not a girl,"<sup>4</sup> that is, she was brought up to work and make money. This is exactly her aim: to be famous and have a big pile of gold. Rosemary has been "catapulted by her mother onto the uncharted heights of Hollywood," but her social origin is in "the middle of the middle class,"<sup>5</sup> and she had had little money until recently. Presently she has freshly started her contact with the world of the rich. She is dazzled. For her the Divers are the image of total success and it is natural that she must admire and envy them.

We notice that what Rosemary first observes is the Divers' appurtenances on the beach. She clearly enjoys examining the "new things she had never seen, from the first burst of luxury manufacturing after the War, and probably in the hands of the first purchasers."<sup>6</sup> Her attitude toward the Divers is similar to Gatsby's before Daisy's house when he first meets her. The only difference is that Rosemary, despite her innocence, is able to notice the Divers' "immobility," a thing Gatsby could not see in Daisy. But "even in their absolute immobility,"<sup>7</sup> Fitzgerald says, "she felt a purpose, a working over something, a direction, an act of creation different from any she had known."<sup>8</sup> In fact, it is the creative way Dick uses money that mostly excites Rosemary. "There was, among many diversions, the car of the Shah of Persia."<sup>9</sup> We can notice that Rosemary is ecstatic before the marvelous car and she cannot see anything beyond its artificial appearance the same way she cannot see anything beyond Dick's façade and his exciting display of wealth: "Where Dick had commandeered this vehicle, what bribery was employed, these were facts of irrelevance. Rosemary accepted it as merely a new facet of the fabulous, which for two years had filled her life."<sup>10</sup> Fitzgerald continues the description of the car as if he himself were in wonder before it. We have a repetition of Fitzgerald's attitude when he describes Rosalind's room and Gatsby's and Tom's

houses. "The car had been built on a special chassis in America. Its wheels were of silver, so was the radiator. The inside of the body was inlaid with innumerable brilliants which would be replaced when the car arrived in Teheran the following week."<sup>41</sup> (Of course this was part of the amusement.) "There was only one real seat in back, because the Shah must ride alone, so they took turns riding in it and sitting on the marten fur that covered the floor."<sup>42</sup>

As already mentioned, Rosemary is too innocent to understand what is going on under the Divers' apparently happy surface. "At the moment the Divers represented externally the exact furthestmost evolution of a class,"<sup>43</sup> Fitzgerald asserts. From a standpoint outside the novel the author is able to show us the dichotomy of truth and falsehood which Rosemary is unable to perceive:

Her naivité responded wholeheartedly to the expensive simplicity of the Divers, unaware of its lack of innocence, unaware that it was all a selection of quality rather than quantity from the run of the world's bazaar, and that the simplicity of behaviour also, the nursery-like peace and good will, the emphasis on the simpler virtues, was part of a desperate bargain with the Gods and had been attained through struggles she could not have guessed at.<sup>44</sup>

Fitzgerald allows himself to peep through the Divers' façade and the reader comes to know that "the desperate bargain with the Gods" has taken place especially inside Richard Diver. Dick "had been swallowed up like a gigolo, and somehow permitted his arsenal to be locked up in the Warren safety-deposit vaults."<sup>45</sup> This fact involves the "struggles she could not have guessed at." Such struggles are intricate and Rosemary cannot easily understand them. They start in Dick's childhood in Buffalo when, as the son of a poor clergyman, he watches his father's struggles in poor parishes"<sup>46</sup> and is already taken by "a desire for money" although "to an essentially unacquisitive nature."<sup>47</sup> Since this period of his life two different men start taking shape in Dick's person: one is the

worker who wants to learn a profession and imitate his father's example of good will; the other is the man who has "a desire for money"<sup>18</sup> and wants to enjoy life, to be a bon vivant, a kind of Rosalind Connage or a young Anthony Patch.

Dick graduates from Yale and then he works his way to the top of his chosen profession--psychiatry. He continues his studies at Oxford, Johns Hopkins, Vienna and Zurich. He is sent to Zurich, Fitzgerald says, because it was wartime and "he was already too valuable, too much of a capital investment to be shot off in a gun."<sup>19</sup> The professional Dick, thus gets ready for his work. But by the time he shares an apartment with Ed Elkins in Vienna the conflict between Dick's two selves has reappeared. Elkins lives the life of a bon vivant with "nice girl visitors,"<sup>20</sup> and the twenty-six-year-old Doctor's contact with him causes Dick to question whether it would be better for him to be a good psychiatrist or simply to enjoy life like Elkins. In a way Dick is similar to Amory Blaine, who could not make up his mind about being a serious writer or a "Princeton slicker" interested only in an easy life with plenty of fame and money. Fitzgerald is clear about Dick's vacillation: "His contact with Elkins aroused in him a first faint doubt as to the quality of his mental processes; he could feel that they were not profoundly different from the thinking of Elkins," who would say: "And Lucky Dick can't be one of these clever men; he must be less intact, even faintly destroyed."<sup>21</sup> Dick reacts and, partly trying to convince himself that Elkins is not right, he "mocks at Elkins' reasoning, calling it specious and 'American.'" He knew, however, that the price of his intactness was incompleteness."<sup>22</sup> That is, if he is going to be intact as a professional, a psychiatrist, he will be incomplete as the man who wants to enjoy life, the bon vivant. He has to renounce one of his selves.

When Rosemary knows Dick on the French Riviera this conflict has been going on for quite a long time. Presently he is neither the bon vivant nor the psychiatrist. He does not

show it, but he himself knows that "he had lost himself--he could not tell the hour when, or the day or the week, the month or the year. Once he had cut through things, solving the most complicated equations as the simplest problems of his simplest patients. Between the time he found Nicole flowering under a stone on the Zurichsee and the moment of his meeting with Rosemary the spear had been blunted."<sup>23</sup>

My point of view, and Fitzgerald's seems to be this one too, is that Dick's failure starts at the exact moment when he begins giving in to the advantages of money. Like Anthony Patch his lure is not wealth itself, but he wants to enjoy life and money seems to be the only way to achieve his goal.

Nicole should be considered at this point. She is beautiful and rich and for Dick she is the materialization of his old "desire for money." For his bon-vivant self she means the possibility of making his dream come true:

Nicole was the granddaughter of a self-made American capitalist and the granddaughter of a Count of the House of Lippe Weissenfeld. She was the product of much ingenuity and toil. For her sake trains began their run at Chicago and traversed the round belly of the Continent to California; chicle factories fumed and link belts grew link by link in factories; men mixed toothpaste in vats and drew mouthwash out of copper hogsheads; girls canned potatoes quickly in August or worked rudely at the Five-and-Tens on Christmas Eve; half-breed Indians toiled on Brazilian coffee plantations and dreamers were muscled out of patent rights in new tractors--these were some of the people who gave a tithe to Nicole.<sup>24</sup>

Certainly the psychiatrist in Dick perceives that Nicole also represents an enormous danger for him, and at this point of Dick's life the conflict between the Doctor and the man who wants to enjoy life must have been really hard. Dick clearly knows that the Warrens are "in the position of being able to buy her a nice young doctor, the paint scarcely dry on him."<sup>25</sup> At the same time as the bon-vivant wants her money and her beauty, the psychiatrist tries to refuse the "bargain" and for a while Dick wishes Nicole "had no background, that she was

just a girl lost with no address save the night from which she had come."<sup>26</sup> "You're a fetching kid," he tells her, "but I couldn't fall in love."<sup>27</sup> Dick understands that his yielding to the Warrens' opulence will, at least partly, thwart his profession. In his ineffective struggle against the Warrens he uses even sarcasm as a help, especially against Baby, who wants to throw him and Nicole together. "Throw us together!" Dick exclaims. "Sweet propinquity and the Warren money!"<sup>28</sup> Big chance--oh, yes, My God!--they want to buy a doctor? Well, they better stick to whoever they have got in Chicago."<sup>29</sup> But soon he is "revolted against his harshness and makes amends to Nicole, remembering that nothing had ever felt so young as her lips. . . ."<sup>30</sup> Dick is too indulgent and the man who wants to enjoy life through money has a better reason than the psychiatrist: the beautiful girl with plenty of money is easily at hand, and the psychiatrist is defeated.

For a while Dick becomes the bon-vivant and has a good time together with Nicole, but the deep wound in the psychiatrist's heart never heals and occasionally we find him somehow rejecting his surrender. Talking to Rosemary Dick once says: "When Nicole takes things into her hands there's nothing more to be done."<sup>31</sup> It sounds as if he were trying to justify his surrendering to her money. What he says of Nicole is not true. The fact is that he has been taken "into her hands" just because of his own weakness and not because "there's nothing to be done." I do not intend to say that Dick does not love Nicole at all. But the fact that Dick himself tries to justify his surrendering is certainly an argument against those who defend Dick's real love for Nicole and his willingness to help her as a doctor. If he really loved her he should consider his courtship and marriage a victory, but we have seen that from the beginning of their love affair Dick was divided and if their marriage was a victory for the bon vivant, it was, I repeat, a defeat for the psychiatrist. Critics--like Eugene White, for instance--who want to see Dick

as a kind of Christ who sacrifices himself to save Nicole have forgotten that Dick himself keeps saying: "I only pretend to help everybody,"<sup>32</sup> or "my politeness is a trick of the heart."<sup>33</sup> As Fitzgerald puts it, it is "easier to give a show than to watch one."<sup>34</sup> And when Dick is forced to watch the "show" of Nicole's disease the bon vivant in his inner self is benumbed and his dream is swept away: he is not allowed to enjoy life. Nicole's recurring schizophrenia is a trick of fate: after having given up his profession Dick is compelled to give up his dreamed good life. He tries to be a husband and again a psychiatrist. But as a husband he does not love Nicole sufficiently. As a psychiatrist for a long time he has not believed in his profession. The result, we know, is failure as a bon vivant, a psychiatrist, and a husband as well.

It is interesting to observe the way Nicole, Dick and Rosemary spend money. In a way it is used as a means to escape reality like in The Beautiful and Damned. Nicole, especially adores going shopping. Sometimes we watch Rosemary going with her and they feel it is fun spending money. For Nicole "the mere spending of it, the care of goods, is an absorption in itself."<sup>35</sup> One of the few times we see Nicole feeling really well is when she goes shopping and spends a lot of money: at these times she seems to be her own master. She enjoys buying everything she sees and likes:

With Nicole's help Rosemary bought two dresses and two hats and four pairs of shoes with her money. [Notice that normally Nicole does not help anybody; she needs help, but she is able to help people spend money.] Nicole bought from a great list that ran two pages, and bought the things in the windows besides. Everything she liked that she couldn't possibly use herself, she bought as a present for a friend. She bought colored beads, folding beach cushions, artificial flowers, honey, a guest bed, bags, scarfs, love birds, miniatures for a doll's house and three yards of some new cloth the color of prawns. She bought a dozen bathing suits, a rubber alligator, a travelling chess set of gold and

ivory, big linen handkerchiefs for Abe, two chamois leather jackets of kingfisher and burning bush from Hermes.<sup>36</sup>

As time passes, using money as a means to escape the reality of their disorganized lives becomes a habit. Money becomes a mask behind which they try to hide themselves. Dick himself perceives "a discrepancy between the growing luxury in which they lived, and the need for display which apparently went along with it."<sup>37</sup> Fitzgerald calls the reader's attention to this fake attitude of showing off and escaping through money by pointing out: "The style in which they travelled seemed fabulous."<sup>38</sup>

Regard them, for example, as the train slows up at Boyen where they are to spend a fortnight visiting. The shifting from the wagon-lit has begun at the Italian frontier. The governess's maid and Madam Diver's maid have come up from second class to help with the baggage and dogs. Mlle. Bellois will superintend the hand-luggage, leaving the Sealyhams to one maid and the pair of Pekinese to the other. . . . Presently from the van would be unloaded four wardrobe trunks, a shoe trunk, three hat trunks, and two hat boxes, a chest of servants' trunks, a portable filing-cabinet, a medicine case, a spirit lamp container, a pic-nic set, four tennis rackets in presses and cases, a phonograph, a typewriter. Distributed among the spaces reserved for family and entourage were two dozen supplementary grips, satchels and packages, each one numbered, down to the tag on the cane case . . .

The Divers flocked from the train into the early gathered twilight of the valley. The village people watched the debarkation with an awe akin to that which followed the Italian pilgrimages of Lord Byron a century before.<sup>39</sup>

These people are not able to see what is going on under the rich façade of the Divers. They have an attitude similar to that of Rosemary: she thinks of the Divers' show as "a resting, without realizing that the Divers were as far from relaxing as she was herself."<sup>40</sup>

Fitzgerald's approach to the power derived from money can also be looked at in Tender is the Night. It is obvious that economic power exists in the book. Notice how he describes the



Warren family: "They were an American ducal family without a title--the very name written in a hotel register, signed as an introduction, used in a difficult situation, caused a psychological metamorphosis in people."<sup>41</sup> But when we see this matter through Dick we can observe that sometimes he looks at it sympathetically and sometimes disapprovingly like Amory Blaine in This Side of Paradise.

When Dick is called to free Lady Caroline Sibly-Biers and Mary North (now Countess di Minghetti) from prison, he seems to deal sympathetically with the power of money. As he hears the story of their arrest because they have disguised themselves as sailors to pick up girls, he is torn "between a tendency to ironic laughter and another to order fifty stripes of the cat and a fortnight of bread and water."<sup>42</sup> But when he deals specifically with money and its power in order to negotiate their release, we have fun watching him and he himself seems to derive pleasure from his attitude. (Dick is in conference with the chief of police):

"The Italian Countess is still an American citizen. She is the grand-daughter--" Dick told a string of lies slowly and portentously, "of John D. Rockefeller Mellon. Have you heard of him?"

"Yes, oh heavens, yes. You mistake me for a nobody?"

"In addition she is the niece of Lord Henry Ford and so connected with the Renault and Citroën companies--" He thought he had better stop here. However the sincerity of his voice had begun to affect the officer, so he continued: "To arrest her is just as if you arrested a great royalty of England. It might mean--War!"

"But how about the Englishwoman?"

"I'm coming to that. She is affianced to the brother of the Prince of Wales--the Duke of Buckingham.

"She will be an exquisite bride for him."

"Now we are prepared to give--" Dick calculated quickly, "one thousand francs to each of the girls--and an additional thousand to the father of the 'serious' one. Also two thousand in addition, for you to distribute as you think best--" he shrugged his shoulders,--"among the men who made the arrest, the lodging-house keeper and so forth. I shall hand

you the five thousand and expect you to do the negotiating immediately. Then they can be released on bail on some charge like disturbing the peace, and whatever fine there is will be paid before the magistrate tomorrow--by messenger."

Before the officer spoke Dick saw by his expression that it would be all right. The man said hesitantly, "I have made no entry because they have no Cartes d'Identité. I must see--give me the money."

An hour later Dick and M. Gausse dropped the women by the Majestic Hotel, where Lady Caroline's chauffeur slept in her landaulet.<sup>43</sup>

Certainly the affair would not have been solved so easily if money had not changed hands. Most of the time, however, Dick feels annoyance at the power people draw from money, and their abuse of it. His feeling of repulsion, though, is not so praiseworthy a quality when he defends his own cause. His indignation against Baby's insolent attitude is provoked by her offence to his self-pride. She tells him, for instance: "We own you, and you'll admit it sooner or later. It is absurd to keep up the pretense of independence."<sup>44</sup> It is natural that he must resent such insolence. But at times Dick also demonstrates he is disgusted with this attitude of the rich not only because his own welfare is involved but just because he feels they should not allow themselves such arrogance. To illustrate this attitude, we can refer to what Dick thinks of a Psychiatric Congress to be held in Berlin, a Congress where he does not intend to attend "a single session." He sees the Congress as a commercial transaction where those who retain the biggest economic power accomplish the best business. Dick can imagine it well enough:

. . . the paper by the American who cured dementia praecox by pulling out his patient's teeth or cauterizing their tonsils, the half-derisive respect with which this idea would be greeted, for no other reason than that America was such a rich and powerful country. At first there would be an American cast to the Congress, almost Rotarian in its form and ceremonies, then the closer-knit European vitality would fight through, and finally the Americans would play their trump card, the announcement of colossal gifts and endowments, of great new plants and training schools,

and in the presence of the figures the Europeans would blanch and walk timidly.<sup>45</sup>

Like Amory Blaine Dick seems to be complaining against the fact that most of the time money is the strongest argument in almost any situation. On the other hand, it seems that Fitzgerald's old revolt against the great is present again.

Although Dick disapproves of the arrogant attitudes of the rich, he never hints that shortage of money would be a good thing. Actually, for him lack of money means limitation of action, lack of grace, and even dirtiness. Besides Dick's father's cousins in Virginia who are not able to come North for his father's funeral because of a lack of money, and the people of Dick's father's parishes, there are no clear references to poor people in Tender is the Night. We could say, though, that Franz Gregorovius--a friend with whom Dick runs a clinic for a while--and his wife Kaethe represent the poor in this novel. The way Fitzgerald introduces Franz implies that he resembles the poor: "He seemed to have deliberately chosen the standpoint of a humbler class, a choice typified by his selection of a wife."<sup>46</sup> Fitzgerald's and Dick's opinions about the limitations of lack of money are placed upon the Gregoroviuses.

As Fitzgerald says, "the post-war months [Dick had passed] in France and the lavish liquidations taking place under the aegis of American splendor, had affected Dick's outlook."<sup>47</sup> When one day he dines "with Franz and his bride and a small dog with a smell of burning rubber, in their cottage on the edge of the grounds, he feels vaguely oppressed";<sup>48</sup> again his attitude is similar to that of Amory Blaine:

He felt vaguely oppressed, not by the atmosphere of modest retrenchment, nor by Frau Gregorovius, who might have been prophesied, but by the sudden contracting of horizons to which Franz seemed so reconciled. For him the boundaries of asceticism were differently marked--he could see it as a means to an end, even as a carrying on with a glory it would itself

supply, but it was hard to think of deliberately cutting life down to the scale of an inherited suit. The domestic gestures of Franz and his wife as they turned in a cramped space lacked grace and adventure.<sup>49</sup>

Later on we see the Gregoroviuses talking about the Divers. Kaethe tells Franz she does not like Nicole because when she talks to Nicole she "pulls herself back as if I smelt."<sup>50</sup> Fitzgerald comments:

Kaethe had touched a material truth. She did most of her work herself, and, frugal, she bought few clothes. An American shop-girl, laundering two changes of underwear every night, would have noticed a hint of yesterday's reawakened sweat about Kaethe's person, less a smell than an ammoniacal reminder of the eternity of toil and decay. To Franz this was as natural as the thick dark scent of Kaethe's hair, and he would have missed it equally; but to Nicole, born hating the smell of a nurse's fingers dressing her, it was an offence only to be endured.<sup>51</sup>

From the previous quotation we can gather that for Dick this is an offence too. Fitzgerald's tone implies he pities the Gregoroviuses and he is on the side of the Divers: the poor or the behaviour which resembles that of the poor is like something that smells; Fitzgerald and the Divers want distance from them.

Money as an impotent instrument in the hands of the rich is another variation in the amalgam of Fitzgerald's somehow still ambiguous references to wealth. Dick is able to free Mary North and Sibly-Biers from prison with money, but money is not looked upon as a constant panacea to solve all problems. If we pay attention to Dick and Franz's clinic on the Zurichsee we will see that all the people who are there to receive treatment have enormous funds to support them, but most of the time their money is of no validity at all in helping them with their sickness. For an example we have Señor Pardo y Ciudad Real: despite all his properties in Chile, he feels he cannot solve his son's problem and his behaviour is like that of a child. Fitzgerald describes him: "Noble of carriage, with all the appurtenances of wealth and power, Señor Pardo raged

up and down his Hôtel de Trois Mondes and told the story of his son with no more self-control than a drunken woman."<sup>52</sup>

The impotence of money is not only seen through Señor Pardo y Cuidad Real and his homosexual son. "Throughout this hotel there were many chambers wherein rich ruins lived on the derivatives of opium and barbitol listening eternally as to an inescapable radio, to the coarse melodies of old sins."<sup>53</sup> The novel itself is pervaded with "rich ruins": Abe North is a drunkard, Mr. Dumphy and Campion are homosexuals, Sibly-Biers and Mary North turn out to be lesbians, Tommy Barban is an anarchic mercenary, Albert McKisco--although he improves during the book and is the reverse of Dick--is a corrupt writer. All these people live in a somehow artificial world: they do not really live their lives, they simply pretend to.

In Dick's case, specifically, money is not only impotent to make him successful and happy, but it is also a destructive force. Of course we cannot blame money as the only factor responsible for Dick's failure. As we have seen, his own weakness and Nicole's disease greatly contribute to his nonfulfillment. The tremendous economic power of the Warrens, however, is the main agent of destruction of his entire world. The Warrens conquer him with their money and with the same money Nicole saps all his energies and when she can no longer use him she practically purchases another husband.

Fitzgerald's ambivalence toward money in this novel is increased--the same as the ambivalence in The Great Gatsby--by the fact that most of our conclusions derive from the main character's behaviour and Dick changes during the book. As Fitzgerald says in his general plan for the novel, Dick "is a well-formed rather athletic and fine looking fellow. Also he is very intelligent, widely read--in fact he has all the talents, including especially great personal charm. This is planted in the beginning. He is a superman in possibilities, that is, he appears to be at first sight from a burgeoise point of view. However, he lacks that tensile strength--"<sup>54</sup> And still according to Fitzgerald's sketch the novel actually shows "a natural

idealist, a spoiled priest, giving in for various causes to the ideas of the haute bourgeoisie, and in his rise to the top of the social world losing his idealism, his talent and turning to drink and dissipation."<sup>55</sup> Now one could ask, might Dick react differently to money early and late in the book? Certainly the answer is yes, although we do not exactly know what his reaction at the end is. I have already referred to Dick as a boy watching his father deal with poor parishoners and also Dick as a young doctor sharing a room with Ed Elkins in Vienna. These two events plant in the boy and stir in the romantic young man a secret desire for the privileges of money. We have also seen that Dick is divided and that the romantic young man wins the battle over the idealist. He goes through the road of the Warrens' money but is caught in a kind of trap and even money cannot free him from his plight. So similarly to Gatsby the romantic Dick should have felt de-luded and betrayed by money at the end.

The strongest impression we have about Tender is the Night is that Fitzgerald seems to believe that money is not only an impotent means to happiness but also at times it is an evil force. So, although part of his ambivalence towards money in The Great Gatsby is again present in Tender is the Night, Fitzgerald is not exactly the same as ever. He seems to be more strongly convinced of the destructive force of money. This argument, however, does not allow us to say that he is more anti-money than he was before. It seems ultimately that Fitzgerald feels money is necessary and if it becomes evil and destructive it is because people do not use it with honesty of purpose. Nicole says of herself: "I suppose my grandfather was a crook and I am a crook by heritage."<sup>56</sup> There is no doubt that her father and her sister are dishonest too. Dick has an honest purpose: to enjoy life, but when his weakness permits him to enter the false and base world of the Warrens he gains money but is contaminated by their dishonesty and he loses his virtues and his life is destroyed little by little.

## BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

<sup>1</sup>F. Scott Fitzgerald, Tender is the Night (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1962), p. 3.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 3.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 99.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 40.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 53.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 18.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., p. 19.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., p. 19.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., p. 77.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid., p. 77.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., p. 77.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid., p. 77.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., p. 21.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid., p. 21.

<sup>15</sup>Ibid., p. 201.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid., p. 201.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid., p. 201.

<sup>18</sup>Ibid., p. 201.

<sup>19</sup>Ibid., p. 115.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid., p. 116.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid., p. 116.

<sup>22</sup>Ibid., p. 117.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid., p. 201.

<sup>24</sup>Ibid., p. 55.

- <sup>25</sup> Ibid., p. 153.
- <sup>26</sup> Ibid., p. 135.
- <sup>27</sup> Ibid., p. 154.
- <sup>28</sup> Ibid., p. 157.
- <sup>29</sup> Ibid., p. 156.
- <sup>30</sup> Ibid., p. 156.
- <sup>31</sup> Ibid., p. 84.
- <sup>32</sup> Ibid., p. 84.
- <sup>33</sup> Ibid., p. 164.
- <sup>34</sup> Ibid., p. 89.
- <sup>35</sup> Ibid., p. 257.
- <sup>36</sup> Ibid., p. 54-55.
- <sup>37</sup> Ibid., p. 165.
- <sup>38</sup> Ibid., p. 257.
- <sup>39</sup> Ibid., p. 258.
- <sup>40</sup> Ibid., p. 99.
- <sup>41</sup> Ibid., p. 158.
- <sup>42</sup> Ibid., p. 304.
- <sup>43</sup> Ibid., p. 305-306.
- <sup>44</sup> Ibid., p. 177.
- <sup>48</sup> Ibid., p. 132.
- <sup>49</sup> Ibid., p. 132-133.
- <sup>50</sup> Ibid., p. 240.
- <sup>51</sup> Ibid., p. 240.
- <sup>52</sup> Ibid., p. 243.



<sup>53</sup> Ibid., p. 248.

<sup>54</sup> Arthur Mizener, The Far Side of Paradise (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, Sentry Edition, 1965), pp.347-8.

<sup>55</sup> Ibid., p. 343.

<sup>56</sup> Fitzgerald, op. cit., p. 292.

ECONOMIC RELATIONSHIPS IN THE LAST TYCOON

If Tender is the Night did not satisfy Fitzgerald's desire of changing to a different theme from the possession or lack of money, The Last Tycoon seems to have done so. In his last novel Fitzgerald leaves behind his wild luxuriant parties, the nights that were not tender around clinics full of rich ruins, the heavy drinking bouts, and he directs his attention to Hollywood people. In this new environment he deals with hard working people who are not interested in spending their money or being bon vivants like most of the rich characters in his previous novels. In The Last Tycoon we meet persons who are interested in their work and who use work as a means of making money and winning power. Monroe Stahr, as his surname implies, plays the leading role in this new milieu. The way Stahr behaves and his personal way of trying to get more and more power through his intelligent work is what makes The Last Tycoon a novel nearly totally different from Fitzgerald's anterior ones. Stahr searches for a sense of grandeur in everything he touches. Owner of a brilliant imagination, he becomes rich; wealth, in its turn provides him with power. Thus, money itself is not the aim but a means toward power within his business world, a big movie company in Hollywood. Yet, though secondarily, money has its importance in the novel, and, indirectly, Fitzgerald broods for the last time over economic complications. At times, Stahr's sense of grandeur becomes debased and meets Brady's meanness and malice; then Fitzgerald allows us to observe not only the haughty rivalry for power among rich members of the movie company, but also their arrogance--supported by their money--and their unscrupulous use of other people. This chapter concentrates on this secondary theme; besides this, it will also be observed that although money provides

the rich with power, it is again definitely impotent--as it is in The Great Gatsby and Tender is the Night--to provide them with fulfillment in life.

From the very beginning of the novel it becomes quite evident that Fitzgerald is trying to understand Hollywood. Through Cecilia, who--like Nick Carraway--plays a secondary role in the novel, Fitzgerald alerts the reader:

You can take Hollywood for granted like I did, or you can dismiss it with the contempt we reserve for what we don't understand. It can be understood too, but only dimly and in flashes. Not half a dozen men have been able to keep the whole equation of pictures in their heads. And perhaps the closest man can come to the set-up is to try and understand one of those men.<sup>1</sup>

As the novel starts Cecilia is in a plane coming from her College at Bennington to Hollywood for vacation. She is the daughter of Pat Brady, Stahr's partner in the movie company. From Cecilia's first talk with Wylie White, a hired writer of the company, we hear Fitzgerald's first hints about the arrogance and self-importance of Hollywood people whose high social status and power are supported by material wealth. Monroe Stahr, disguised under the name "Mr. Smith," is occupying the special compartment of the plane, the "bridal suite." In fact, Stahr is a privileged man, but his occupying this special place, detached from the rest of the passengers, seems to imply that those who have a certain importance in Hollywood tend to regard themselves as special people and better than everybody else. Fitzgerald observes such attitudes from outside and Wylie's and Cecilia's talk about Wylie's first meeting in Hollywood sheds the first light on the behaviour of the people who live in this part of the world:

'It [Hollywood] is a good place for toughies, but I went there from Savannah, Georgia. I went to a garden party the first day. My host shook hands and left me. It was all there--the swimming pool, green moss at two dollars an inch, beautiful felines having drinks and fun--

'--And nobody spoke to me. Not a soul. I spoke to half a dozen people but they didn't answer. That

continued for an hour, two hours--then I got up from where I was sitting and ran out at a dog trot like a crazy man. I didn't feel I had any rightful identity until I got back to the hotel and the clerk handed me a letter addressed to me in my name.'

Naturally I [Cecilia] hadn't ever had such an experience, but looking back on parties I'd been to, I realized that such things could happen. We don't go for strangers in Hollywood unless they wear a sign saying that their axe has been thoroughly ground elsewhere, and that in any case it's not going to fall on our necks--in other words, unless they are<sup>2</sup> a celebrity. And they'd better lock out even then.

Cecilia has not had such an experience because she is the daughter of a rich Hollywood man and this is enough to call other people's attention to her. We can remember, as an example, the scene when Wylie introduces Schwartz to Cecilia:

'Miss Brady--Mr. Schwartz,' said Wylie White.

'He's a great friend of your father's, too.'

Mr. Schwartz nodded so vehemently that I could almost hear him saying: 'It's true. As God is my judge, it's true!'<sup>3</sup>

What Wylie tells Cecilia later on is perfectly true:

"You've got a great card Celia--your evaluation of yourself. Do you think anybody would look at you if you weren't Pat Brady's daughter?"<sup>4</sup>

An important facet of Hollywood that Fitzgerald observes is the way the tycoons use people to make money for them and, when they are no longer useful to their purposes, throw them out and leave them in the gutter.

They never did anything for people like Martha, who had made them so much money at one time. They let them slip away into misery eked out with extra work--it would have been kinder to slip them out of town.<sup>5</sup>

By the last statement we can perceive that Fitzgerald enters the novel now and disapproves of the movie industry captains. There are several other cases like Martha's: "'Old' Johnny Swanson had been as big in pictures as Tom Mix or Bill Hart--now it was too sad to speak to him."<sup>6</sup> Manny Schwartz is another ruin; he "was the head of some combine once--First

National? Paramount? United Artists? Now he's down and out," Wylie White says.<sup>7</sup> Manny Schwartz indirectly complains of his present situation: "Once upon a time when I was in the big money, I had a daughter--a beautiful daughter."<sup>8</sup> Now he feels he has lost everything he once owned; he ends up committing suicide, and this way he proves Hollywood has ruined him completely.

Stahr is the head of this world. Talking to the married couple of writers, the Tarletons, Stahr himself admits that "the system was a shame, gross, commercial, to be deplored."<sup>9</sup> But, as Fitzgerald points out, Stahr does not say that he had originated the system. Thus, although the first and strongest impression Stahr arouses in the reader is a sympathetic one, we can certainly observe many faults and imperfections in this man who seems to consider himself perfect. As a whole he is a man of merit, for he is competent and does what he believes in, but, like Jay Gatsby, his purity of intention is stained by his using his talent and money only to achieve his own dream. It is true that by making his dream reality, his employees and art itself would improve, but Stahr's fault remains in that his goal is his own dream, his own satisfaction, and not the consequences of the accomplishment of his dream, that is, his employee's welfare and the improvement of the movie art. Even Stahr's attitude which follows the scene when he meets a Negro man on the beach who reads Emerson and hates the movies because--he thinks--they are junk, does not make clear that he wants to improve his movies just for the love of art. It seems to me that what Stahr really wants is to gain this man's approval and praise and in this way become more respected in his own eyes and feel himself more powerful. Thus, I cannot completely agree with Fitzgerald when he says that "Stahr was an artist only, as Lincoln was a general." We can perfectly agree that Stahr is an artist too, but it is obvious he is not an artist only; at least, he is not concerned uniquely with art. Stahr calls himself "a merchant,"<sup>10</sup>

"a rich dope,"<sup>11</sup> "the only sound nut in a hatful of cracked ones."<sup>12</sup>

I should observe again that Stahr certainly has a great talent and he knows how to deal with his business in an intelligent and remarkable way. As Fitzgerald says, it is perfectly true that Stahr "was a marker in industry (sic) like Edison and Lumière and Griffith and Chaplin. He led pictures way up past the range and power of the theater, reaching a sort of golden age before the censorship."<sup>13</sup> But, not only like Gatsby but somewhat egotistically like Tom Buchanan and Baby Warren, Monroe Stahr uses his talent and money only to achieve his own goal: to be the best movie man in Hollywood. He applies his money to what he believes is good for him, the same way as he protects his employees only while they are useful tools in his hands, or the same as he tries to improve his movies because this will make him an even more powerful captain of industry.

This point of view of mine can be challenged and rejected if we interpret Stahr's desire to produce "a quality picture" which would lose some money as a proof of his desire to produce and protect real art. I do not believe, however, that Stahr wants to produce such a film just because he trusts more in art than in money or in his own position as the best man in Hollywood. The same way, I do not believe that Stahr wants only to protect his employees when he has a rough falling-out with Brady near the end of the novel because of a cut in the employees' payment. The fact is that Stahr thinks he himself "must be right always, not most of the time, but always--or the structure would melt down like gradual butter."<sup>14</sup> His will is always above everything else. So it seems he is not defending his employees or protecting art but the righteousness of his own unchangeable point of view. As an instance, once he tells a group of supervisors and directors he does not want them to produce a certain picture any longer; the reason is that they have slightly changed the story Stahr

had bought and the girl who plays the main role in the picture is no longer the one Stahr would like to see in the picture. He makes it very clear that the directors are to respect his will and not the public's. Fitzgerald describes Stahr's self-confidence:

Pacing the floor swiftly, Stahr began. In the first place he wanted to tell them--[the directors] --what kind of girl she was--what kind of girl he approved of here. She was a perfect girl with a few small faults as in the play, but a perfect girl not because the public wanted her that way but because it was the kind of girl that he, Stahr, liked to see in this sort of picture. Was that clear?<sup>15</sup>

Now, I ask, does he really want to produce a quality film with the only aim of protecting art? It seems his desire to produce such a picture is simply one more demonstration of the imposition of his own point of view which is greatly supported by his economic power.

If we watch Stahr in a restaurant arguing with the communist party member Brimmer, we will learn something else about Stahr; under the effect of a little alcohol he reveals part of his egotistic and ambitious and snobbish self. It also reveals the part money plays in his personal psychology:

Stahr ordered a whiskey and soda and, almost immediately, another. He ate nothing but a few spoonfuls of soup and he said all the awful things about everybody being lazy so-and-so's and none of it mattered to him because he had lots of money. I [Cecilia] think that Stahr realized that it sounded pretty ugly outside of the proper company--maybe he had never heard how it sounded before. Anyhow he shut up and he drank off a cup of black coffee. I loved him, and what he said didn't change that, but I hated Brimmer to carry off this impression. I wanted him to see Stahr as a sort of technological virtuoso, and here Stahr had been playing the wicked overseer to a point he would have called trash if he had watched it on the screen.<sup>16</sup>

The whole story is narrated through Cecilia and the picture we get of Stahr is one taken by a woman who is in love with him. It seems she does not want the reader to carry off any unfavorable impression of Stahr. But even Cecilia cannot

help pointing out some of his faults, so it is quite clear that he is not only the technological virtuoso Cecilia perceives him to be. Stahr is also greatly concerned with what he can do with all the money he possesses. Despite his apparent purity of intention, he believes, for instance, that the brains of the writers belong to him; the reason for this belief is that he has gotten money enough to pay for them, which also allows him to believe that he has the right to use these writers as he pleases. For Stahr, writers or people in general, like everything else in the company, are "a question of merchandise." "I want to buy what's in your head,"<sup>17</sup> he tells one of the company's writers. "When I want to do a Eugene O'Neill play, I'll buy one,"<sup>18</sup> he tells a group of professional people in the studios, reproaching them because they had changed his original story. We can see Stahr seems to be very proud of being able to buy everything he wants, and from this economic power he seems to derive moral strength to impose himself as a leader and be respected by the people he commands.

It is true that Stahr is humane, too, with some Hollywood people like Pete Zavras and a desperate actor named Mr. Roderiguez. I would say, however, that Stahr's sympathetic treatment of these people goes together with his brilliant ability to manage his business and it is also a question of merchandise, especially in Mr. Roderiguez' case, for he has been making lots of money for the company. Stahr's dialogue with Roderiguez reveals this fact clearly: "Have you seen "Variety"?" Stahr asks him. "Your picture's held over at Roxi's and did thirty-seven thousand in Chicago last week."<sup>19</sup> Besides the fact that Stahr likes to be appreciated by giving Roderiguez attention, this actor and his work stand for excellent merchandise. He is very useful to Stahr as a piece or gear in his industrial machine, but as soon as he stops being useful he will probably be discarded the same way as Schwartz, Swanson, Martha Dodd, Evelyn Brent, and others were. As for Pete



Zavras, he seems to be introduced in the novel not to prove Stahr's magnanimity but as a literary device to meet the demands of the plot. Two years after having been used by the studios, Zavras tries to commit suicide by leaping from one of the buildings of the movie company. He does not die and Stahr treats him in a friendly way and helps him. According to Fitzgerald's sketch, because of this gesture of Stahr, Zavras will save him from being murdered by someone influenced by Brady as the novel comes to its end.

Whether it is only for self-pride and self-satisfaction or not, Stahr really wants to produce a quality film, and whether or not it is true that it will lose money, the simple fact that Stahr mentions such a possibility is enough to throw Pat Brady against him. Brady seems to be the kind of man who would not do anything in the company without thinking first of the profit he would get. Unfortunately Fitzgerald died just as he finished writing the sixth chapter of The Last Tycoon and he left us an incomplete novel. We know the rest of the story only through Edmund Wilson, who first edited the book "from Fitzgerald's notes and outlines and from the reports of persons with whom he discussed his work."<sup>20</sup> What should attract our attention is the fact that the implications with money should increase from the middle to the end of the novel. Stahr's and Brady's deaths are greatly determined by economic complications.

I have already referred to Stahr's meeting with Brimmer, the Communist Party member. The meeting takes place at the very end of the last chapter Fitzgerald wrote. Soon after this interview, the synopsis of the rest of the story reveals, Stahr makes a trip East to solve recent economic problems:

A wage-cut has been threatened in the studio, and Stahr has gone to talk to the stockholders—presumably with the idea of inducing them to retrench in some other way. He and Brady had long been working at cross-purposes, and the struggle between them for the control of the company is rapidly coming to a climax . . .<sup>21</sup>

Brady fights for money itself, Stahr struggles to keep his old position as the true and more powerful captain of the industry. This confirms that Stahr is not entirely for money, but for power and control; still, money is very important in the whole process. It seems that it would be around this matter that nearly all the rest of the story would turn.

It is at this stage of the novel that Brady and Stahr had a violent falling-out and their fight goes on openly. Through Cecilia, Brady comes to know that Stahr has been seeing Kathleen--(the girl who resembles his wife)--again. Kathleen's husband is a technician in the studio and Brady, playing upon his jealousy, throws him against Stahr, who might possibly be killed by this man. The synopsis of the remaining story goes this way:

Stahr must stand up to Brady, who he knows will stop at nothing. He evidently fears Brady will murder him, for he now decides to resort to Brady's own methods and get his partner murdered. For this he goes straight to the gangsters. It is not clear how the murder is to be accomplished; but in order to be away at the time, Stahr arranges a trip to New York. He sees Kathleen for the last time at the airport, and also meets Cecilia, who is going back to college in a different plane. On the plane he has a reaction of disgust against the course he has taken; he realizes that he has let himself be degraded to the same plane of brutality as Brady. He decides to call off the murder and intends to wire orders as soon as the plane descends at the next airport. But the plane has an accident and crashes before they reach the next stop. Stahr is killed and the murder goes through. The ominous suicide of Schwartz in the opening chapter is thus balanced by the death of Stahr.<sup>22</sup>

The whole drama is strongly influenced by economic reasons. The haughty rivalry among the rich which had already played a destructive role in The Great Gatsby, is also one of the primary reasons responsible for Stahr's and Brady's tragedy. Money remains subtly under the structure of the entire novel.

While some critics could possibly say that Stahr has lost

all his energies to improve the movie industry, I would not deny their statement, but I would add that his weakening and death has a stronger basis on his preoccupation with his personal success as the richest and most powerful aristocrat in the movies. Although at a first glance it seems that Stahr is not much concerned with money and its advantages, privileges and the status it gives, his relationship with Kathleen is another fact that can reveal--as does his already mentioned meeting with Brimmer--that Stahr actually worries about his position as a moneyed aristocrat. Like Anthony Patch, Gloria or Rosalind, he believes in an aristocracy of money and this is certainly the reason for his not taking Kathleen as part of his life forever. As Edmund Wilson puts it, Fitzgerald had implied in his sketch that Kathleen is "poor, unfortunate, and tagged with a middle-class exterior which does not fit in with the grandeur Stahr demands of life."<sup>23</sup> So he can love her only while he sees her as the physical image of his dead wife, whom he adored, but when he thinks of Kathleen as a woman with no social background, he feels he no longer can accept her.

One last aspect to be looked at in this novel is the impotence of money to provide the rich with an actually joyful life. Though not so evidently and not so strongly as Tender is the Night, The Last Tycoon is also a novel pervaded with worried, tired, sick, and dissatisfied people. Stahr's work has worn him out completely, and if his plane had not crashed he would have died soon anyhow. Cecilia breaks down and develops tuberculosis as a result of Stahr's accident and her father's murder; she puts her story together in a sanatorium. One of the secondary employees in the studio, Jane Meloney--a little blonde writer of fifty, has "ulcers of the stomach," although "her salary is over a hundred thousand a year." And Fitzgerald adds: "A complicated treatise could be written on whether she was 'worth it' or more than that or nothing at all."<sup>24</sup> Mr. Roderiguez is the best of all the examples. He is a successful actor and his pictures are making him and the

company high profits. In spite of his material success the actor is desperate and seeks for spiritual comfort. It seems he has been sexually impotent for six weeks and he is ashamed with his wife:

'She's been a good sport about it, but I am ashamed. I think "Rainy Day" grossed twenty-five thousand in Des Moines and broke all records in Kansas City. My fan mail's way up, and there I am afraid to go home at night, afraid to go to bed.'<sup>25</sup>

Here again we have a double image of a Fitzgerald character. This double view--one true, the other false--has already been noticed in The Great Gatsby and in Tender is the Night. Those who look at Mr. Roderiguez from outside, his fan club, see him as a happy rich man who has achieved complete success. From what they can observe, they understand Mr. Roderiguez's life is a paradise of bliss and they envy his position, his success and his money. The reader, on the other hand, who sees what goes on in the inner self of this desperate actor, can only be depressed. If Mr. Roderiguez, together with Brady, and, to a certain extent, with Stahr, thought money was the best means to achieve happiness, the book demonstrates that money has not played the role they expected it to play.

As I have already mentioned, although the economic theme is no longer the main concern of Fitzgerald, it is still quite important. While Fitzgerald still wonders about this theme he seems to be suggesting that happiness depends on satisfaction through work or on artistic fulfillment or something other than money. Money and the lack of it, however, persist in spoiling this satisfaction and fulfillment. Even without knowing whether or not The Last Tycoon would be the best or the worst of Fitzgerald's books, I can affirm from what he left that this novel conveys once more his belief that an excess of money or the excessive pursuit of economic power can sometimes be nearly as bad as total lack of economic support. Both ruin people. Again, money and lack of it play a tragic role. The two extremes seem to meet; misfortune and disgrace

make the very poor and the very rich similar people: they share, at the end of their lives, a destiny of dissatisfaction and ruin. As the novel closes we cannot decide whether we feel more sorrow for Schwartz, Zavras, Martha and the other sad "discarded flowers," or for the moneyed Roderiguez, Brady and Stahr.

## BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

<sup>1</sup>F. Scott Fitzgerald, The Last Tycoon (Great Britain: Penguin Books, Hazell Watson & Viney Ltd., 1974), pp. 5-6.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., pp. 14-15.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 9.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 83.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 123.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 27.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., p. 14.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., p. 12.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., p. 72.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid., p. 21.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., p. 127.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid., p. 24.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., p. 35.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid., p. 70.

<sup>15</sup>Ibid., p. 50.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid., p. 150.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid., p. 21.

<sup>18</sup>Ibid., p. 49.

<sup>19</sup>Ibid., p. 42.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid., p. 154.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid.

<sup>22</sup>Ibid., pp. 158-159.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid., p. 157.

<sup>24</sup>Ibid., p. 45.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid., p. 44.

## CONCLUSION

From what we have said about F. Scott Fitzgerald's five novels it becomes clear that his attitude toward money, or toward the very rich and the very poor, is not exactly the same from the beginning to the end of his literary life. Yet, some of Fitzgerald's ambivalent and even contradictory attitudes toward this matter are constant throughout his five novels. Despite his optimism toward life in general, it can be said that as a whole Fitzgerald's novels seem to convey the feeling that life is a cheat most of the time, and for those who have no riches life is actually unendurable. As for the rich, Fitzgerald understands that "they are a race apart with a better seat in life's grandstand, that their existence is somehow more beautiful and intense than that of ordinary mortals. Barricaded behind their fortunes, they seem to him almost like royalty."<sup>1</sup> But, on the other hand, Fitzgerald feels the rich are corrupt and he cannot trust their power, and he notices that even their material wealth cannot free them from disorder, adversity, suffering and failure.

What subtly suggests Fitzgerald's disappointment with the rich is his attempt to move to another subject than the rich in his last two novels. But, as it has already been implied previously in this thesis, his transition was not wholly successful, for both Tender is the Night and The Last Tycoon are again permeated with economic complications. It is possible that he felt the problem of having and not having money so deeply in his own person that he was never able to leave this subject behind and, although trying to move away from it, he kept writing about it until his very last day in a constant attempt to understand the role money plays in man's life.

Amory Blaine portray's Fitzgerald's early belief that money would be the right key to an earthly paradise. Amory

does not approve of many of the attitudes of the rich but his hatred against the poor is stronger than his disapproval of the rich and he implies that only money could save the poor. As for his own well-being, it is quite clear that he thinks all his dreams could be accomplished if he had only gotten enough money. When we meet the heroes of Fitzgerald's second novel only a step from a big fortune, it seems we are going to read the story of a young, rich couple who are going to show us the paradise Amory dreamed of. Their thirst for money is not allowed to be quenched yet because the money they want takes too long to come. As the novel closes we have the feeling that Anthony and Gloria were ruined mainly because of their impecuniousness. What happens to them in economic terms is what would have happened to Amory and Rosalind if they had gotten married. Thus, at the end of Fitzgerald's second novel we still have good reasons to understand that if his heroes had become rich at the very beginning of their marriage they would not have ended up so tragically. Yet, we could also gather that Fitzgerald was suggesting that the mere proximity to a great quantity of money had functioned as a catalytic element strong enough to corrupt Anthony and Gloria.

Then, as we finish reading Fitzgerald's third novel and we see that both the rich and the poor have been doomed, we get a little less confused about his actual attitude toward money though--as was said in the chapter on The Great Gatsby--we do not know whether Fitzgerald is being a cynic, a snob or a moralist. There is something very clear, however: money has not played the role Amory/Rosalind and Anthony/Gloria had hoped it to play, and the true character of the rich has been disclosed: Tom and Daisy are damned shams; and as Gatsby tries to imitate them, he becomes one of them too. Besides being fakes, they use their wealth to destroy one another and this way money leads to hell instead of paradise.

Fitzgerald's fourth novel, Tender is the Night, serves to confirm that he understands money is an evil force. Dick



Diver is in part corrupted and destroyed by the wealthy. On the other hand, despite the destiny of Dick and the other ruins in this novel--and here we return to an ambivalent and somewhat contradictory Fitzgerald--money itself is not what causes the disasters of human life. Dick himself is too weak and in a way he himself is responsible for his own downfall. It seems Fitzgerald believes that a successful person should always spend money freely, but if we go back over his five novels we see that none of his spenders are completely happy and we conclude that Fitzgerald also conveys that the pleasure of spending money should not be the most important thing in a man's life. As he wrote his daughter at the end of his life, "the redeeming things in life are not 'happiness and pleasure' but the deeper satisfactions that come out of struggle."

In his last novel Fitzgerald turns to working people and he seems to intend to observe whether they can be redeemed or not by work and artistic fulfillment. He seems to suggest the earthly paradise that Amory, Anthony, Gatsby and Dick had looked for does not really exist, and freedom with money is important but only work and artistic fulfillment can provide man satisfaction. Then, one could ask, why was Monroe Stahr not a completely successful and happy man? I would say that his problem was again the craving for economic power: his satisfaction was not his work itself nor his artistic fulfillment, but the power he would derive from the money his artistic talent would bring him. It seems the same happened to Fitzgerald as a writer: if he had loved his art more and loved less the money he wanted his art to give him, his days would have been happier and his literary production better.

## BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

<sup>1</sup> Andrew Turnbull, Scott Fitzgerald (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1962), p. 150.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Eble, Kenneth E. F. Scott Fitzgerald. New Haven, Conn.: Twayne Publishers, Inc., 1963.
- Fitzgerald, F. Scott. The Crack Up. New York: New Directions, 1945.
- \_\_\_\_\_. This Side of Paradise. Great Britain: Penguin Books, Cox & Wyman Ltd., 1974.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Beautiful and Damned. Great Britain: Penguin Books, Hazell Watson & Viney Ltd., 1973.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Great Gatsby. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Tender is the Night. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1962.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Last Tycoon. Great Britain: Penguin Books, Hazell Watson & Viney Ltd., 1974.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Bernice Bobs Her Hair and Other Stories. Great Britain: Penguin Books, C. Nicholls & Company Ltd., 1974.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Lost Decade and Other Stories. Great Britain: Penguin Books, C. Nicholls & Company Ltd., 1975.
- Lahood, Marvin J. Tender is the Night: Essays in Criticism. Indiana University Press, 1969.
- Perosa, Sergio. The Art of F. Scott Fitzgerald. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1965.
- Bradley, Beaty, Long & Perkins. The American Tradition in Literature. Fourth Edition. Grosset & Dunlap, distributed by W. W. Norton & Company, Inc.
- Mizener, Arthur. The Far Side of Paradise. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, Sentry Edition, 1966.
- O'Connor, William Van. Seven Modern American Novelists. New York: The New American Company, 1968.
- Turnbull, Andrew. Scott Fitzgerald. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1952.

Turnbull, Andrew. The Letters of F. Scott Fitzgerald. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1963.

Twentieth Century Views: F. Scott Fitzgerald, A Collection of Critical Essays. Ed. Arthur Mizener. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963.

Cunliffe, Marcus. The Literature of the United States. England: Penguin Books Ltd., 1971.

James, Henry. The American. New York and Scarborough, Ontario: New American Library.

Foster, E. M. Aspects of the Novel. England: Penguin Books, Hazell Watson & Viney Ltd., 1970.

DeNovo, John A. Selected Readings in American History. Vol. II, Chapter 10. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1969. Pp. 295-329.