

Florida State University Libraries

Electronic Theses, Treatises and Dissertations

The Graduate School

2006

Ayn Rand's Heroes: Between and Beyond Good and Evil

Robert L. Powell II



THE FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

**AYN RAND'S HEROES: BETWEEN AND
BEYOND GOOD AND EVIL**

By

Robert L. Powell II

A Dissertation submitted to the
Department of English
in partial Fulfillment of the
requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Degree Awarded:
Fall Semester, 2006

The members of the Committee approve the dissertation of Robert L. Powell defended on October 30, 2006.

Douglas Fowler
Professor Directing Dissertation

William Cloonan
Outside Committee Member

Caroline "Kay" Picart
Committee Member

John Fenstermaker
Committee Member

Approved:

Name of Department Chair, Department of English

Name of Dean, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences

The Office of Graduate Studies has verified and approved the above named committee members.

Dedicated to my lifelong mentor, teacher and friend.
To my grandfather, the late Dr. C.E. Walker, who saved my
life and helped to instill three things within me which
no man can ever take away—knowledge, wisdom
and courage.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In Ayn Rand's postscript at the end of her novel, **Atlas Shrugged**, she claimed that no one helped her towards success in her life achievements. In no way does the same hold true for me. First and foremost, I would like to thank God for giving me the talents and abilities that I do have. A heartfelt and profound thank you goes out to Dr. Douglas Fowler and Dr. Stephen Armstrong, true friends and mentors to me in every sense of the words. I would also like to thank Dr. Caroline "Kay" Picart, Dr. William Cloonan and Dr. John Fenstermaker for agreeing to serve on my committee and for all their professional help and guidance. A grateful word of acknowledgement goes out to the Florida State University School of Arts and Sciences for its English Teaching Assistant Summer Stipends. Without the stipend I received in the Summer of 2005, this timely completion of my dissertation would not have been possible. I would also like to thank my mother, Dr. Deidre D. Powell and the love of my life, Felicia A. Storey for their love, motivation and inspiration.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| Abstract..... | vi |
| PREMISE/INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| 1. <i>THE FOUNTAINHEAD</i> AS ART AND ROMANTIC LITERATURE..... | 9 |
| 2. <i>THE FOUNTAINHEAD</i> AS PHILOSOPHICAL LITERATURE: EXISTENTIALISM AND MARXISM..... | 56 |
| 3. <i>THE FOUNTAINHEAD</i> AS POLITICAL LITERATURE: AYN RAND'S OBJECTIVISM vs. GEORGE ORWELL'S SKEPTICISM..... | 85 |
| 4. FRIEDRICH NIETZSCHE'S SUPERMAN IN AYN RAND'S HEROES. <i>THE FOUNTAINHEAD'S</i> TRUE HERO: GAIL WYNAND-- <i>THE FOUNTAINHEAD'S</i> TRUE VILLAIN: DOMINIQUE FRANCON..... | 116 |
| 5. RAND'S LITERARY LEGACY: WRITERS POSSIBLY INFLUENCED BY RAND'S FICTION..... | 158 |
| 6. THE AMERICAN DREAM OF SUCCESS, WEALTH AND EXCESS: THE RANDIAN HERO IN TWENTIETH CENTURY BRITISH AND AMERICAN LITERATURE..... | 194 |
| 7. GREED IS GOOD: THE RANDIAN HERO IN POP CULTURE..... | 230 |
| CONCLUSION..... | 251 |
| NOTES..... | 255 |
| WORKS CITED..... | 283 |
| BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH..... | 301 |

ABSTRACT

This comparative study examines Ayn Rand's fiction in relation to Twentieth century literature and culture. Despite its linguistic potential, **The Fountainhead** is not good art and does not represent romantic fiction in the tradition of Victor Hugo or Johann Wolfgang von Goethe. Artistically speaking, it truly represents Rand's own reactionary type of prose which rebels against literary movements she hated such as naturalism and modernism.

In bringing the Russian tradition of ideological fiction to America, Rand's philosophy of Objectivism is really a right-wing form of Existentialism. This philosophy was originated in fiction by Rand's beloved Fyodor Dostoevsky. Many ideas of her fiction are similar to Marxism.

Ayn Rand and George Orwell both endured shocking life experiences which shaped their ideas and fiction. Where Rand learned anti-communism and extreme capitalism, George Orwell learned skepticism. Rand's most skeptical heroes, Gail Wynand, Dominique Francon, Dagny Taggart and Hank Rearden are the most realistic and interesting of her canon.

Rand's **The Fountainhead** is a blend of Friedrich Nietzsche's philosophy of the Superman and the typical American capitalist hero. In the tradition of Theodore Dreiser's Cowperwood trilogy, Gail Wynand, her most Nietzschean character, is Rand's true hero and Dominique is her true villain. **The Fountainhead** and **Atlas Shrugged** don't fit easily into any specific literary genres. Therefore, popular writers, such as Mickey Spillane and Edna Ferber may have been influenced by Rand. Furthermore, similar tendencies of Rand's work can also be seen in choice literature novels of Simone deBeauvoir, Toni Morrison and Joyce Carol Oates.

As a novel of capitalist heroes, **The Fountainhead** sits among an unappreciated group of works by the literary establishment which should be understood, if not embraced. The 1943 work portrays capitalist heroes such as Mark Twain's Hank Morgan and Jack London's Burning Daylight without their loveable 'common man' aspect. Rand's capitalists are rebel anti-heroes with the American idea, that, in pursuit of their excessive selfish desires-- the sky's the limit.

Randian heroes—anti-heroes of productive work, have continually re-emerged in American Popular Culture. Rand's fiction is popular because it's entertaining soap opera trash that Americans love. Loveable common man tycoons such as Bill Gates and Sam Walton have turned into the anti-heroic Don King and Ken Lay. Anti-heroic icons such as J.R. Ewing of **Dallas** and Gordon Gekko of the film **Wall Street**, in the Randian tradition, show us the ugly but true side of American capitalist culture that is important for us to expose, admit and examine.

PREMISE/INTRODUCTION

Throughout this study, I aim to examine how alternate versions of Ayn Rand's heroes continually re-emerge throughout Twentieth Century British and American literature and pop culture and ponder the possible implications of that emergence. I will also compare and contrast key characters and ideas in **The Fountainhead** with those of contemporary literature and pop culture to show how the content of Rand's novel is artistically, politically and philosophically similar in construction but different in *stance* to typical twentieth century literary tendencies in both the United Kingdom and the United States. Furthermore, I hope to show how Rand's work opposes the typical literature and pop culture theme "excess causes downfall" to demonstrate an unpopular but accurate side of the American imagination—we all want to strive for some version of the success, wealth and excess-- or greed. Perhaps we all strive to be like Ronald Reagan and the robber-barons of Enron, Jay Gatsby and George W. Bush—all modern day versions of Ayn Rand's heroes who are incarnations of the "American" dream. The self-enlargement of this hero is a dark but spellbinding super-nova at the center of the American firmament.

Rand's work carries on literary traditions of nineteenth century Europe. Her work shows the influence of French and German romanticism and Russian philosophical literature. According to Gene H. Bell-Villada, "Along with her Nietzsche-through-Russian eyes, Rand poured her potent American brew into a very Russian vessel: the novel of ideas. The grand debates that breathe life into **The Brothers Karamazov** have long moved and excited many a college youth, and Rand indeed acknowledged in Dostoevsky a kindred literary [if not philosophic] spirit."¹

Most great works of literature, such as Ford Madox Ford's **The Good Soldier**, J.D. Salinger's **The Catcher in the Rye** and John Steinbeck's **In Dubious Battle** teach the reader and relate the work to real life with mostly pessimistic portrayals and narrative. Rand constructs these same types of traditions in her fiction but instead of teaching, she preaches to the reader to strive to achieve exaggerated positions of greatness with extremely optimistic portrayals and narrative. Artists like Ford, Salinger and Steinbeck are skeptical while Rand is empowering. When discussing the nature of literary art, Rand states, "art does not teach--it shows, it displays the full concretized reality of the final goal."² Therefore, what Rand shows us with her "characters as ideas" is more important than what we learn from either the story itself or the way

it is told. “Lovers of Rand fiction . . . admire the work for its contents, not its art.”³

In stating the purpose of her novels, Rand goes on to say:

The motive and purpose of my writing is the projection of an ideal man. The portrayal of a moral ideal, as my ultimate literary goal, as an end in itself—to which any didactic, intellectual or philosophical values contained in a novel are only the means. . . My purpose, first cause and prime mover is the portrayal of Howard Roark or John Galt or Hank Rearden or Francisco d’Anconia as an end in himself—not as a means to any further end. Which, incidentally, is the greatest value I could ever offer a reader (**The Romantic Manifesto** 162).

Although these portrayed ideals are too extreme, Rand’s heroic Nietzschean idea of “greatness in man” is beneficial in that, if taken in moderation, this optimistic hope can motivate us to strive for success and happiness as the heroes of our own lives. Since 1943, alternate versions of the Randian hero continue to emerge in both twentieth century literature and pop culture.

Rand’s fiction, portrayed through her rebellious heroes, is bothersome, controversial and nerve striking because it represents the noisy, industrialized and unnatural city aspect of the American imagination. The American Eden is furnished within primeval forests and virgin landscapes and perhaps a noble savage or two; it is, of course an outdoor affair and powered by God’s own green photosynthesis. We never even adjusted ourselves to Henry Ford’s engine, much less the soiling money and machinery of Wall Street and Hollywood. In the American imagination, the spare, bare quietism of Henry Thoreau is everywhere preferred to the mansions of the money changers. The Randian hero is neither lovable, ‘heart of gold’ nor common everyman who embraces nature and the ‘goody-goody’ country existence. The American imagination prefers its heroes to be at least mildly sugar coated with good morals, religious convictions and a likeable character. Rand’s heroes bluntly challenge all these aspects of the American establishment.

In defining the Randian hero, it is a mixture of two specific archetypes—the rogue hero and the independent egotist. In their book **Popular Culture: An Introductory Text**, Jack Nachbar and Kevin Lause give four categories to pop culture heroes—citizen hero, rogue hero, citizen celebrity and rogue celebrity. They define the rogue hero as, “those who represent the beliefs and values associated with individual freedom—with the need to challenge the mainstream

when its powerful currents threaten to wash away minority rights in favor of majority rules” (316). All four of these heroes maintain key similarities and differences. Nachbar and Lause categorize former President Ronald Reagan as a citizen-hero and just like Rand’s Howard Roark, he was eternally optimistic and eternally youthful (319). Optimism is a key element of both Rand’s and nearly all pop culture [Movies/T.V./Video Games] heroes.

Rand’s heroes are a mixture of this optimism and independent egoism:

All that which proceeds from man’s independent ego is good. All that which proceeds from man’s dependence upon men is evil. . . he [the Randian Hero] does not exist for any other man—and he asks no other man to exist for him. . . The first right on earth is the right of the ego. Man’s first duty is to himself. His moral law is never to place his prime goal within the persons of others. His moral obligation is to do what he wishes, provided his wish does not depend primarily upon other men. This includes the whole sphere of his creative faculty, his thinking, his work. But it does not include the sphere of the gangster, the altruist and the dictator (**For the New Intellectual** 81,82).

Therefore, the Randian Hero is one who egoistically lives by his own *productive* work and individually rebels for his freedom against the mainstream establishment. Rand’s famous novel takes on more similarities to pop culture than literature because it is exaggerated in both style and character portrayal.

Parallels of Rand’s heroes tend to be characterized more as “good guys” in literature and more as “bad guys” in pop culture. For example, in works of twentieth century British and American literature such as Vladimir Nabokov’s **Lolita** and Ford Madox Ford’s **The Good Soldier**, the rogue heroes Humbert Humbert and Edward fall more or less into the role of protagonists. However, the same type of heroes in pop culture [especially in the greedy decade of the 1980s] like Robert Redford on **Indecent Proposal**, Michael Douglas on **Wall Street** and Larry Hagman on **Dallas** serve as the antagonistic “men we love to hate” versions of the Randian heroes Roark, Dominique and Wynand in the **The Fountainhead**.

Again, with her heroes, Rand gives the opposing view of the same issue in relation to politics. Rand’s heroes show that greed is good and extremes of wealth and prosperity can never hurt us. Most works of literature and pop culture, such as F.Scott Fitzgerald’s **The Great**

Gatsby and the movie **Wall Street** show that extremes of wealth and prosperity cause our downfall. I intend to show Ayn Rand's *possible* influence on twentieth century literature by showing key similarities, such as optimism, characters as ideas and a selfish striving for wealth and happiness of the protagonists, in post 1943 [year of **The Fountainhead's** publication] literary works such as Jean Rhys' **Wide Sargasso Sea**, Evelyn Waugh's **Brideshead Revisited**, Tom Wolfe's **Bonfire of the Vanities** and Toni Morrison's **Sula** and **Beloved**. Also I will compare and contrast **The Fountainhead** to earlier works of the twentieth century that may have influenced Rand such as Edna Ferber's **Giant** and Jack London's **The Iron Heel**.

Many characters of literature and pop culture seek the same things as the Randian Hero—total joy and happiness with no pain. Both share this same constructed goal. However, real life and most literature *teach* us that total joy doesn't exist without some pain—this is usually ambivalence. Rand's work *shows* us that joy can exist without pain and that if we become one of her greedy capitalist heroes we can have enjoyment and the Nietzschean morality that goes “Beyond Good and Evil” and will never be sad. While this is not a totally ridiculous idea, it's far too optimistically idealistic. Rand's watered down Nietzschean Supermen and Superwomen such as Roark, Wynand and Dominique need to be applied more moderately and realistically into everyday life. I will attempt to make this application by contrasting the philosophical and political differences of Rand's “romantic realism” to George Orwell's skepticism in both his fiction and non-fiction. The British author politically experienced and wrote about both the left and right and moved from extremism towards moderation in his life and fiction.

While Orwell would have opposed Rand's “watering down” of her Nietzschean heroes and the Americanism of her melodramatic [or romantic] characterizations, pop culture movies about money and power that exist in his native Britain such as **The Bitch** give a less watered down version of Rand's heroes. Despite the fact that Orwell may not have liked these British portrayals of Nietzschean [or Randian] heroes, he probably would have appreciated the fact that the main characters in these movies were either extremely “selfish greed is good” or a clearly opposite version—with nothing watered down or clouded. He would have been very skeptical and cautious of Rand's making her Nietzschean Supermen look like non-Nietzschean moderates.

“Among many other things, of which an educated sympathy for victims and especially racial victims was only one, he [Orwell] had grown sensitive to intellectual hypocrisy and was

well-tuned to pick up the invariably creepy noises which it gives off. He was already an old India hand, in other words, when it came to detecting corrupt or euphemistic excuses for undeserved and unchecked power.”⁴

Why **The Fountainhead** and not **Atlas Shrugged**? **The Fountainhead** is important because it represents a less extreme period of Rand’s literary career. Therefore, its ideas and applications are less extreme than those of **Atlas Shrugged**. Though it is still too extreme, it stands for a more moderated form of Objectivism than Rand’s magnum opus. **The Fountainhead** is more practically applicable to real life. It is the least exaggerated of her two major novels. Douglas Den Uyl states, **The Fountainhead** is the quintessential presentation of American individualism, American optimism, and the promise that is America. **Atlas Shrugged**, by contrast, depicts a new social order and bears a certain utopian quality that looks at America from the outside. **The Fountainhead**, on the other hand, takes its bearings from within the American context (14-15). The settings of **Atlas Shrugged** are more extremely fantasized than those of **The Fountainhead**.

In making a relevant contribution to twentieth century literature and pop culture, Ayn Rand’s **The Fountainhead** is more important in what it represents than the work itself. Thus, by remaining between British moderation and American excess in our sensibilities as both literary scholars and pop culture consumers, we can all be more realistic and moderated Nietzsche “Lite” heroes than Rand’s in our own ways and strive for the promise of wealth, prosperity, and happiness characterized by her roguish and egotistical “ideal man.”

In making a comparative Nineteenth and Twentieth Century British and American literary study with the fiction of Rand, it is important to consider her very broad and multi – disciplinary audience. Ayn Rand’s fiction caters to four different and not-so-easy to define audiences. These are the Objectivists, Neo-Objectivists, academic scholars and the general Pop Culture masses. In defining the difference between the first two categories, Chris Matthew Sciabarra says, “The orthodox thinkers [Objectivists] see Rand’s philosophy as closed and complete. The neo-Objectivists accept certain basic principles, while expanding, modifying, or revising other aspects of Rand’s thought”⁵. Her spectrum of followers moves from her religious followers [Objectivists] to those who follow “certain basic principles” [neo-Objectivists] to those who study her in the academy [academic scholars]—usually of Philosophy, but in rare occasions, an English or Psychology scholar will speak out about her work; to the

main target audience of both **The Fountainhead** and **Atlas Shrugged** [the Pop Culture masses].

Her works of fiction were the most practical and wholesale way to apply her philosophy to the everyday lives of the general public. Therefore, more people are introduced to Objectivism through Rand's fiction than her non-fiction. The non-fiction works such as **The Romantic Manifesto**, **The Virtue of Selfishness** and the posthumous, **Philosophy: Who Needs It**, maintain Objectivists, Neo-Objectivists and probably some academic scholars as target audiences. Nearly all Randian Scholarship caters to every group except perhaps the most important—the Pop Culture masses.

While this study will be first and foremost a comparative literary work that examines **The Fountainhead** on many different scholarly levels, in relation to both nineteenth and twentieth century academic literature, its aim is also to cater to the pop culture masses. This work will integrate the examination of re-emerging Randian heroes by using a combination of literary, academic and pop culture means. It is intended to cater to the general pop culture masses as much as it does to the Objectivists, Neo-Objectivists and academic scholars. By studying **The Fountainhead** on many disciplinary and social levels, this work will attempt to form a bridge between the religion and/or education of Objectivists, neo-Objectivists and academic scholars and the inspiration and/or entertainment of the pop culture masses. The purpose is to make this study non-condemning of Rand's work and relative to real life enough for Objectivists, intellectually deep enough and not totally promotional of her complete philosophy for neo-Objectivists, making it more of a representational than artistically appreciated study of academic literature for academic scholars, and practical and interesting enough for pop culture masses.

While all parts of this study should relate to a wide audience of readers, specific chapters of it will cater more to specific target audiences. The earlier chapters, from chapters one to three, will appeal more to Objectivists, neo-Objectivists and academic scholars. Chapters four and five will serve as a transition from a focus for a smaller academic audience to a wider readership. Chapters six through eight will cater more to the pop culture audiences of Rand's fiction. While studying mostly **The Fountainhead** as a whole in relation to the major thematic ideas of this piece, some examples of characters and situations from **Atlas Shrugged** will also be used as evidence.

Without either promoting or condemning Ayn Rand and her work, in this study, I intend to demonstrate how, politically, philosophically and artistically, **The Fountainhead** represents

the disguised American Dream. Just as Rand's politics were to the right, so is that of American excess. Her politics simply moved too extremely in this direction for the liking of the majority of scholars, critics and readers. The philosophy of Objectivism takes on striking similarities to Existentialism while Rand also sits at the very opposite side of Karl Marx on the scale of Hegelianism. On this scale, Rand sits in a strange place between "Right" and "Romantic" classifications. While she only partially claimed influence from Friedrich Nietzsche, she violently opposes the philosophies of both G.W.F. Hegel and Immanuel Kant. In making this transition from Rand's philosophy to art, Kant holds a very important place that she would never admit.

In academic circles, Kant is considered, if not the most important, a major ideological player in the origin of the romantic movement. In **Romanticism and Evolution**, Bruce Wilshire states:

To call Immanuel Kant a romantic would be grotesque, if for no other reason than that he comes close to presenting reason and emotion, reason and inclination as opposed to each other. And yet the age is unthinkable without him. In his stress on reason he is the apotheosis and extreme point of the Enlightenment; but here the Enlightenment transcends itself and verges on something different (41).

This "something different" became Rand's trademark style of fiction. While Objectivist scholars, such as Leonard Peikoff, intellectually oppose Kant's philosophy, it's important to note that Rand never read any of his work. Ronald E. Merrill says, "Like Nietzsche, to the end of her life she considered Kant her intellectual arch-enemy. [She is said to have admitted, however, that she never actually read any of Kant's works herself]"(22). She criticized the great thinker who artistically [or philosophically] paved the way for her. While this work does not aim to deeply study Objectivism or any other types of philosophy, the artistic and political representations and implications of Rand's fiction cannot be properly examined without at least a basic look at its scientific [philosophical] and esthetic [artistic] origins and a few of its key and basic tenets.

Chapter one will contemplate **The Fountainhead** as art. Furthermore, it will compare and contrast nineteenth century literary traditions such as Romantic literature from works like Victor Hugo's **Les Misérables** and Johann von Goethe's **The Sorrows of Young Werther** to that of Rand's fiction. It will also briefly examine the importance of Kant's philosophy to Rand's

fiction. Her artistic style of Romanticism was used to inspire the American Dream of greatness, or success and excess through inspirational and God-like characters or “ideal men” who served more as ideas preached in her sermons than actual real life people.

Chapter two will study Rand’s work in relation to philosophical literature. More specifically, it will relate it to works of both Existential and Hegelian philosophy such as Ralph Ellison’s **Invisible Man**, Albert Camus’ **The Stranger** and Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels’ **Communist Manifesto**. It will also examine the ideological literary impact from works of the great Russian writers Fyodor Dostoevsky and Leo Tolstoy. Chapter three will study Rand’s political thought represented in **The Fountainhead** and compare and contrast it with that of George Orwell as portrayed in both his fiction and non-fiction such as **Animal Farm, 1984** and **Homage to Catalonia**. Chapter four will examine the Nietzscheanism of the Randian Hero. It will study the great influence of Friedrich Nietzsche’s “Superman” on Rand’s fiction. After defining the Randian hero, it will also relate her use of Friedrich Nietzsche’s “Übermensch” and what it means for both the characters of **The Fountainhead** and in relation to American culture.

Chapter five will examine post 1943 works [1943 was the year of **The Fountainhead’s** publication] of twentieth century authors who have *possibly* been influenced by Rand—both mainstream academic and obscure writers. Chapter six will compare and contrast Rand’s “Greed is Good”, Gordon Gekko’s trademark words in the movie **Wall Street**, and her “sky is the limit” type of pro-Capitalist heroes with those of literature in relation to the typically American idea that “excess causes downfall.” It will examine different versions of the Randian hero throughout twentieth century British and American literature.

Chapter seven will examine versions of the Randian hero in American pop culture. This will include real life capitalist icons like Donald Trump and Don King along with those of movies and television shows. This will also include capitalist video games. The conclusion will then follow to cohesively connect these ideas and representations to implications of the Randian hero for the American Dream in Twentieth Century literature and pop culture.

CHAPTER 1 *THE FOUNTAINHEAD AS ART AND ROMANTIC LITERATURE*

In considering Ayn Rand's **The Fountainhead** as art, many analytical and categorical factors must come into play. Concepts such as art are nearly endless in terms of definition, study and realization. Because art itself is such a broad and multidisciplinary dimension of human endeavor, an examination of Rand's literary style in relation to it must analytically and categorically move from the generalities of art itself to the specifics of its respective types and movements. Her non-traditional blend of romanticism and optimism is her most important artistic trait. Although her art [literature] appealed more to readers than her science [philosophy], the two are inseparable. Her art, just like her philosophy, is extreme and difficult to categorize. While many academic intellectuals merely dismiss her as a pop novelist, her work does include artistically appreciated nineteenth century literary forms. Furthermore, it is my belief that she has influenced at least a few writers who are studied and artistically appreciated in the academy. Ayn Rand's **The Fountainhead** is both a radar and transmitter that received many literary traits and ideas from other artists and scientists and reflected back a few traits and ideas to other literary artists.

The artistic and scientific problem with Rand is that neither her fiction nor her philosophy wholly, or even mostly, fit into any type of twentieth century fine art or pop art literary movements [such as Post-Modernism, contemporary literature or Detective or Science fiction]. Her fiction is a sub-genre of its own. Furthermore, academic scholars and pop art consumers aren't sure if this latter statement is a compliment or condemnation of her work. **The Fountainhead** is the product of Ayn Rand and her scientific, or artistic experiment. It blends a strange mixture of characteristic traits from high art and pop art. For example, in the tradition of pop art her works portray optimism, happy endings, sensationalized characters and heavy plot. In the tradition of high art, Rand gives us romantic literary style and philosophical literature. This evil-looking goddess mixed all these elements in a pot and took each one to more extreme levels than we have seen in the art of romantic literature. Because of this strange brew, **The Fountainhead** sits on the cusp between fine art and pop art, literature and pulp fiction, a novel and a screenplay, realism and drama. Nevertheless, despite all these things that the 1943 novel totally is not, **The Fountainhead** is totally American.

In American culture, art is placed into different categories. Is **The Fountainhead** art--in

the specific forms of fine art, literature and romanticism? In attempting to answer this difficult and multifaceted question, we must start at the beginning by defining art. After attempting a definition, we must then move to the more specific aspects of art that Rand's novel represents and compare and contrast it with examples of literary art. No matter how concrete a definition of a major social institution like art may be, few scholars, artists and audiences will see it as exactly the same thing. Art takes on different meanings to different people based on life experience, education, personalities, sensibilities, etc. Just like the broadness of the topic itself, the 1943 work was meant to cater to a wide range of readers from many different walks of life. Therefore, beginning with a broad definition may be appropriate.

Moving from broad to specific in the terminology of the word, **Webster's New World Dictionary** defines **art** as, "human ability to make things; creativity of man as distinguished from the world of nature." It defines **fine art** as, "any of the art forms that include drawing, painting, sculpture, and ceramics, or occasionally, architecture, literature, music, dramatic art, or dancing. Pop art is, a realistic art style, especially in painting and sculpture, using techniques and popular subjects adapted from commercial art and the mass communications media, such as comic strips, posters, etc. The aesthetic and academic problem with **The Fountainhead** is that it may arguably fit into all these definition categories--or none of them.

In his famous essay, **What is Art?**, Leo Tolstoy defines art as:

To evoke in oneself a feeling one has once experienced and having evoked it in oneself then by means of movements, lines, colors, sounds, or forms expressed in words, so to transmit that feeling that others experience the same feeling—this is the activity of art . . . it is not the production of pleasing objects; and above all, it is not pleasure; but it is a means of union among men joining them together in the same feelings, and indispensable for the life and progress towards well-being of individuals and of humanity (123).

In their ideas about the purpose of art, Tolstoy and Rand ideologically clash here. While the above passage argues that art's primary purpose is to share and evoke feelings so that audiences may empathize and learn from them, Rand says that art should mainly show us, not what we are, but the 'ideal man' that we should strive to be.¹ In defense of Rand, her novel does evoke feelings, but not through the empathy for the characters experienced in the artful narrative

descriptions, like most traditional literary works.² Rand's characters evoke feelings more from what they say and she tries to transmit feelings more through the inspirational ideological speeches of the characters than through narrative.

For example, in **The Fountainhead**, when Howard Roark's mentor, Henry Cameron is on his deathbed, he gives his last words of advice to the aspiring young architect who succeeds him, a noble but loveable loser:

'I know . . . what you're going through at your office
Just now. . .' Roark had never spoken to him of that.
'No. . . don't deny and . . . don't say anything . . . I know
. . . But. . . it's allright . . . Don't be afraid . . . Do you
remember the day when I tried to fire you? . . . Forget
what I said to you then . . . It was not the whole story
. . . This is. . . Don't be afraid . . . It was worth it . . .'
His voice failed and he could not use it any longer. But
the faculty of sight remained untouched and he could
lie silently and look at Roark without effort. He died
half an hour later (179).

The words of this speech are strong and motivating. They stir up feelings of greatness and achievement. They make me want to root for Howard Roark to succeed. However, it's difficult to sympathize with either Roark or Cameron because the narrative describes actions more than thoughts and feelings. The narration prevents us from feeling what the characters feel.

In his essay, "The Benefits and Hazards of the Philosophy of Ayn Rand," Nathaniel Branden, Rand's long time associate, makes some good points about these feelings that she inspires in relation to the way a novel should be written:

A further difficulty lies in the fact that she was a novelist and chose principally to present her philosophy in fiction . . . There are some wonderful benefits to be derived from dramatizing one's ideas in a novel, but there are also hazards. A novel can be a superb form through which to illustrate a new code of ethics or morality because one really has the opportunity to show, concretely and specifically, what one means and what one advocates; one can dramatize one's ideas through characters, actions, and events—saying to the reader, in effect, 'This is what I mean.' The problem lies in the fact that a good novelist has to consider many other elements besides philosophical exposition: drama, pace, excitement, suspense, and so forth. There is no time

for the kind of qualifications—amendments, exceptions, special cases—that slow down the pace. So what we get [from Rand’s fiction] are broad slashes, sharp-cutting strokes, which can make superb reading and fantastic theatre--*unless* you’re sixteen years old, reading this novel and feeling more excited than you’ve ever felt in your life, your mind and soul on fire, and taking it all in as if it were to be read like a philosophical treatise. That’s not how novels are to be read. But you see the problem, especially when reading a novelist as powerful and hypnotically persuasive as Ayn Rand (42).

Here’s an example of literary art evoking feelings in just the opposite way—by sharing the thoughts and feelings of the characters through narration:

Lolita, light of my life, fire of my loins. My sin, my soul. Lo-lee-ta: the tip of the tongue taking a trip of three steps down the palate to tap, at three, on the teeth. Lo. Lee. Ta. She was Lo, plain Lo, in the morning, standing four feet ten in one sock. She was Lola in slacks. She was Dolly at school. She was Dolores on the dotted line. But in my arms she was always Lolita.³

This opening to Vladimir Nabokov’s famous novel is often considered by many readers [academic and otherwise] to be perhaps the most artistically rich prose ever written in English. It is the narrative antithesis to Rand’s action filled stage direction-looking narratives. Nevertheless, it is interesting to note that both Russian-American writers shared some similar theories of art and ties to great Russian writers such as Tolstoy, Dostoevsky and Nikolai Chernyshevsky.

Nabokov loves an art that mimes as nature does, and he insists on a nature not just brutishly Darwinian but a nature for art’s sake, a nature that loves mimicry and disguise . . . The most interesting qualities in Nabokov’s novels and stories are the compassion he makes us feel so frequently for his characters; the brilliant use of language [perhaps the most dazzling prose ever written in English]; the genius for mimicry and sharp observation; the laughter that isn’t forgetful of pain; the tart, funny, exhilarating combination of elegance and venom; the slapstick hilarity.”⁴

Everything about Rand’s art is different but the same as Nabokov’s. She does these same things, but in very different ways. Rand’s art is mimetic, but it doesn’t mime as nature does. It mimes

idealized *romantic* heroes, settings, etc. instead of those of nature. Whereas Nabokov gives beautifully ambivalent absurdity, instead of this, Rand struggles to give satirically represented characters.

While Nabokov maintained a consistent level of intensity with his absurdity throughout the novel, Rand moved from one extreme to the other. While the satire in her fiction is not necessarily a bad trait, the main artistic difference between her comedy and Nabokov's is that of absurdity within good Modernist literature moving to Post-Modernism. Unlike Rand, great artistic novelists like Nabokov and J.D. Salinger mean for their work to be ambivalently funny and serious at the same time. According to Stephen Cox (1986), "Rand's essayic style is more guardedly solemn than usual on the issue of comedy and satire . . . In **The Romantic Manifesto**, she says, 'Too often, humor is used as the camouflage of moral cowardice.'⁵ What is surprising, in view of such solemnities, is the wealth of comedy, from broad farce to black humor, to be found in her novels" (24). Unlike the artistic greats of post World War II literature, although she plays with humor on different levels, Rand doesn't mean for her novels to be funny.

She also laughs more at the villains than the heroes. The wider the range of emotions expressed in a character, the more real he or she is. Cox (1986) refers to Rand's farcical humor by stating, "At one extreme are Rand's expertly staged symposia of clowns, gathering of figures like Wesley Mouch, Tinky Holloway, and Jimmy Taggart [all characters of **Atlas Shrugged**]. At either extreme are single moments that combine horror with a grotesque comedy, as in the bizarre self-revelations of Ellsworth Toohey:

Ellsworth was fifteen, when he astonished the Bible class teacher by an odd question. The teacher had been elaborating upon the text: 'What shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?' Ellsworth asked: 'Then in order to be truly wealthy, a man should collect souls?'" ⁶

When reading these lines for the first time in the novel, they seemed more of a satire of the institution of religion itself than of Toohey's character. While Toohey's character may more or less represent the idea of religion [his middle name is Monkton—like a religious monk]. This sounded more like a creepy and grimly scary pronouncement of one who will rob men of their happiness.

Humbert Humbert's narratives are not as gothic, eerie and gravely dark in their humor. They take on a lighter and more effortless tone:

You have to be an artist and a madman, a creature of infinite melancholy, with a bubble of hot poison in your loins and a super-voluptuous flame permanently aglow in your subtle spine [oh, how you have to cringe and hide!], in order to discern at once, by ineffable signs --the slightly feline outline of a cheekbone, the slenderness of a downy limb, and other indices which despair and shame and tears of tenderness forbid me to tabulate—the little deadly demon among the wholesome children; she stands unrecognized by them and unconscious herself of her fantastic power.⁷

Nabokov is artful with ease in this passage. It's funny, seriously passionate and poetically beautiful all at the same time. It looks more improvised and effortless than Rand's prose. All artists are madmen of some form or another is what he comically implies. Can one be more passionate than to have a bubble of hot poison in the loins? Humbert Humbert is describing both joy and pain simultaneously in this passage.

Unlike Nabokov, and many literary artists, Rand's narrative tendency is to give us either total joy or total pain in her character descriptions. Note how **The Fountainhead** describes similar feelings of a character [Roark's pain and sadness] in the following passage:

He felt at times as if the beams and girders were shaping themselves not into a house, but into a barricade to stop him; and the few steps on the sidewalk that separated him from the wooden fence enclosing the construction were the steps he would never be able to take. It was pain, but it was a blunted, unpenetrating pain. It's true, he would tell himself; it's not, his body would answer, the strange, untouchable healthiness of his body (176).

In this passage, Roark goes through total suffering. It describes objects more than it does feelings. It describes feelings in similes and in relation to concrete objects instead of feelings themselves. Here is a passage in **The Fountainhead** describing joy for Roark [with a couple of his friends]:

They talked about nothing in particular, sentences that had meaning only in the sound of the voices,

in the warm gaiety, in the ease of complete relaxation. They were simply four people [Roark, Mallory, Dominique and Mike Donnigan] who liked being together. The walls rising in the darkness beyond the open door gave sanction to their rest, gave them the right to lightness, the building that was like a low, audible harmony to the sound of their voices. Roark laughed as Dominique had never seen him laugh anywhere else, his mouth loose and young (336).

Rand takes four sentences, packed with verbs to write a passage similar to that of Nabokov's in length. The passage of similar length from Nabokov is one poetically long sentence.

In **The Fountainhead**, we don't get anything representing Humbert Humbert's "Joy the color of hellflames." While it seems like the author tries to present this in Howard's rape of Dominique, it's too extreme. Furthermore, it's excessive passionate savagery given to us all at one time. It's a nerve striking and extremely shocking dose of the hero's savagery in the midst of his total civilization everywhere else in the novel:

She let her teeth sink into his hand and felt blood on the tip of her tongue . . . She felt the hatred and his hands . . . She fought in a last convulsion. Then the sudden pain shot up, through her body, to her throat, and she screamed . . . Then she felt him shaking with the agony of a pleasure unbearable even to him . . . and she bit his lips and she knew what he had wanted her to know (218).

These verses feel angry, painful and passionate. They feel more like an explosion of terror, a release of a long time repressed agony than joy, happiness or pleasure. Unlike Rand, Nabokov gives us the hero's savagery, or "hellflames" with artfully rich blends of civilization in bits and pieces all throughout the novel. The extreme levels of optimism, savagery and brutality in the **Fountainhead** make us feel either happily inspired by or sorry for "what happened" to the characters instead of because we can feel the pain they feel.

Despite the many artistic differences between Rand's prose and Nabokov's, some of their artistic ideas were the same. Both writers' ideas of art were almost completely antithetical to those of Leo Tolstoy—and each other. "Nabokov claimed that, 'a work of art has no importance whatever to society. It is only important to the individual, and only the individual reader is important to me. I don't give a damn for the group, the community, the masses, and so forth.'"⁸

Being the rugged individualist that she was, Rand would have probably agreed wholeheartedly with this statement. It sounds like something she would say. Both writers scorned the traditional and institutionalized society in their fiction. According to Tolstoy's definition of art, "[art] is a means of union among men joining them together in the same feelings, and indispensable for the life and progress towards well-being of individuals and of humanity" (123).

Both Rand and Nabokov learned from a bad Russian literary artist—Nikolai Chernyshevsky. "Chernyshevsky's **What Is to Be Done?** Is an unusual work. And, as badly written as it is, it had enormous literary impact on some of Russia's greatest writers."⁹ According to D. Barton Johnson, "Rand took her utilitarian view of literature [and style] from Chernyshevsky—although substituting a very different ideological content" (103). Just like **The Fountainhead**, **What Is to Be Done?** is loaded with action filled narratives instead of feeling descriptions:

It took Vierotchka a long time to undress, because was lost in thought. First she took off her bracelet, and sat long with it in her hand; then she removed her ear-rings, and forgot herself again. At last she remembered that she was very tired . . . [she]threw herself into the chair in utter weariness. She sat there some time before it came over her that she must undress as quickly as possible . . . (19).

The plot is heavy:

. . . and Nicolas felt that he could not move his hands, which were fixed to his sides, as by an iron belt; and indeed they were pinned by Kirsanof's right hand, while his left hand had Nicholas by the jaw, ready to clutch his throat, and Kirsanof was saying, 'Just see how easily I can choke you.' And he squeezed his gullet; and Nicholas perceived that it was a very easy thing for Kirsanof to choke him; but Kirsanof's hand has already left his throat (198).

Furthermore, the prose form is interrupted with lengthy moral and ideological speeches. When the protagonist, Viera Pavlovna begins a sewing union, she gives a nearly two-page speech to her workers about the nature of the work, things good people do and how love and passion is more important than money. Just like Johnson stated above, Rand's work is different in ideology, but similar in style.¹⁰

Both Rand and Nabokov applied artistic ideas from Chernyshevsky in their fiction:

Nabokov explicitly took Chernyshevsky as the starting point of his evaluation of the Russian literary tradition and his own place in it. In his novel **The Gift**, Nabokov incorporates a biography of the martyred Chernyshevsky which intimates that he was 'the bad seed' in nineteenth and twentieth century Russian cultural [and political] history.¹¹

In viewing some of these passages of Chernyshevsky as a biographical character of Nabokov's **The Gift**, it's interesting to note how many of these described artistic tendencies mirror those of Rand. Of Chernyshevsky's style, in **The Gift**, Nabokov says, "He became absorbed in an examination of the problems . . . Without a hint of poetry; these were chess comic strips, nothing more . . ." (185-86). Academic scholars tend to dismiss **The Fountainhead** in the same way. Her style and characters are often thought of as "pop" [or chess comic strip] literature.

According to Johnson, both writers took pieces of Chernyshevsky's esthetic ideology with them on their separate routes to literary realism. **What Is to be Done?** became the progenitor of Socialist Realism and Rand's Capitalist Realism [or what Rand calls Romantic Realism] (103). Nabokov took the route of Socialist Realism and Rand took Romantic [or Capitalist] Realism. Of the artistic influence on Nabokov, Johnson goes on to say:

It was, according to Nabokov, Chernyshevsky's example that displaced the aesthetically-based Pushkin tradition and supplanted it with the utilitarian anti-aesthetic tradition that was to end in Socialist Realism. Nabokov saw his own work as an attempt to reassert and advance the aesthetically based view. Chernyshevsky was thus a touchstone for both Nabokov and Rand. Nabokov and Rand nicely illustrate the old saw that no discerning person should like both Dostoevsky and Tolstoy (104).

Nabokov liked Tolstoy and Rand liked Dostoevsky. When grading great Russian writers, Nabokov gave Tolstoy an "A plus" and Dostoevsky a "C minus" or was it a "D plus?" ¹² In an interview, he speaks of Dostoevsky's art by saying, "I dislike intensely **The Karamazov Brothers** and the ghastly **Crime and Punishment** rigamarole. No, I do not object to soul-searching and self-revelation, but in those books the soul, and the sins, and the sentimentality, and the journalese, hardly warrant the tedious and muddled search." ¹³ Rand likes Dostoevsky because of, "his superb mastery of plot structure."¹⁴

While each Russo-American writer liked his or her respective literary predecessors back in the homeland, Nabokov's ideas about art are neither totally separated from Rand's nor totally similar to Tolstoy's. Nabokov says:

Art has been too often turned into a tool to convey ideas --whether political or moral—to influence, to teach, to improve and enlighten and what not. I am not telling you that art does not improve and enlighten the reader. But it does this in its own special way and it does it only then when its own single purpose remains to be good, excellent art, art as perfect as its creator can make. The moment this only real and valuable purpose of art is forgotten, the moment it is replaced by a utilitarian aim, however commendable in itself, art [ceases] to be art, and through this loss of its ego, loses not only its sense and its beauty but also the very object to which it has been sacrificed: bad art neither teaches nor improves nor enlightens, it is bad art and therefore has no reasonable room in the order of things. **15**

This type of presentation of moral ideas in novels, through dialogue and actions more than narrative description, that Nabokov speaks out against, is heavily used in the fiction of both Rand and Dostoevsky. In **The Brothers Karamazov** when Mr. Karamazov acts buffoonishly insincere and questions the elder about how to gain eternal life, Elder Zosima replies:

You have known for a long time what to do—you are intelligent enough to see it yourself: stop indulging in drunkenness and incontinence of speech, do not give way to sensual lust and particularly to your passion of money. Also, close down your taverns; if you cannot close them all, close at least two or three. And, above all, stop lying (50).

About the nature of his art, Dostoevsky says, “I am called a psychologist, it's not true, I am only a realist in the highest sense, i.e., I depict all the depths of the human soul.” **16** This sounds a lot like what Rand does in her fiction. “A realist in the highest sense” sounds like the same idealism found in the characters of **The Fountainhead**—characters not as they are, but as they should be.

“I depict all the depths of the human soul” sounds like the moral spectrums represented through the characters of both authors. Just like the four brothers in Dostoevsky's novel, all of the characters of **The Fountainhead** represent different levels of good and evil. The heavy dosages of these moral representations and verbalized ideas in the two novels give strong

evidence that, to Rand and Dostoevsky, what their works of art stood for was more important than the work of art itself. While both Rand and Nabokov believe that the reader should learn from art, they use art to teach in contrasting ways. In the Modernist tradition, Nabokov presents Humbert Humbert through artful narrative description and the reader must draw his or her own impression of his moral character and the ideas that his character is used to convey. Rand and Dostoevsky tend to tell the readers what they want them to know through monologues and dialogues rather than narration. When Nabokov says, “through this loss of its [art’s] ego” it [ego] is a word synonymous with Rand and both her fiction and philosophy.

Rand makes an artistic mess of this word “ego.” While her style is quite similar to that of Dostoevsky, the main difference between them is in both language and character portrayals. The “sense of life” of the two writers contrast one another. According to John Cody, “Rand’s literary vision or sense of life is that of ‘man worship’: rational heroic humanism . . .” he goes on to say, “I have styled Rand’s vision ‘Promethean’ because she has self-consciously exploited and repeated the Greek legend of Prometheus in **The Fountainhead**” (31).¹⁷ Note the description of Howard Roark at the beginning of the novel:

So that the world seemed suspended in space, an island floating on nothing, anchored to the feet of the man on the cliff. . . His body leaned back against the sky. It was a body of long straight lines and angles, each curve broken into planes. He stood, rigid, his hands hanging at his sides, palms out. He felt his shoulder blades drawn tight together, the curve of his neck, and the weight of the blood in his hands. He felt the wind behind him, in the hollow of his spine. The wind waved his hair against the sky (**The Fountainhead** 15).

Characters like these in her novels are described more as Gods to be worshipped than actual people. In real life, even heroic men are not usually worshipped like Gods. Roark is described here like a majestic object that’s higher than anything on earth. This is not the way we usually think of real life people. Heroes tend to have limits—that’s what makes them human. Unlike Rand’s [and maybe some of Homer’s] all literary characters are usually humans, not Gods. This creates an artistic distance between the reader and the realist image of Howard Roark.

Dostoevsky’s protagonist, [Aloysha of **The Brothers Karamazov**] is described to us in much more realist terms:

But he [Aloysha] certainly loved people: throughout

his life he seemed to believe in people and trust them, and yet no one ever thought him simple-minded or naïve. There was something in him [and it stayed with him all his life] that made people realize that he refused to sit in judgment on others, that he felt he had no right to, and that, whatever happened, he would never condemn anyone. He gave the impression that he could witness anything without feeling in the least outraged, although he might be deeply saddened (**The Brothers Karamazov** 21).

This narrative describes characteristics of real people with whom we can relate. Therefore, the reader can base this piece of fiction on a real life experience. While objects of literary art don't have to specifically emulate any real life person or thing, they usually are founded on some basis of real experience. Charles Schug states that experience is the material of all literature, but some writers, the non-Romantic, tend to treat experience as a given (58). **The Fountainhead** does this in giving us a man to worship as if we all have seen or experienced this in real life. Perhaps this literary tendency is why Rand was accused of being a cult leader. Like in Tolstoy's **War and Peace**, God is given a disguised name within a man, like king, dictator, or emperor—not just God.

Despite the fact that in both of their esthetic philosophies, Rand and Nabokov speak against art being utilitarian, unlike Tolstoy, the art in their works looks grossly opposite. Although not as poetic as Nabokov, the prose of Tolstoy's **War and Peace** appears to fit more distinctly into the “Socialist Realism” category than Nabokov. Just like in **Lolita**, the descriptions of **War and Peace** try to allow the reader to feel what they feel:

The look which Pierre had noticed in Prince Andre's Eyes was more striking now . . . Pierre began to feel That to express enthusiasm, ideals, and hopes of Happiness and goodness was unseemly before Prince Andre. He felt ashamed of giving expression to all The new ideas he had gained from the masons . . . At the same time he felt an irresistible desire to show His friend at once that he was now a quite different Pierre, better than the one he had known in Petersburg (240).

In relating this art in terms of what D. Barton Johnson calls “Social Realism” and “Capitalist Realism,” the work of Tolstoy and Rand represent these traits more extremely among these four writers. **War and Peace** champions the humble while **The Fountainhead** champions the

egotistical. The two characters in Tolstoy's novel that represent egotism and the pinnacle of power and status, Napoleon and Tsar Alexander, are hardly described at all. Even when the two immortal heroes dramatically meet face to face, the only description he gives is, "Napoleon gave a slight backward turn of his head, and a slight motion of his little fat hand" (**War and Peace** 261).

They are mentioned throughout [as the symbols of power and glory that all the novel's characters are trying to reach] but the author describes the down to earth and humble that we can relate to more instead of the idealized larger than life hero:

Life meanwhile, the actual life of men with their real interests of health and sickness, labour and rest, with their interests of thought, science, poetry, music, love, affection, hatred, passion, went its way, as always, independently, apart from the political friendship or enmity of Napoleon Bonaparte (**War and Peace** 262).

Howard Roark is so egotistical that he doesn't see most of the other characters. "He [Roark] stood looking at her [Mrs. Keating]. She knew that he did not see her. No, she thought, it was not that exactly. He always looked straight at people and his damnable eyes never missed a thing, it was only that he made people feel as if they did not exist" (**The Fountainhead** 17).

Lolita and **The Brothers Karamazov** both fit in between this Social and Capitalist "Realism" scale. Humbert Humbert looks more real than the extremely good Aloysha and extremely bad Dmitry, but like Tolstoy, Dostoevsky's novel looks like it represents more of a Socialist "common good" than Nabokov's. Both Roark and Humbert Humbert are individualized rogue heroes who rebel against the social establishment. However, Humbert Humbert is much more real because we can "feel" him. No two of these four Russian or American writers are similar in any two of these artistic traits. Rand and Tolstoy are the most opposite of the four. About the work of Tolstoy, she says, "I cannot stand Tolstoy, and reading him was the most boring literary duty I ever had to perform, his philosophy and his sense of life¹⁸ are not merely mistaken, but evil, and yet, from a purely literary viewpoint, on his own terms, I have to evaluate him as a good writer." ¹⁹

Despite the great differences between the literary arts of Rand and Tolstoy, it is very interesting what Nabokov says about **War and Peace**:

War and Peace, though a little too long, is a rollicking

historical novel written for that amorphous and limp creature known as ‘the general reader,’ and more specifically for the young. In terms of artistic structure it does not satisfy me. I derive no pleasure from its cumbersome message, from the didactic interludes, from the artificial coincidences, with cool Prince Andrey turning up to witness this or that historical moment . . . **20**

This sounds exactly like he’s talking about characteristics of **The Fountainhead**. It’s a long novel with some historical basis to it. It’s written for the non-academic general reader [this is probably a good reason why its sales are so great]. It appeals more to teenagers than any other age group [the young]. It is also filled with didactic interludes, or morally educational speeches.

Despite the fact that their theories of art conflicted, both Rand and Tolstoy purposefully produced their art outside the academy. According to Louis Torres and Michelle Kamhi, Rand began her career as a popular writer and, like Tolstoy and other well-known Russian writers, she deliberately pursued her literary and philosophic goals from the position of academic outsider (16). She remained profoundly a Russian thinker. Like most of Russia’s great literary figures, she was an artist, social critic, and nonacademic philosopher.²¹ Tolstoy’s feelings about the academic establishment were similar to Rand’s.²² Perhaps her choice as a popular novelist was motivated more by the possibility for a wider audience, readership and book sales than if she was just an academically appreciated novelist. It’s not that her novels are any better than those of the fine art literary academies, they just appeal to a much wider audience.

Her artistic academy, or school of thought was initially and indirectly developed in ancient Greece. Rand’s theory of art shares important points of correspondence with earlier thinkers—most notably, Aristotle—although she integrates such views into an original totality, informed by a more accurate understanding of human cognition and emotion.²³ Rand claimed to take most of her artistic and philosophical ideas from Aristotle. However, criticisms and problems come not only from these ideas she learned from him, but also from some of Aristotle’s artistic ideas as well. First of all, her greatest pronouncements of artistic education that she took from Aristotle were actually misinterpreted from his **Poetics**.

In **The Romantic Manifesto**, Rand says about Aristotle, “It was Aristotle who said that fiction is of greater philosophical importance than history, because history represents things only as they are, while fiction represents them ‘as they might be and ought to be’”(168). In Chapter 9

of **Poetics**, Aristotle actually says:

Rather they [historians and poets] differ in this, that while the former speaks of incidents that have come to be, the latter speaks of incidents that might come to be. On this account [the process of] is both more philosophic and more worthy than history, for making speaks more of universals while history speaks more of particulars. The universal, being that which characters of a certain kind of succession of incidents, is that at which [the process of] making aims in setting down names for characters, while the particular is what Alkibiades,²⁴ for example, did or suffered (17).

Rand quotes selective words of Aristotle here, but takes this statement out of context. In the above passage, he is specifying the differences between poetry, history and *philosophy* as individual and respective disciplines. He is not really saying that poetry is better than history. Kenneth A. Telford interprets that in this passage, Aristotle means that the function of the poet lies somewhere between that of the historian, who seeks the particularity of actual events and that of the philosopher or scientist who seeks universality in his statements about existing things (93).²⁵ Aristotle is really talking about how the nature of the poet's work lies within an artistic spectrum between history and philosophy [or science].

She misquotes his meaning in the second part of her statement as well when she quotes him as saying that "fiction represents things as they ought to be." Chapter 25 of **Poetics** says:

Since the poet is an imitator, just as the painter from life or any other maker of likenesses, of necessity he always imitates one of three things: either such as were or are, such as are said or seem to be, or such as ought to be (49).

"As ought to be," is only one of three of Aristotle's types. Rand makes it seem like he's saying it's the only type that the poet should imitate. According to Torres and Kamhi, "By suggesting that Aristotle was advocating idealization in literature, Rand is arguing for the sort of fiction she wrote and most valued; she is not stating a proposition true of all fiction" (63-64). About this same passage from Aristotle, Stephen Cox (1986) interjects, "But Aristotle is not arguing for idealized characterization. He is merely observing that characters—of whatever moral 'type'—should be used to illustrate 'general truths' about the way in which various sorts of people

behave.”²⁶ For Rand, in this instance of misquoting Aristotle, she should have simply said that she preferred the art of presenting men as they “ought to be” to the other two forms.

In artistically presenting men as they “ought to be,” she has developed some of her own literary terminology. What she calls a “sense of life” is a term associated with both Rand and her artistic process:

A sense of life is a pre-conceptual equivalent of metaphysics, an emotional, subconsciously integrated appraisal of man and of existence. It sets the nature of a man’s emotional responses and the essence of his character.²⁷

This is Rand’s way of saying that philosophy is a must in the artistic process. Artists subconsciously make value judgments about who their characters will be and what they will look like before they are created. This sounds like she’s saying that just like people in real life make choices about who they are and want to be, morally speaking, literary characters should be representatives of this same idea as either heroes or villains--either one side or the other. In relation to this point, novels like **The Fountainhead** and **The Brothers Karamazov** present good and evil through a moral spectrum [good, bad and in between] of characters. These novels are also often heavier in plot and more lengthy than artistically appreciated novels that give more *illusions* of morally polar opposites, like **Lolita**, **Sula**, **The Heart of Darkness** and **The Good Soldier**.

Unlike many literary artists, Rand believes that plot is so important that she developed a term called a “plot-theme.” About this she says:

In order for fiction to be good, the theme and plot of a novel must be integrated. The link between the theme and events of a novel is an element called the ‘plot theme.’ In a story, this is a conflict in terms of action, corresponding to the theme and complex enough to create a purposeful progression of events. . . . For example, the theme of **Atlas Shrugged** is ‘The role of the mind in man’s existence.’ The plot-theme is: ‘The men of the mind going on strike against an altruist-collectivist society.’ The theme of **Les Miserables** is: ‘The injustice of society toward its lower classes.’ The plot-theme is: ‘The life-long flight of an ex-convict from the pursuit of a ruthless representative of the law’ . . . The integration of an important theme with a complex plot struc-

ture is the most difficult achievement possible to a writer, and the rarest. Its great masters are Victor Hugo and Dostoevsky.²⁸

With respect to Hugo and Dostoevsky, nothing could be further from the truth in regard to fine literary art. A good novel does not have to have a complex plot. Within this type of art, the way a story is told is more important than what is told. A theoretical reliance on too much plot is an artistic liability of Rand's. She says, "In real life, we can only judge what people do and what they say. Therefore, characterization in a novel can be achieved only by two major means: action and dialogue. Passages dealing with the characters' thoughts and feelings are of no value without action and dialogue."²⁹

In **Aspects of the Novel**, E.M. Forster cites a passage of similar meaning from Aristotle and makes some important clarifications and distinctions about them:

'Character,' says Aristotle, 'gives us qualities, but it is in actions—what we do—that we are happy or the reverse.' We have already decided that Aristotle [and also Rand are] wrong and now we must face the consequences of disagreeing with [them]. 'All human happiness and misery' says Aristotle, 'take the form of action.' We know better . . . There is, however, no occasion to be hard on Aristotle. He had read few novels and no modern ones . . . and when he wrote the words quoted above³⁰ he had in view the drama, where no doubt they hold true. In the drama all human happiness and misery does and must take the form of action. Otherwise its existence remains unknown, and this is the great difference between the drama and the novel. The specialty of the novel is that the writer can talk about his characters as well as through them or can arrange for us to listen when they talk to themselves (83-4).

Rand, who worked as a much-respected screenwriter in Hollywood for long periods in the 1930s and 1940s, considered the most difficult aspect to be devising a plot, a 'concrete story,' that would convey an 'abstract theme.' She wrote to Henry Blanke [producer of **The Fountainhead** (the movie)]:

A real dramatic plot is the one surefire element for a great popular success, in a novel, a stage play or a picture—most particularly in a picture. . . [Plot] is the one absolute must in a story. Characterization, dialogue, mood and all the rest . . . have value only

when based on a good plot. Without it—they are worthless. The plot of a movie is its motor. It is not an accident that people call pictures ‘vehicles’ for stars. A vehicle has to move. A plotless story is like an expensive car with a wonderful body design, luxurious seats, upholstery, headlights [production, direction, cast]—and no motor under its hood. That is why it gets nowhere.³¹

The two great women writers of Modernism, Virginia Woolf and Katherine Mansfield, included almost no plot whatsoever in their fiction. In Woolf’s **To The Lighthouse**, all the characters do is have a fancy dinner, paint pictures and talk about going to the lighthouse. In Mansfield’s **The Fly**, a man, whose son has died, kills a fly. However, they were artistically appreciated for the way they painted pictures with words and played with stream of consciousness and focalization. Furthermore, they make us feel what’s inside of the characters.

While great potential is visible for this type of good art in Rand’s vivid and artful descriptions of settings, character appearance, and dialogue, what she doesn’t present vividly is what’s on the inside of these characters. Just like the author herself, her characters think too much and feel too little. While art cannot totally be separated from philosophy, they are two different entities. Art is mostly about feeling and philosophy is mostly about thinking. In artistic theory, A novel *can and should* be separated from a drama or screenplay. Unfortunately, Rand’s fiction lumps these two artistic entities together and her excessive art theories overshadow the impressive potential of her practice. “Bound by her own moral-aesthetic theory, Rand refuses to permit her characters to develop all the various types of significance, tragic or otherwise, that their richly observed psychology seems to require. The effect, ironically, is to reduce the stature and independence of characters whom Rand wishes to render large and free.”³²

Good literary artistic audiences want to enjoy feelings, not make moral judgments and deep philosophical ideas and thoughts about what a good man or woman should be, do or say. Modernist novelist D.H. Lawrence is very similar to Rand in beautifully descriptive artistic style. However, he is antithetical to her in just about every other aspect. In relation to excessiveness of plots, Rand would be very extreme. While Lawrence’s plots don’t tend to be as non-existent as Virginia Woolf or Katherine Mansfield, his fiction doesn’t focus very much on action. The following is a description of two potential lovers together from his novel, **Women In Love**:

And they both felt the subterranean desire to let go,

to fling away everything, and lapse into a sheer unrestraint, brutal and licentious. A strange black passion surged up pure if she could tear the world asunder them . . . Ah, if that which was unorgiastic and satisfying event it would be. And she wanted it, she trembled slightly from the proximity of the man, who stood just behind her, suggestive of the same black licentiousness that rose in herself. She wanted it in him, this unacknowledged frenzy. For a moment the clear perception of this preoccupied her, distinct and perfect in its final reality (319).

If we could feel and share these same types of emotions with Howard Roark, Gail Wynand or Dominique Francon, we would be closer to them as true human beings. We could more easily relate our feelings and experiences to theirs and [here comes a bad word for followers of Rand's aesthetics] learn from them. Sharing their feelings make our lives and experiences more applicable to theirs.

Note how excessive action descriptions create a barrier to these shared feelings in a similar passage regarding two lovers in **The Fountainhead**, Peter Keating and his true love, Catherine Halsey:

When they walked out together, when they were alone in the cold brilliance of streets flooded with late sunlight, Keating felt himself recapturing everything Catherine had always meant to him, the strange emotion that he could not keep in the presence of others. He closed his hand over hers. She withdrew her hand, took off her glove and slipped her fingers into his . . . She was looking straight ahead at the gold light, he saw her delicate profile and the faint crease of a smile in the corner of her mouth, a smile of quiet happiness. But he noticed that the edge of her eyelid was pale and he began to wonder whether she was anemic (240).

The language itself in this passage tries to hold back feelings with words. In the third line, instead of saying "Keating felt . . . etc," it says "Keating felt himself recapturing". Too many verbs are being used in these sentences. No sentence in this passage has fewer than two verbs. Beautiful descriptions are given of settings like, "late sunlight" and "cold brilliance." However, "the strange emotion" mentioned in line four is given no such description at all. More feeling descriptions about her characters would make her good vivid prose even more richly descriptive.

By just looking at a passage like this one, it seems that Rand probably included her heavily ideological philosophy into her creative writing process.

Having associated myth with the embodiment of moral ideals, Rand turns directly to the moral uses of characterization:

Many readers of **The Fountainhead** have told me that the character of Howard Roark helped them to make a decision when they faced a moral dilemma. They asked themselves: ‘What would Roark do in this situation?’—and, faster than their mind could identify the proper application of all the complex principles involved, the image of Roark gave them the answer. . . such is the psycho-epistemological function of a personified [concretized] human ideal.³³

“Since Rand sets no limits to the theory that her characters should be able to help her readers with their moral dilemmas, she encourages the idea that art functions to help its audience make decisions about virtually all such problems.”³⁴ E.M. Forster (1927) comments on this type of moral idealization of characters by stating, “. . . the plot, instead of finding human beings more or less cut to its requirements, as they are in the drama, finds them enormous, shadowy and intractable, and three-quarters hidden like an iceberg. In vain it points out to these unwieldy creatures the advantages of the triple process of complication, crisis, and solution so persuasively expounded by Aristotle. A few of them rise and comply, and a novel which ought to have been a play is the result” (85).

This same idea holds true of **The Fountainhead**. It looks like a novel that should have been a play. In her article, “Psyching Out Ayn Rand,” even in bashing Rand and her work, Barbara Grizzuti Harrison admits that her descriptions and word uses are creatively vivid. She says that, “There are some yummy visual set pieces in **The Fountainhead**. Dominique dines in solitary splendor: ‘A shallow crystal bowl stood in a pool of light in the center of the long table, with a single water lily spreading white petals about a heart yellow like a drop of candle fire.’ She bathes in a sunken bathtub, ‘the hyacinth odor of her bath salts, the aquamarine tiles polished, shining under her feet, the huge towels spread out like snowdrifts to swallow her body’ (204). Ah, shades of Cecil B.—Rand’s apprenticeship in Hollywood served her well.”³⁵

Here’s another example of her superb setting description:

Walking the soil of a desert island holds one anchored to the rest of the earth; but in their penthouse, with the

telephone disconnected, Wynand and Dominique had no feeling of the fifty-seven floors below them, of steel shafts braced against in space, not an island, but a planet (**The Fountainhead** 487).

Passages like this show her potential for artfully rich prose. Artfully speaking, the proper usage of words are simply used in the wrong literary places. When it comes to narrative description, stream of consciousness, and the verbal sharing of emotions, the same type of artfully descriptive style is omitted as she tells about thoughts and feelings instead of showing:

Gail Wynand raised a gun to his temple. He felt the pressure of a metal ring against his skin—and nothing else . . . He felt no relief, no despair, no fear . . . One does not die like this, he thought. One must feel a great joy or a healthy terror. One must salute one's own end. Let me feel a spasm of dread and I'll pull the trigger. He felt nothing. **36**

This passage shows two literary tendencies of Rand. The feelings shared here are mostly physical feelings. Again, we are blocked from feeling what the character feels. The reader is told that Gail Wynand feels “no fear,” “no relief,” “no despair,” instead of being shown.

Another of her tendencies demonstrated in this passage is the moral idealization of this character. It is not “right” for Gail to die in this instance if it's not in a heroic way. He must feel a certain way. He must salute his own end. This is a very dramatic reason for a failed suicide attempt. It seems like a reason that dramatic stage martyrs like William Shakespeare's Julius Caesar, or George Bernard Shaw's Saint Joan [Joan of Arc] might refuse to commit suicide. A truer to life novel version of the same type of hero in a similar situation would be Holden Caulfield of J.D. Salinger's **Catcher in the Rye**:

I stayed in the bathroom for about an hour, taking a bath and all. Then I got back in bed. It took me quite a while to get to sleep—I wasn't even tired—but finally I did. What I really felt like, though, was committing suicide. I felt like jumping out the window. I probably would've done it too, if I'd been sure somebody'd cover me up as soon as I landed. I didn't want a bunch of stupid rubbernecks looking at me when I was all gory (104).

Although this post World War II novel is of a different literary tradition, style and context than Rand's 1943 novel, it shows more “real people” in situations that look more like “real life.”

While Salinger sacrifices much of Rand's melodrama for absurdity, it takes on a great ambivalence that's more of a quality of real life.

While both Holden and Gail want to die with dignity in this same type of situation, Holden's narration is expressed more artfully. He tries to make the reader laugh at his reason and feel sorry for it at the same time. Wynand is simply presented to the reader as an idealistic hero that we can see more than feel. Holden's suicide reason is neither totally serious, funny nor stupid. Wynand's reason is totally serious and totally melodramatic. Salinger's ambivalence and absurdity are more artistically appreciated characteristics of novels than Rand's consistency in serious melodrama.

Ayn Rand's art is better than her science. The sales of her fiction vs. her non-fiction gives evidence to this point. According to Jeff Riggerback, Rand's essays have never been anywhere nearly as popular with readers as her novels. For every reader of **The Virtue of Selfishness** or **Capitalism: The Unknown Ideal**, there are 100 or more readers of **Anthem**, **The Fountainhead** and **Atlas Shrugged**. While high sales continue for these novels, every one of Rand's volume of essays is now out of print in hardcover. The typical reader of Rand knows only her novels. And from her novels this reader gets a very different message indeed (58).

This means that her art conflicts with her science. Each of these two entities for Rand are unique because what Randian fiction and philosophy are not are just as important as what they are in their relations to art. While most famous scholarly figures are respected as either great artists [poets, novelists] or scientists [philosophers, essayists]. Rand tends to be respected as neither a good artist nor scientist. Gene Bell-Villada states, "As an artist, Rand's contribution [to literature] is nil. The novel of ideas was not her invention, and there is nothing that a self-respecting writer might learn specifically from her screeds other than how not to write. Her twofold compatriot Nabokov, by contrast, stretched the limits of fiction, and you needn't like the wizard's chilly aestheticism to appreciate his formal artifice and prose beauties. A.S. Byatt's **Possession**, D.M. Thomas' **The White Hotel**, and Ariel Dorfman's **Widows** simply could not exist without the dazzling example of Nabokov's **Pale Fire**. Rand has no such writerly heirs (240).

Despite my disagreement with Bell-Villada's main point here, some of his statements hold true. Rand didn't invent the novel of ideas and her prose doesn't represent good literary form. However, **The Fountainhead** does make some contributions to art and the reader can get

more out of it than a lesson on how not to write. **The Fountainhead** is art. In terms of the prose narrative style and structure, it's not good art and not good literature. However, the creation of its characters and the goals they are seeking and what they ideologically and symbolically represent in relation to American society and culture are valuable and inseparable as art in the American imagination. Douglas Den Uyl says, "it is the characters Rand creates who exemplify the blend of art and philosophy, not the components of the process she uses to create them" (45).

Her way of presenting her ideas are just as excessive as the American dream that she's trying to portray. She was a good imaginative writer who ideologically blocked her own creative process. Stephen Cox (1986) states that, "Rand's own work, unfortunately, provides some good examples of what too often happens when theory strives for mastery over creative life. . . . When theory imposes its own shape on her novels, it usually does so to their detriment."³⁷ Artistically, she claimed to be a Romantic writer of fiction. If Rand's work qualifies as literary art, does it also qualify as Romantic literature?

Webster's New World Dictionary defines the Romantic Movement as:

The revolt in the 18th and early 19th cent. against the artistic, political, and philosophical principles that had become associated with neoclassicism: characterized in literature, music, painting, etc. by freedom of form and spirit, emphasis on feeling and originality and on the personality of the artist himself and sympathetic interest in primitive nature, medievalism, Orientalism, the common man, etc.

It defines Classicism as, "the aesthetic principles or qualities regarded as characteristic of ancient Greece and Rome, objectivity, formality, balance, simplicity, restraint, etc: generally contrasted with Romanticism." This definition of Classicism is interesting because it echoes some similar words in relation to Rand's literary art. Her aesthetic theory was loosely based on that of Aristotle, a Greek philosopher. "Objectivity" sounds just like her philosophy of "Objectivism." "Restraint" of emotions is what she demonstrates and preaches in both her art and science. For an artist who claims Romanticism, according to this definition, more than a few of her artistic and scientific theories appear to follow along the lines of Classicism.

Nevertheless, let's begin with the Romantic Movement at its beginnings. It's a problematic literary and cultural movement for a few reasons. Romanticism began in Germany

and then moved westward. In determining the historical roots of the movements, Morse Peckham claims that the first document that reveals the breakdown of the Enlightenment orientation and its failure to solve the profoundest problems of existence is **The Sorrows of Young Werther** by Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, first published in 1774 and reissued in a revised edition in 1787.

38 This monumental work was followed in 1790 by philosopher Immanuel Kant's **Critique of Judgment**. In this work, Kant's effort was to, "determine the condition of man in the world and the relation of man to the world in which he finds himself."**39** According to Kant:

Only what has in itself the end of its real existence --only man that is able to determine his ends by reason, or, where he has to derive them from external perception, can still compare them with essential and universal ends, and then further pronounce aesthetically upon their accord with such ends, only he, among all objects in the world, admits, therefore, of an ideal of beauty, just as humanity in his person, as intelligence, alone admits of the ideal of perfection (**Critique of Judgment** SS 17).

These are considered the artistic and philosophical origins of the Romantic Movement.

Throughout her career as both a literary artist and philosopher, Ayn Rand professed an ongoing enmity with the ideas of Kant. However, Kant is responsible for the ideological beginnings of Rand's trademark literary movement--Romanticism. Therefore, Objectivists and Randian scholars should actually thank, instead of condemn, Immanuel Kant and his philosophy. According to Chris Matthew Sciabarra, Rand's anti-Kantianism probably came more from a bias about his philosophy that she learned from her early teacher, N.O. Lossky. As the chief Russian translator of Kant's works, he too criticized the German philosopher's contention that true being [things-in-themselves] transcends consciousness and remains forever unknowable.**40** In one article, in reference to Kant, Lossky says, "Causality is thus wholly identified with the conception of order—as it had been identified by Kant, for whom it was merely a category of the understanding, devoid of all ontological content."**41** Rand very possibly absorbed a Russian bias against Kant inadvertently.**42**

Raised from Kantian roots, Romanticism was a movement more known and appreciated for poetry than fiction. Furthermore, it is more associated with English poets of the period rather than novelists of either England, France or Germany. Within the academy, the Big Six Romantic

writers in England, Wordsworth, Coleridge, Keats, Byron, Blake and Shelley are the most popular and widely studied artists connected to this movement. According to Robert Miles, “The Romantic novelist was drawn to the period’s interest in the subjective and irrational, the oneric and the outré, as represented in such aesthetic fads as the sublime, graveyard imagery, and the supernatural. While such material was workable in the medium of poetry, it pulled against the qualities that had become intrinsic to the novel form: duration, a concern with community, and the objective representation of events” (180).

While the movement began around the last twenty-five years of the eighteenth century, the first popular Romantic novels to take France [the country of origin for Victor Hugo, Rand’s claimed Romantic predecessor] by storm didn’t come until around the middle of the nineteenth century, about seventy-five years later. Two of the most famous in France were Gustave Flaubert’s **Madame Bovary** (1857) and Victor Hugo’s **Les Misérables** (1862). A major reason for this delay was the French Revolution. “Although many periods have something resembling factors like the Industrial Revolution, extreme political instability, social unrest, migration, weakened religious and ethical foundations, changing aesthetic canons, endemic illness growing from poor sanitation and malnutrition, wide spread methods of child care that exacerbated psychological problems, and rapid dissemination of information and commentary, only the Romantic period has them all.” **43**

These contextual changes of the times are important to this literary movement. These problematic times created a problematic movement. Furthermore, because Romanticism stemmed from many different types of social changes, it’s artistic nature as a movement took on different types of literary tendencies. Some works of Romantic literature were naturalistic, escapist and modernistic. It included characters that were too good for their worlds in both optimistic and pessimistic ways. According to Allan H. Pasco, “Romanticism can be understood as an opposition to Classicism—the claims of the imagination, the individual, and emotion in confrontation with reason, universals and discipline” (9). Romantic literature is a balance between reason and nature.

In studying the Romantic nature of the Randian novel, and her possible place within this troubling artistic explosion of the nineteenth century, we must look at Victor Hugo’s place in the movement. This is necessary because the author of **The Fountainhead** mostly patterned her form of Romanticism after him. In the artistic battle between feelings and thought, or reason and

emotions, that is Romanticism, the narratives of both Rand and Hugo lean towards the end of reason. Despite this, Hugo's narrative touches on feeling descriptions better than Rand does:

Javert was at this moment in heaven . . . he, Javert, personified justice, light, and truth, in their celestial function as destroyers of evil . . . he stood erect in a halo of glory . . . he displayed in full glory the super-human beastliness of a ferocious archangel . . . happy and indignant, he had set his heel on crime, vice, rebellion, perdition, and hell; he was radiant, exterminating, smiling . . . (**Les Misérables** 113).

While the best Romantic literature expresses feelings and passions and deals more with nature than reason, the two are artistically inseparable. Artistically speaking, thoughts simply cannot be described as beautifully as feelings. Romantic novelists must deal with both contrasting entities.

For example, although Hugo, as a Romantic novelist, emphasized morals and reason over nature and feelings, he still embraced feelings and nature as a part of the art:

We have already looked into the depths of that conscience; the time has come to look into them again. We do so not without emotion, nor without trembling. There exists nothing more terrific than this kind of contemplation. The mind's eye can nowhere find anything more dazzling or more dark than in man; it can fix itself upon nothing which is more awful, more complex, more mysterious or more infinite. There is one spectacle grander than the sea, that is the sky; there is one spectacle grander than the sky, that is the interior of the soul (**Les Misérables** 74).

Although he puts reason above nature here and man's soul above anything natural on earth, nature is understood as a part of this creation. It is dealt with as an ingredient of Romantic literature. Right from the very beginning of her novel, Rand is trying to conquer nature in her narrative instead of artistically integrating it to add balance to her heavy doses of reason. "He looked at the granite. To be cut, he thought, and made into walls. He looked at a tree. To be split and made into rafters. He looked at a streak of rust on the stone and thought of iron ore under the ground. To be melted and to emerge as girders against the sky" (**The Fountainhead** 16).

Johann van Goethe gives us a better balance of these two things in the Romantic style of his novel **The Sorrows of Young Werther**:

A vast, twilit whole lies before our soul; our emotions

lose themselves in it as do our eyes, and we long to surrender our entire being and let ourselves sink into one great well of blissful feeling. Alas, when we approach, when There has become Here, everything is as it was before, and we are left with our poverty, our narrowness, while our soul thirsts for comfort that slipped away (33).

Here is a mixture of the feeling of bliss and losing ourselves in emotion. When reason conflicts with this and brings us back to reality, we're not as happy. This is not to say that conflicts of reason and emotion do not exist in Rand's characters. Her prose style simply does not show them. She is more concerned with the thematic messages and the battles between good and evil. The thoughts that she gives of the characters in the narrative deal with actions and never emotions or feelings.

In **Madame Bovary**, Gustave Flaubert not only gives a good balance of both, but he beautifully describes both reason: "She was now acquainted with the pettiness of the passions exaggerated by art. Forcing herself to take her mind off her sorrows, she tried to see in this reproduction of them nothing but a visual fantasy designed for her enjoyment, and she even smiled inwardly with scornful pity when a man wearing a black cloak appeared from behind the door curtain at the back of the stage,"(194) and emotion:

With the diversity of her moods—by turn mystic, joyous, loquacious, taciturn, passionate and nonchalant—she awakened a thousand desires in him, aroused his instincts and memories. She was the amorous heroine of all novels and plays, the vague 'she' of all poetry. He saw on her shoulders the amber skin of the 'Bathing Odalisque'; she had the long-waisted figure of a feudal chatelaine; she also resembled the 'Pale Woman of Barcelona,' but above all she was an angel! (**Madame Bovary** 229).

While Flaubert may be the best at the combination of both a good style and story, D.H. Lawrence's art of narrative details, painting the picture and putting the reader there are perhaps the best of any [borderline Romantic] novelist:

She could see his face, although it was a pure shadow. But it was a piece of twilight. And her breast was keen with passion for him, he was so beautiful in his male stillness and mystery. It was a certain pure effluence of maleness, like an aroma from his softly, firmly moul-

ded contours, a certain rich perfection of his presence, that touched her with an ecstasy, a thrill of pure intoxication (**Women in Love** 193).

The “firmly moulded contours” that Lawrence describes here is stylistically very similar to Rand’s verbal picture of Howard Roark [page 19 above, pg. 15 of the novel].

The key difference is that Lawrence gives more of a realistic comparison here. He compares the human body to a sculpture and Rand compares it to a building, or skyscraper. More imaginary limitation exists here in Lawrence’s prose. This prose, though it leans more towards nature, doesn’t go too far with it. It keeps nature within the grasp of both our imaginations and experience. Rand not only leans more towards reason and/or imagination, she takes it far beyond our experience. People don’t look to even the most heroic people as mythical Gods, or buildings or monuments that stand higher than anything else on earth.

Allan H. Pasco states, “. . . When Romantic heroes tried to pose statuesquely on the slopes of Mount Olympus they tumbled face down, nose in the comic” (89). Rand’s heroes stand on top an Americanized version of Mount Olympus all throughout **The Fountainhead**. “. . . In their penthouse, with the telephone disconnected, Wynand and Dominique had no feeling of the fifty-seven floors below them, of steel shafts braced against granite”. . . (487). “The fifty-seven floors below them” is the key statement here. The mythological presentations give these heroes a comic book type quality. Mary Shelley does a little of this in **Frankenstein**, “I resolved to go alone to the summit of Montanvert . . . It had then filled me with a sublime ecstasy that gave wings to the soul . . . short windings, which enable you to surmount the perpendicularity of the mountain . . . I looked on the valley beneath.”⁴⁴

The difference here is that Shelley artistically gives this symbolism in one main place in her novel. Rand does this all throughout **The Fountainhead**.⁴⁵ While not arguing here that repetition has no place in Romantic literature, the same symbol six times in one novel is excessive literary overkill. This literary flaw of Rand’s make her characters too extremely Romantic. Speeches in dramas, generally have this majestic quality about them because in plays, the audience can’t see or hear what the characters are thinking. In novels, we can.

Victor Hugo does the same type of thing with his heroic characters:

Hugo’s prose narratives obviously cannot be approached as conventional novels. Paradoxically, this writer who aimed at, and succeeded in, reaching the

largest possible public also made new and difficult demands on the reader. Closer to romance and myth than to the realist tradition, projecting linguistic and metaphoric structures that achieve what has been called the *roman poeme*, the novels of Hugo, always steeped in a sociohistorical context tend toward the elaboration of a new epic which no longer sings the heroic exploit but the moral adventure of man. **46**

Just like Hugo, Rand also succeeded in “reaching the largest possible public.” The tastes of the general public are not the same as those of specified groups. The general public cannot appreciate art and science like specified interest groups can. Therefore, a work of literature written for a general audience tends to be more melodramatic, packed with action and less effective as artwork. Because its readership is so diverse, works like **The Fountainhead** must entertain as much as educate. Rand is closer to romance and myth than to realism. However, she differs from Hugo in that her work is more about man’s heroic exploits than his moral adventures.

In **Les Miserables**, Jean’s moral adventures begin when he is released from prison. Later, he takes forty sous from a boy who throws his fortune into the woods. Even later in the novel, he adopts Cossette, a little girl whose mother has died, and is in the care of the abusive Thenadier family. Through his journeys in the novel, Valjean is continually learning and improving his moral character. Kathryn Grossman asserts, “It [Valjean’s spiritual revolution] consists less in making automatically good responses to temptation than in having such responses proceed from a growing, vital self. It is a process, not a product (149). . .his conscience judging him far more severely than the law” (152).

With the exception of Dominique, no character in Rand’s novel really morally develops. Gail Wynand doesn’t really learn that he doesn’t control New York. He makes the mistake of mixing his professional and personal lives. His professional career has built a paper that’s against Howard Roark types, it’s his living. This man, who has gained his success by destroying Howard Roark types all his life, now completely changes the stance of his paper because he is Roark’s friend. Wynand never apologizes for his paper to Dominique, never apologizes for firing her, or offers her the job back, so why should he refute what his paper says for Roark?

It’s an unrealistic mistake made by a wealthy newspaper mogul who should know that business and friendship should remain separate. At the beginning of the story, the characters

have already morally developed as much as they ever will. They begin and end on either the side of good or evil. The novel is not about “adventures” in moral improvement, but “exploitation” to see who rules the world and who gets crushed in the ongoing battles between good and evil. Even Dominique shares Roark’s moral convictions from the beginning.

In his presentations of dramatic myths, Hugo doesn’t go to the extremes that Rand does. Hugo’s romantic descriptions also remain within our experience and imagination. Hugo’s heroes look like noble statesmen. This image stands between the realism of Rand, Flaubert and Lawrence. Because his characters are noble statesmen, more visible and applicable to the common man than a God, Hugo’s Romanticism is more realistic than Rand’s but less realistic than Flaubert’s or Lawrence’s. Melodramatic speeches, poses and actions come from even the most lowly of his characters. In Hugo’s novel **Ninety-Three**, a lowly beggar gives a speech:

Poverty, riches—that makes a terrible business. That is what brings on catastrophes. At least I have that idea. The poor want to be rich; the rich are not willing to be poor. I think that is about what it is at the bottom. I do not mix myself up with matters. The events are the events. I am neither for the creditor not for the debtor (97). **47**

While noble statesmen are more conceivable to us than people as Gods, even the common man looks loftier and larger than life for our imagination in Hugo. He’s presented to us as either extremely lowly or extremely exalted.**48** We can relate more to balances between these two types.

Unlike Rand’s Romantic heroes, Hugo’s heroes represent the common man. As his Romantic heroes, the common man and the commonwealth of France are representatively one and the same. This allows for greater balance within his heroes because they can represent people of any demographics or socioeconomic status. Kathryn M. Grossman articulates, although Jean Valjean’s ethos is centered on individuals, it cannot be entirely divorced from the social and political sphere. The individual and society, the particular and the general, plot and digressions, reflect and stand for each other in this internally consistent system (188). In the novel, Napoleon, the great military emperor and Valjean, the lowly outcast of an ex-convict, each represent the spirit of France on different socioeconomic levels. Although they are different in class, they are the same in spirit and goals—their individual happiness and the progress of France.

According to Kathryn M. Grossman, “France is not just a place but a creative process.

Marius' belief that Napoleon was the 'incarnation' (472) of his country because he epitomized such vastly different tendencies foreshadows a similar view of Valjean" (196). Therefore, in **Les Misérables**, the happiness, progress, agendas and more importantly, the Romantic spirit of a lowly beggar can be the same as a noble statesman. The common man has no such place within the Romantic spirit of Rand's fiction. Thus, many Randian Heroes, like Howard Roark, Gail Wynand and Hank Rearden are self-made men who have elevated themselves from the socioeconomic status of common man. In her work, happiness existed merely on the individual level. It's every man for himself. The most selfish, greedy and egotistical hero wins. Unlike the rest of Romantic fiction, happy endings don't usually come to people with these atypical characteristics.

However, this is not a flaw of Rand's work. It is simply where Victor Hugo differs from both Rand and the typical canon of nineteenth century Romantic Literature. Neither Ursula, Gerald, Gudrun or Birkin from **Women in Love** nor Emma Bovary nor Victor Frankenstein are common men or women. Each is of at least middle class status. The Romantic literary styles and heroes of Rand, Hugo, Flaubert and Lawrence were all different but the same. Emma Bovary resorts to excess, greed, egoism and selfishness—traits associated with capitalism in pursuit of her individual happiness. Just like Gerald, the mining industrialist [who represented capitalism] in **Women in Love**, these characters and what their lifestyles were or represented ultimately caused their downfall. Howard Roark is one of the few capitalist Romantic heroes who prosper and find happiness as a result of this. Even the nice, unselfish and sympathetic character, also a capitalist hero, Christopher Newman in Henry James' **The American**, fails to get the girl and win happiness at the novel's end.

Like typical Romantic literature, Rand's characters also struggle for happiness. However, the way her narrative presents these struggles look very different from the rest. Her atypical mixture of Romantic style and optimism, represented through her characters, is the most intriguing and effective aspect of Ayn Rand's narrative. It's not what makes it good Romantic literature, but it's what inspires us in her fiction. It's not her romantic style, but her melodramatic inspirations [and the way she applies them to real life situations] her extreme blends of art, philosophy, melodrama, religion and optimism. Optimism is most important. The roots of optimism come from a French philosopher whom Rand never credits. Actually, in her typical way, she bashes this philosopher and a couple of others that she uses in her fiction. Of these

philosophers, Rand says:

The philosophers who attempted to devise an allegedly rational code of ethics gave mankind nothing but a choice of whims: the ‘selfish’ pursuit of one’s own whims [such as the ethics of Nietzsche]—or ‘selfless’ service to the whims of others [such as the ethics of Bentham, Mill, Comte and of all social hedonists, whether they allowed man to include his own whims among the millions of others or advised him to turn himself into a totally selfless ‘schmoo’ that seeks to be eaten by others (**The Virtue of Selfishness** 30).

Three different ingredients of Rand’s Romantic literary style come from three of these four philosophers mentioned above. The man-worship and likening man to Gods comes from Friedrich Nietzsche’s philosophy of the Superman [more about this in Chapter 4], her literary optimism comes from Auguste Comte’s philosophy of Positivism and her idea of happiness being the moral purpose and main goal of man’s life comes from J.S. Mill’s philosophy of Utilitarianism.

In the explanation of his philosophy of Positivism, Comte explains that, “Positivism is an endeavor to become more perfect . . . and the motto of the philosophy is love, order and progress . . . Reason has been divorced for a long time from Feeling and Imagination. But, with the more complete and systematic culture here proposed [Positivist Philosophy], they will be re-united.”

49 Feeling and imagination are the two main ingredients of Romanticism. Comte added a third ingredient to change the Romantic novel. Richard Osborne interprets Comte’s philosophy to mainly say, “We are all optimists-confident about a future rational society”(135). This integration moved literature from the pessimistic Romantic heroes like Emma Bovary and Werther to the more optimistic heroes like Christopher Newman and ultimately, to Howard Roark.

J.S. Mill’s philosophy, as stated in **Utilitarianism** can also be seen not only in Rand’s philosophy and literature, but also optimistic literature in general. It’s main premise is:

The creed which accepts as the foundation of morals ‘utility’ or the ‘greatest happiness principle’ holds that actions are right in proportion as they tend to promote happiness, wrong as they tend to produce the reverse of happiness (7).

Rand’s Objectivist philosophy says, “To live for his own sake means that the achievement of his

own happiness is man's highest moral purpose.”⁵⁰ In John Galt's speech in **Atlas Shrugged**, he says, “All that which is proper to the life of a rational being is the good; all that which destroys it is the evil”(940). Rand is basically saying the same thing as J.S. Mill in her philosophy. She merely revises Utilitarianism to say that this happiness must be selfish and gained by rational means. It is interesting to note that during their lives, Comte and Mill were friends and their major works and philosophies evolved around the same time—the mid-nineteenth century.⁵¹

The mid-nineteenth century was a cultural explosion for Europe from which Romanticism and optimism evolved. The Positivist Age in France, which P.E. Charvet categorizes as 1850-1870, happened, ironically, at the exact same times of Victor Hugo's exile from France (1851-1870). G. Barnett Smith states that, poetic genius in France was wrapped in the grave-clothes of classicism; it was a corpse that needed galvanizing into life; and it was practically Victor Hugo who rose and said, ‘Loose her, and let her go.’ Goethe had already fought the battle of literary freedom from old superstitions in Germany, and Byron had done the same in England. It was now the turn of France to feel the new gush of life, and to gather strength and luster in the revival (49-50).

While both writing in exile at the time of the French Revolution, Victor Hugo and Nikolai Chernyshevsky composed two of the most important works in relation to optimism and Romantic literature, **Les Miserables** (1862) and **What Is To Be Done?** (1863). Hugo applied optimism in relation to Comte's Positivism into literature for France and Chernyshevsky applied it in relation to Marxism for Russian Literature. According to Walter N. Vickery, Marxism is, of course, very much the child of the optimistic and deterministic thought of the nineteenth century. The same glib optimism was expressed in Chernyshevsky's **What Is To Be Done?** –and incidentally, countered in Dostoevsky's **Letters From the Underground** (118-119). ⁵²

Kathryn Feuer categorizes Chernyshevsky's novel as *a romance*, which has evolved from the chivalric romances of the Middle Ages. Although Chernyshevsky's work emerged from and was written during the same contextual background, this romance should not be confused with a Romantic novel.⁵³ Just like Rand, Chernyshevsky's used ideas in his novel from J.S. Mill's philosophy of Utilitarianism and never gave him any credit. Andrew M. Drozd says that **What Is To Be Done?** was viewed by scholars as a work that propagates a philosophy of rational egoism. He was often viewed as borrowing the Utilitarian philosophy wholesale, with vulgarizations, without crediting J.S. Mill as a source and mentioning him quite infrequently in

his works (101). Ayn Rand propagates rational egoism and she has also been accused of vulgarizing other philosophers like Friedrich Nietzsche. The Romantic movement and optimistic literature are just a couple of the great artistic forms that Rand vulgarizes through her work.

Nevertheless, **What Is To Be Done?** is important to the literary optimistic movement for a couple of main reasons. First of all, it portrayed optimism individually:

But her happiness was much more, oh, much more!
Everything was happiness, except these sorrows; and
these sorrows were only exceptional and rare occur-
rences. . . Bright and Gay was the ordinary course of
business, and it filled Viera Pavlovna's heart with con-
stant happiness (184).⁵⁴

It contrasted Hugo's communal optimism in which no character could be separated from the Spirit of French Commonwealth:

He continued: 'This man who is among us represents the king. He has been confided to us; we must save him. He is necessary to the throne of France; in default of a prince he will be—at least this is what we try for—the leader in the Vendee. He is a great general. He was to have landed in France with us; he must land without us. To save the head is to save all.' 'Yes! Yes! Yes!' cried the voices of the whole crew (**Ninety-Three** 61).

It looks exactly like the blueprint to **The Fountainhead** in that it shows not only Romantic optimism, but key components of Rand's Objectivism appear in it almost verbatim:

'Akh! What a sacrifice he made for my sake!' And I never thought of making a sacrifice; I was never so foolish as to make sacrifices, and I hope I never shall be. I have done what was for my best good. I am not a man to offer sacrifices; and there are no such men in existence (**What Is to Be Done** 126).

This looks very similar to the creed preached by the inhabitants of Galt's Gulch [Rand's utopian society] in **Atlas Shrugged**, which says, "I swear by my life and my love of it—that I will never live for the sake of another man, nor ask another man to live for mine"(933).

As one of Ayn Rand's chief literary influences and heirs, Edna Ferber includes a line which looks almost verbatim to this creed of Rand's in her novel, **Giant**—a work full of optimism and some traces of Rand's literary tendencies.⁵⁵ When discussing his ambitious

desire to be a doctor instead of carrying on the family ranch for his father, Bick, Jordan Benedicts says, “I’d die for Papa if it was a quick choice between his life and mine. But I won’t live for him” (381). Just like the progressive nature of this melodramatic statement in **Giant**, **The Fountainhead** is a practical application of Positivism:

No matter how terrible their struggle, no matter how difficult the obstacles they encounter, the basic sense of life of Ayn Rand’s heroes—as of the novels—is indestructibly affirmative and triumphant. Whether the characters achieve victory or, as in **We the Living**, suffer defeat, they do not regard pain and disaster as the normal, as the inevitable, but always as the abnormal, the exceptional, the unnatural.⁵⁶

In regard to the blending of Comte’s three ingredients, Rand’s work heavily stresses reason, and gives repressed dosages of feeling and imagination. Again, a key difference between Rand’s work and that of Romantic Literature is that true Romantic heroes deal with reason and emotion and try to create a balance between them. Rand’s heroes set their feelings aside and her villains randomly embrace feelings and emotions without thinking. She shows one extreme or the other instead of a balance between the two entities.

For example, in the beginning of **The Fountainhead**, the hero has just been expelled from school, he is alone, he has no friends. There is no one with whom he can share his inner life or values. Howard gives no indication of being bothered by any of it. He is serenely happy within himself.⁵⁷ This is how the author describes his feelings, “Howard Roark laughed . . . He laughed at the thing which had happened to him that morning and at the things which now lay ahead. He knew that the days ahead would be difficult. . . He knew also that he would not think . . . He did not laugh as his eyes stopped in awareness of the earth around him”(The **Fountainhead** 15). He responds to his tragedy in an optimistic way. We get a little of his thinking and none of his feelings or imagination. He either doesn’t feel anything or he keeps these feelings hidden. We don’t know what great things he may be imagining because they are hidden from us in the narration.

Hugo, the closest predecessor to Rand’s literary style, does deal with this mixture of reason, imagination and emotion, “The moon, shining through the four panes of the window, threw its whiteness into the ruddy and flaming garrett; and to Marius’ poetic mind, a dreamer

even in the moment of action, it was like a thought of heaven mingled with the shapeless nightmares of earth” (**Les Miserables** 270). This same type of rich mixture of literary elements doesn’t exist in Rand’s work.

While **Giant** is not a Romantic novel, it also deals with reason, imagination and emotion. Furthermore, traces of the movement’s characteristics can be seen in it. In **Giant**, reason takes the form of tradition in that Bick has run the ranch like a dynasty, the way he has been taught by his sister, Luz. He expects his children to run it after he’s gone. “They’re both too young to know what they’re doing. One thing’s sure. Jordy’s [Bick’s son] going to run Reata. He’s got to learn” (**Giant** 383). Passion can be seen from Bick in the argument with his wife, Leslie, when she asks him to move from their home and let their relative, Uncle Bawley, run the ranch:

Get this. If you can understand anything that isn’t Virginia and pink coats and hunt dinners and Washington tea parties. Just get this. I run Reata. I run Holgado. I run the damn wet Humedo Division and Los Gatos too and a lot you’ve never heard of. Everything in them and on them is run by me. I run everything and everyone that has the Reata brand on it (**Giant** 313).

Imagination is portrayed when Jordy, Bick’s son, unlike his father, has dreams and aspirations that go beyond the outer gates of Reata Ranch. “Harvard . . . that’s what I want to do more than anything in the world . . . But not for his [Bick’s] reason . . . That’s right. Pre-medical. Biology chemistry physics . . . After that I want Columbia University P. and S. . . . Besides, the New York hospitals give you a better chance at material than any city in the world except maybe London” (**Giant** 380).

Good Romantic novels portray inner struggles. **Giant** and **The Fountainhead** mainly portray these struggles from outside the inner self. For example, in Ferber’s novel, Bick argues with Leslie about the mistreatment of Mexicans and ideas of the five main characters of **The Fountainhead** are often given in the form of philosophical speeches. The key difference between these two authors and their respective works is that, unlike **The Fountainhead**, **Giant** isn’t claimed to be a Romantic novel. The best Romantic novels focus on the consciousness of fewer main characters with more versatile human qualities and traits represented within them. Flaubert’s priority is art over life. About this, the great romantic novelist said, “What seems beautiful to me, what I should like to write, is a book about nothing . . . The finest works are

those that contain the least matter.”⁵⁸ For this reason, **Madame Bovary**, **Women In Love**, and **The Sorrows of Young Werther** are three of the best Romantic novels of the movement.

In **Frankenstein**, when Victor first discovers that he is capable of creating life, the struggles between nature, imagination and reason go on inside him. His reason warns him as he says, “. . . How dangerous is the acquirement of knowledge, and how much happier that man is who believes his native town to be the world, than he who aspires to become greater than his nature will allow.” He listens to this reason initially, “I doubted at first whether I should attempt the creation of a being like myself or one of simpler organization . . .” But his imagination, “. . . but my imagination was too much exalted by my first success to permit me to doubt of my ability to give life to an animal as complex and wonder as man. . .” allows his emotions to take over, “Life and death appeared to me ideal bounds, which I should first break through, and pour a torrent of light into our dark world. A new species would bless me as its creator and source; many happy and excellent natures would owe their being to me . . . I might in the process of time [although I now found it impossible] renew life where death had apparently devoted the body to corruption” (**Frankenstein** 48-9).

We don’t experience these same inner struggles in **The Fountainhead**. For example, when Howard Roark dynamites the Cortlandt Building because it’s not designed to the specifications of his drawing, Gail Wynand develops a personal conviction to defend him. Wynand will now use every resource he has to defend the man whom he made a career out of destroying with his newspaper. Wynand’s conflicting feelings and/or convictions are thus described:

He had been calm while he telephoned, got a county Judge out of bed and arranged Roark’s bail. But when he stood in the warden’s office of a small county jail, he began to shake suddenly. ‘You bloody fools!’ he said through his teeth and there followed every obscenity he had learned on the waterfront . . . He was Stretch Wynand of Hell’s Kitchen again and this was the kind of fury he had felt when standing behind a crumbling wall, waiting to be killed. Only now he knew that he was also Gail Wynand, the owner of an empire, and he couldn’t understand why some sort of legal procedure was necessary, why he didn’t smash this jail, with his fists or through his papers, it was all one to him at the moment, he wanted to kill, he had to kill, as that night behind the wall, in defense of his life (**The Fountainhead** 620).

Here we see Gail Wynand's struggles with reason and emotion from outside his inner self. We can't experience the thoughts and feelings that are causing him to be furious. People don't just snap without emotions getting the better of them. We can only see his actions when guided by reason—his calmness and his imagination going back to an important time in his past and the results of his emotions taking over his reason—his violent fury and outburst of obscenities. He defends Roark because he believes he has the power and must be imagining both him and Roark winning at the end—but Rand doesn't show this in the narrative.

If Rand's narrative showed us more of the inside of her characters and their struggles without artistically repressing her potentially beautiful style, her work would be more romantic. Inner struggles between reason and emotion tear normal people up inside. Romantic heroes are not normal people. According to Lloyd Bishop, "Romantic heroes are born in sorrow and are early exposed to envy, bitter jealousy and calumny. Although of noble impulses, his intense individualism and hypersensitivity often result in morbid or pathological tendencies. His melancholy often degenerates into involitional melancholia, masochism, or even mere petulance" (16-17). These heroes are too good for the world they live in. They don't handle their emotions well. They're extremely happy or extremely sad. They want the extreme happiness to go on forever and loathe the sadness so much that, in many cases, it's worse than death.

Good Romantic heroes are sick like this. Rand's heroes are too well. Even though we see traces of these types of sicknesses from Dominique, Peter, and Wynand, who are also the three most realistic characters in the novel, they handle their emotions better than typical Romantic heroes. So many of the characters in the novel converge to destroy Roark that, just like Superman [Nietzschean or the comic book version] he must be impervious to pain. **The Fountainhead's** heroes look superhuman in this regard. When alone on the cliff after being expelled from school, Roark laughs about it to himself—is this man ever sad?!. Dominique shows this same type of masochism when she is raped by Howard Roark and shows a general indifference to everything—like Toohey's attempt to destroy her by matching her with Gail Wynand.

Unlike the Romantic heroes, Werther and Emma Bovary, Rand's heroes, though slightly ill and also too good for the world, can handle living in the real world. Werther is a sicker hero than Emma Bovary. Both keep dreaming about their fantasy goals so much that they ruin their

lives in their obsessions to achieve it. While Werther's passions are so strong that nothing in his life matters, his sense of morals, or reason are strong as well. Unlike Emma Bovary, he doesn't propose to have an extramarital affair to satisfy these desires. He only steals a forbidden kiss and embrace near the end of the novel before killing himself. Everything is fantasy to Emma Bovary as well. Reality is unbearable and fantasy is never as satisfying as her dreams. Emma tries to live these dreams through adultery and carelessly living beyond her means.

Disgust with the world around them is another key trait of sick heroes. Lloyd Bishop calls this type decadent Romantic heroes. He says, the decadent Romantic hero feels caught up himself in the world's degeneracy and decay (142). They each deal with this utter disgust for the world in their own way. Seymour of "A Perfect Day for a Bananafish" in J.D. Salinger's **Nine Stories**, contemplates such ugly things as "olives and wax," "six tigers eternally running around the same tree" and "a lady from Canada poking a little dog with balloon sticks" (14-15). He deals with these horrible unceasing images by shooting himself to death.

In **The Fountainhead**, Dominique often contemplates the ugly as well, ". . . you're a wonderful person, Alvah, [her boss on her job as a writer for Wynand's newspaper] but not exactly inspiring and I don't think it would be beautiful to cringe before a whip in your hand—oh, don't protest, it would be such a polite little whip, and that's what would make it uglier" (143). Dominique is a decadent Romantic heroine. However, she is not as sick as Seymour or Gerald. She can exist in the world without killing herself. Nevertheless, in order to make her extreme life indifference and utter hatred of the world's mediocrity bearable, she must turn to evil. Throughout the novel, Dominique's only joy is destroying greatness and beauty in the world. She doesn't react to the world around her the way that the typical Romantic hero should.

Typical Romantic heroes are also portrayed through different levels of conditions of the human soul through narrative description. We can see a versatile range of emotions in Emma Bovary, the epitome of the Romantic heroine. **Madame Bovary** shows us episodes of her madness, "She was in a stupor . . . The ground felt like water beneath her feet. . . The memories and thoughts of her mind gushed out at once . . . she saw her father, Lheureux's office, their room in the hotel, another landscape" (271), happiness, "She was entering a marvelous realm in which everything would be passion, ecstasy and rapture; she was surrounded by vast expanses of bluish space, summits of intense feeling sparkled before her eyes . . ." (140), and sadness, "Everything seemed shrouded in a kind of vague, floating black atmosphere, and sorrow sank

into her soul, moaning softly like the winter wind in an abandoned castle” (107).

Rand only gives us happiness or anger, no melancholy or madness. For example, when Peter Keating is at the lowest point of his career, when his career is near its end and his hopes and aspirations are gone and he's broke, busted and disgusted. Rand describes his melancholy like this, “He walked slowly, his arms pressed to his body, his shoulders hunched, as if drawn against a permanent chill . . . He drank often, without joy” (564). Peter, Dominique and Roark all use anger, violence or bitterness in order to gain their happiness. Peter tries to frame Lucius Heyer to indirectly cause him to have a heart attack so he can gain a partnership in an architecture firm. Dominique publicly agrees to leave her husband, Peter, to be the mistress of the rich and powerful Gail Wynand.

Happiness is so important to Rand's characters that they'll literally crush anything and anybody standing in the way of it. This strain of brutal optimism can be seen all throughout **The Fountainhead**. The struggle for happiness is an artistic trait synonymous with not just Romantic Literature, but literature in general. Traditional Romantic heroes are usually antithetical to the forces of reason. Rand's heroes represent the forces of reason. Furthermore, the traditional heroes of this movement fight for happiness with their attitudes, Rand's heroes, and even some of Hugo's, fight with actions.

For example, In **Madame Bovary**, the romantic heroine, Emma is victimized by the brutal optimism of Rodolphe, the decadent a romantic hero. As a result of her victimization, which develops a hatred for men in her, she uses the same type of brutality to control Leon, her second extramarital lover in the novel. Thus, we find out that both of these Romantic heroes are the same, both victims and oppressors, each not totally fulfilled or happy in their lives. At the end of Lawrence's **Women in Love**, Gudrun shows such open contempt and hatred for Gerald that he kills himself. Gerald not only represents industrialism and capitalism [two things that Lawrence was totally against] but also reason.

The more brutal the optimism is, the less Romantic the novel is. Gudrun and Emma strive for happiness by using their emotional passions instead of physical actions. Gudrun shows in her attitude that she hates Gerald. Emma's jealous and controlling attitude of Leon was her struggle for happiness. Even in Edna Ferber's **Giant**, a non-Romantic and optimistic novel, Leslie's moral struggles against Bick, her husband were passionate battles of attitude. When Bick's son refused to run the ranch and become a doctor, this is a battle of attitude. Rand's optimism shows

us brutal battles of action. Howard Roark is an excellent example. Two of his goals in the novel were to gain the love of Dominique and always have his buildings erected in the ways he designed them. Rand's hero resorts to rape and destruction of property to achieve these goals. Even the brutal optimism Toni Morrison's anti-heroine Sula is not as extreme as Howard Roark's. In a quest for meaningless thrills, she sleeps with her best friend's husband and causes him to leave her. Furthermore, Sula's indifferent attitude about it was worse than the actual act itself, "How come you did it, [slept with her husband and caused him to leave her] Sula? Sula replied, "He just filled up the space" (124).

Hugo's optimism is in both action and attitude. While the spirit of progress for the Commonwealth of France exists in every conversation, thought and interaction, violence serves as a valuable tool to carry out this mission as well. In **Ninety-Three**, when an old man kills Halmalo's brother for an accident on the high seas that kills other sailors and is confronted about it, he says, "He failed in his duty; I did not fail in mine. What I did I would do again. And I swear by the great Saint Anne of Auray, who sees us, that in a similar case I would shoot my son just as I shot your brother" (70).

Rand's characters draw even less sympathy than either Hugo's or Morrison's. Despite the fact that Hugo's optimism can be as brutal as Rand's, in action, his is at least justified by a time of war. Sula is both a victim and oppressor. It's hard for us to feel sorry for Rand's victims. Although Peter Keating is the pathetic guy who we most feel sorry for in her work, after his career goes downhill, nothing is really preventing his happiness other than himself. His mother suggests that he marry Catherine, the girl he wanted to marry all along. He's free to do what will make him happy—give up architecture for painting. It was not too late for him to gain a new lease on life. Gail Wynand fails to save Howard Roark with his paper. However, he's filthy rich and only loses one paper—a small cog in the great wheel of his whole empire—it's hard to feel sorry for a man like this. Ambivalent characters, which readers can either equally love or hate, are the best types in the Romantic genre.

Ambivalence is the key to good Romantic literature. Hugo's romantic lit is ambivalent. Victor Brombert argues:

The novel [**Ninety-Three**] appropriately begins with a military operation, as the battalion of the Bonnet Rouge penetrates into the woods of La Saudraie, in Brittany, to flush out royalist guerillas. The first para-

graph announces a time of 'epic combats.' Yet all the opening signals are double-edged: it is a military operation, but we are in the lovely month of May; the battalion searches for armed rebels, but discovers instead a defenseless peasant woman with her hungry children. Even Hugo's terminology is strikingly ambiguous. The lair that the soldiers expect to find in this manhunt turns out to be a natural cavity formed by branches, a bower of foliage, half-open like an 'alcove.' At the center of this unexpectedly feminine setting is a woman breast-feeding an infant. The ambush has been converted into a trap of tenderness. **59**

Instead of these types of blends of toughness and tenderness, joy and pain, reason and emotion, Rand presents her characters in the same ways either all throughout the novel, or one significant change which creates to polar opposites of character. For example, Toohey, Roark and Peter stay the same way through the whole story. Wynand is characterized as a corrupt and power mad through more than three-fourths of the novel. Then on page 620, he makes a transformation to a man of integrity and stays this way to the novel's end. Before she is raped by Howard Roark, Dominique is indifferent about everything. After the rape, she cares about her life and happiness more. These are atypical traits of Romantic literature.

The best Romantic literature is realist, not escapist. **Webster's New World Dictionary** defines escapism as, "a tendency to escape from reality, the responsibilities and routine of real life, especially by unrealistic imaginative activity." A great tendency of escapist novels is to include and/or portray backgrounds or characters of actual life events. **War and Peace** refers to Napoleon's battle to conquer Russia and Czar Alexander. Napoleon is also referred to in **Les Miserables**, along with the French Revolution and a scene at the Battle of Waterloo. **The Fountainhead** is roughly based on the career of innovative architect Frank Lloyd Wright.**60** Scholars conflict with one another over Hugo's Waterloo scene in *Les Miserables*, "Imagination and direct experience are exploited according to the whims of the author with a view to producing some special, almost independent effect; the magnificent description of Waterloo in **Les Miserables** is almost wholly irrelevant"**61** "Even more significant [than the French Revolution] is the insistent recall of the battle of Waterloo, seen at the same time as the end of the world, a return to the past, and a new beginning—in other words, as a major, yet problematic turning point in the destiny of Europe . . . The opposition of pen and sword, of warrior and poet,

is given added significance if one remembers that Hugo's own father had been a general under Napoleon".⁶²

Ayn Rand contemplated the fact that she might be an escapist while her ideas of Romantic literature conflicted with those presented by Flaubert. In **The Romantic Manifesto**, she says that as a child, she refused to read stories about the children of the folks next door. She was uninterested in such people in both real life and fiction. I refer to myself as a Romantic Realist . . . If Romantic art is an escape, then a hard-core realist is a vermin-eaten brute who sits motionless in a mud puddle, contemplates a pigsty and whines that 'such is life.' If that is realism, then I am an escapist. So was Aristotle. So was Christopher Columbus (167-68). P.E. Charvet uses the term "Romantic Realist" in describing the mature works of Flaubert. He refers to **Madame Bovary** as 'realist'.⁶³ Flaubert is more of a Romantic Realist than Rand. Both Rand and Hugo are idealists. Charvet goes on to say, Hugo glorified man's struggle against the powers of darkness, moving upwards towards the light. . . moral idealism and the conviction that man's goodness was strong (293). . . Hugo personifies moral ideas like pity, expiation and duty more than human passions (303).

In studying the nature of Flaubert's art in relation to Rand, Hugo and the Romantic Movement, Charvet asserts, "The novel as an art-form must, if it was to recapture public favor, break new ground, search for the unheroic hero, be a mirror of the drab and even the sordid" (274). Anti-escapist heroes like Emma Bovary, Humbert Humbert, Holden Caulfield, Sula Peace and Jake Barnes are real to us because they fail as much as they succeed. We learn more from unheroic heroes [the term itself sounds ambivalent] because failure is much easier than success. More people know failure than those who know success—therefore, more 'common men and women' can relate to them.

Rand's escapist failure is a representational success for the American imagination. While her use of historical events and characters take away from the Romantic aspect of her work, it does hold a valuable place in literature. The character types and historical backgrounds of Rand's novel are no different from those of mainstream Twentieth Century literature, academic or otherwise. Just like F. Scott Fitzgerald's **The Great Gatsby**, Ernest Hemingway's **The Sun Also Rises** and John Steinbeck's **The Grapes of Wrath** represented the American culture of the 1920s and 1930s, respectively, so does the **Fountainhead**. It represents the first postwar boom (WWI) period of innovation and economic progress despite the inevitability of the Great

Depression.

As a Romantic hero, Howard Roark's character is not far removed from the hard boiled and laconic type between good and evil like Mickey Spillane's Mike Hammer or Raymond Chandler's Phillip Marlowe. Although he looks more tough than tender, and comes from humble origins, Roark can fit into Middle or High class society as a gentleman like Ian Fleming's James Bond. Peter Keating is a lost generation type of character who spends time in speakeasies and has trouble finding his way. Like Robert Cohn, he's a pathetic and spineless loser who depends on others for everything. Like Tom Joad in **The Grapes of Wrath**, Howard Roark is a tough rebel hero who is a loner and fights against both injustice and impossible odds for his happiness [although happiness is not the same to them]. Gail Wynand looks just like Jay Gatsby, a gentleman of the world who uses his wealth and power to gain eternal happiness. Dominique Francon is just like Brett Ashley, a dangerously promiscuous woman who weakens men by destroying their emotions and passions out of idle boredom.

While parallels of the typical characters of this time exist in Rand's novel, she shows a very different period between the wars than Fitzgerald, Hemingway or Steinbeck. Rand shows a period of industrial production as opposed to Steinbeck's agricultural development. **The Fountainhead** shows real world type of American struggles and competitions for career establishment and success as opposed to Fitzgerald's and Hemingway's spoiled rich kids who party their lives away and wildly squander away fortunes which they didn't earn. Fitzgerald and Hemingway show the spirit and atmosphere of the Roaring Twenties, Rand the spirit of industrialization in the first American economic boom, between the wars, Steinbeck shows the suffering of the lower classes as a result of the greed, excess and fast, frivolous living of the rich.

What these artifacts of American culture represent are all equally important. None of these portraits of America are good, bad, right or wrong. They are simply the 1920s and 1930s that the author feels and believes and wants to share with us. Despite favorites in terms of the different cultures, socioeconomic statuses and literary appreciations and categorizations of these four works, it is important to see and consider all these sides of America. We can learn from the America we don't like as much as from the one we do like. Even though it's hard to label **The Fountainhead** as any specific type of literature, scientifically or artistically, representationally, it is no further away than any of these other three novels from the American Imagination.

The Fountainhead creates an important fusion of the American Imagination to the

philosophy of Friedrich Nietzsche [more about this in Chapter 4]. Like in Nietzsche's **The Birth of Tragedy**, Romantic literature must include both Dionysus and Apollo. Nietzsche argues for a good blend of both when he says, "The difficult relations between the two elements in tragedy may be symbolized by a fraternal union between the two deities: Dionysus speaks the language of Apollo, but Apollo, finally, the language of Dionysus; thereby the highest goal of tragedy and of art in general is reached" (131). Caroline Picart asserts, "For Nietzsche, it is only when the Apollinian and the Dionysian forces exist in art that art is 'healthy'—possessing a dynamic balance between the rational and elemental" (43).

The problem with Ayn Rand is that her non-fiction essays preach total Apollo and no Dionysus while her fiction gives mostly Apollo and one violent explosion of Dionysus. Just like her writing style represses feelings, Howard Roark's rape of Dominique represents repressed emotions, Dionysus covered up under Apollo, dying to get out. According to Judith Wilt, "Rand was unrepentant, though paradoxical. She was both damned and praised for slipping religious mysticism through the back door of her rationalist romances via a steadily deployed rhetoric of sacred words and images that she condemned in her prose essays and introductions" (188).

Because it's too Apollinian and not Dionysian enough, Rand's literature is not Romantic. It is no more Romantic in form and content than Mickey Spillane or Ian Fleming. It is more of a literary reaction against traditional forms of Romanticism. Her style is totally escapist, individualist and optimistic—these non-ambiguous totalities are atypical of Romanticism.

Reactionary writers like Rand are more important for what their work is against. It's a reaction against the Romantic trend that typically includes many aspects of literature that she hated: socialism, naturalism and pessimism. Rand believes that all Romantic literature should be of her favorite type—individualistic, rational, escapist, idealistic and optimistic. Unlike Hugo, she throws away, or refuses to deal with any of these aspects of Romanticism that she doesn't like. Good artists don't do this. **Madame Bovary** gradually moves from Classicism to Romanticism and Hugo's heroes existentially take on both individual and communal identities. **The Fountainhead** is a reactionary historical revival of Romanticism in *her* own way. Her own way is valuable as literature. The problem is that she claims it is the same Romanticism of some of the nineteenth century greats—instead of her own reactionary form.

"Most generations have their burden of pessimism, but its focus, like that of optimism, tends to shift. In the Romantic generation, pessimism was metaphysical, the individual marked

out for suffering being the centre of interest; conversely he current of messianic optimism was also a form of egotism, the individual seeing himself as the instrument of providence, as the bearer of a message of good tidings.”⁶⁴ In regards to the Romantic movement, Hugo took the optimistic individual route and Flaubert took the pessimistic naturalistic route. Hugo’s optimistic route died in France while Flaubert’s pessimistic route was reincarnated into D.H. Lawrence through the Modernism movement. While the onset of Post-Modernism ultimately became the death, more or less, of traditional Romanticism, **The Fountainhead** tried to breathe life back into a dead movement.

Rand is important for bringing these two literary traditions to the American Literary canon. While optimism is atypical of academic literature, as a reincarnated Chernyshevsky, Rand kept the optimistic tradition alive almost in its entirety. While literary movements like Romanticism tend to get lost with the progression of movements and contextual eras, **The Fountainhead** may remain as at least its last complete literary [symbolic if not artistic] tribute to this great movement of the nineteenth century. While no other works of American Literature attempt to capture the entirety of both Romanticism and optimism, like Rand—strains of these literary ancestors can be seen in our mainstream literature today. Optimism can be seen in Edna Ferber’s **Giant** and idealized heroes can be seen in the works of Ian Fleming and Mickey Spillane.

Unlike the indirect effects of Romanticism, Rand’s novels are practical fusions of her art and science to apply to our lives directly. **The Fountainhead** is more of Ayn Rand’s practical guide artistically to attempt to apply her philosophy to our everyday lives than a Romantic novel of Objectivism. As art and Romantic literature, **The Fountainhead** is a failure. However, we have as much to learn from literary failures as we do from literary successes. All writers, both good and bad have failed in some works. In **Aspects of the Novel**, E.M. Forster says, “. . . even if the novelist has not got it correctly, well—he has tried” (64).

Rand’s countering Romantic portrayals of individualism, optimism and pro-capitalism are not bad representations in themselves. They are simply atypical of traditional artistic literature that’s appreciated within the academic establishment. In his article, **Capitalism’s Hidden Heroes**, Jack Cashill states, “academics paid some attention to the capitalist in literature prior to the mid-Sixties, but they seem to have done so grudgingly, as if in forced response to a loathsome fashion”(157). As a radar seeking out optimistic melodrama from the many

blossoming literary movements of nineteenth century Europe and tweaking it for vulgarization of more generalized American sensibilities, **The Fountainhead** provided a fictional bridge between individualistic Romanticism [to be reborn as capitalist literature] and Nietzschean Existentialism. While it's a difficult journey through works like **The Birth of Tragedy** and Dostoevsky's **Notes From The Underground** because the Romantic side of Ayn Rand's bridge is broken, it's still a bridge nonetheless.

CHAPTER 2
THE FOUNTAINHEAD AS PHILOSOPHICAL LITERATURE:
EXISTENTIALISM AND MARXISM

In making a literary transition from Romanticism to Existentialism, in relation to Rand's fiction, some definitions and considerations about Romanticism still remain. While classifying **The Fountainhead** as "an extremely right-wing version of every 'ism' known to man" is not as silly or exaggerated an idea as it may seem, it's hard to separate her work from any artistic and philosophical movements, in relation to the individual, of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Rand's works even take on striking similarities to artists whom she opposed and hated. Because **The Fountainhead** is more of a philosophical novel than an artistic one, the work is an example of how Rand's fiction looks more like that of Fyodor Dostoevsky than Victor Hugo. Therefore, the 1943 novel of Rand's is more existential than it is romantic.

Before studying **The Fountainhead** in relation to definitions of Existentialism, we should not only look at the literary transitions from Romanticism to Existentialism, but also Rand's problems in making this transition. William Barrett states that the origins of Existentialism emerged from the overflow of the Romantic movement. He says that Romanticism did not stop at literature. The existence of Romanticism overflowed the realms of imagination and art. Existential philosophers have struggled with the problems developed by Romanticism—the absolute decision, resoluteness, choice of oneself. Romanticism posed the problem of the individual as it has never been posed before.¹ He also says that the Romantic movement was the individual against the laws of classicism, the protest of feeling against reason, nature against the encroachments of industrial society, a drive towards naturalness of being.²

The Fountainhead represents the exact and polemical opposite to each of Barrett's classifications of Romanticism. Howard Roark's modernistic architecture opposed the classical styles of the Greeks and Romans. While his reason is scattered over the entire novel, other than through his rape of Dominique, we don't see any of Roark's emotions. Man-made buildings are praised while nature is described as a thing to be conquered. Everything about Howard Roark, from his demeanor to his disbelief in God to his planned out course of life actions, shows rationality instead of naturalness of being. Roark is just like the opposite characters to the typical Romantic heroes. He's egotistical and skeptical of religion like Monsieur Homais in **Madame**

Bovary, rational like Albert of **The Sorrows of Young Werther**, and capitalist like Gerald of **Women In Love**.

Throughout **The Fountainhead**, Rand has the nineteenth century Romantic tradition all wrong but its polar opposites all right. Before relating these ideas to those of Existentialism, a definition would be in order. **Webster's New World Dictionary** defines Existentialism as, "a philosophical and literary movement, variously religious and atheistic . . . based on the doctrine that existence takes precedence over essence and holds that man is totally free and responsible for his acts, and that this responsibility is the source of dread and anguish that encompass him." Jean Paul Sartre, who is generally credited with bringing together the art of post-Romanticism, and blending it with science and similar pre-existing philosophies into one cohesive philosophy of Existentialism, defines the movement by saying, "Man is nothing else but what he makes of himself. . . existentialism's first move is to make every man aware of what he is and to make the full responsibility of his existence rest on him. And when we say that a man is responsible for himself, we do not only mean that he is responsible for his own individuality, but that he is responsible for all men."³ Therefore, this philosophy puts the individual first and his society second.

In his definition of Romanticism, in relation to Sartre's definition of Existentialism, Bruce Wilshire states, "For the romantic, the individual acts for the sake of the whole and finds himself the greater individual"(15). This sounds like Existentialism in reverse. As Romantic literature, **The Fountainhead** opposes nearly all traditional forms of the art and looks only somewhat like the fiction of Victor Hugo. However, as philosophical literature, **The Fountainhead** can be very tricky. It's not exactly what it seems to be. It seems to present the idea that "the individual is paramount and to hell with his society." Nevertheless, a deeper look at its characters' actions and words show a closer connection to Rand's philosophical foes and neutrals than she claims.

Ayn Rand's philosophy of Objectivism is not as original as she claims. As represented in **The Fountainhead**, it is really a right wing form of both Existentialism and Marxism. Let's begin with Existentialism. "It would not be a distortion to say that both Objectivism and existentialism call for the assertion of the free individual against those theologies and those oppressively conformist societies which set to make him deny his unique self in the interests of ready-made social molds and values."⁴ Above all, Existentialism is an ambivalent philosophy.

Although both Objectivism and Existentialism are characterized by individual rebellion against social institutions, Existentialism can never totally separate the individual from his or her society. Of this idea, in his essay, **Existentialism**, Jean Paul Sartre explains:

He [man] realizes that he cannot be anything [in the sense that we say that someone is witty or nasty or jealous] unless others recognize it as such. In order to get any truth about myself, I must have contact with another person. The other is indispensable to my own existence, as well as to my knowledge about myself. This being so, in discovering my inner being I discover the other person at the same time, like a freedom placed in front of me which thinks and wills only for or against me. Hence, let us at once announce the discovery of a world which we shall call inter-subjectivity; this is the world in which man decides what he is and what others are (290).

Despite the fact that Rand would disclaim any of this type of inter-subjectivity in her philosophy and fiction, evidence of this can be seen in **The Fountainhead**. Even though Howard Roark is an individual and concerned mainly with his own selfish interest and welfare, he helps his friend Peter Keating by doing his work for him. Every character in this novel, with the exception of maybe Peter Keating, helps someone else in the novel.

For reasons like this one, Objectivism follows Existentialism more closely and wholly than any other philosophy. According to Jeff Walker, “Ayn Rand’s American Objectivism became what Jean-Paul Sartre’s French existentialism aspired to but failed to become—a complete, intelligible, and livable, if still controversial, philosophy adopted consciously and with understanding by millions” (345). Sartre credits Fyodor Dostoevsky with beginning the Existentialist movement. He states, “Dostoevsky said, ‘If God didn’t exist, everything would be possible.’ That is the very starting point of existentialism. Indeed, everything is permissible if God does not exist, and as a result man is forlorn, because neither within him nor without does he find anything to cling to. He can’t start making excuses for himself.”⁵ In terms of characterization, plot structure, representation, and a novel of heavy philosophical ideas, **The Fountainhead** looks more like an Americanized Dostoevsky novel than anything else.

In her artistic and/or scientific transition from Romanticism to Existentialism, Rand’s European Tour of influence moved from East to West. It started in Greece with Aristotle and moved to Russia, Germany and France before finding its true home in America. Her work

follows Dostoevsky and Nietzsche more closely than any other philosophical writers. Nietzsche provided a great bridge in that he was both a romanticist and existentialist. Dostoevsky is the father of Existentialism as he influenced a generation of these philosophers. According to William Barrett, the Russians did not have philosophers, but they did have Dostoevsky and Tolstoy. . . It has been said that every man is born either a Platonist or an Aristotelian; it might be said with equal justice that he is born either a Tolstoyan or Dostoevskian. While Dostoevsky was the novelist of the abnormal and the morbid and presented the human spirit at its heights and depths, Tolstoy by contrast is the portrayer of the normal and the organic.⁶ Therefore, perhaps it may be said that in Russia, Tolstoy was a reincarnated Plato and Dostoevsky was the second coming of Aristotle.

French Existentialist writers took the great influence of Dostoevsky and ran with it. Hazel Barnes says, of all previous writers, Dostoevsky has had the most profound influence on the twentieth century French writer. Albert Camus has stated that his thought owes more to Dostoevsky and **The Possessed** than to any other single author or book. With Sartre and de Beauvoir, the influence is somewhat less obvious. Yet it would not be an exaggeration to say that every one of their literary works, as well as those of Camus, is an examination of the consequences of Dostoevsky's 'If God is dead, everything is allowed.'⁷ This point by Dostoevsky sounds very similar to Nietzsche's trademark statement, "God is Dead!"⁸ Of Dostoevsky, Nietzsche said, 'Dostoevsky is the only psychologist from whom I was able to learn anything. I rank my acquaintance with him among the most splendid achievements of my life.'⁹

Both were on the cusp of Romanticism and moved into Existentialism. So was Johann Wolfgang von Goethe as his Faust represented his more existential, or more balanced with evil, version of the romantic Werther. Nietzsche followed the existential originator Dostoevsky into this movement and Rand followed Nietzsche. In movements like these, successors tend to put a slightly different twist on their predecessors. Bruce Wilshire states that, "Nietzsche was deeply influenced by the romantics. We find in his work the desire to be whole and the sense that the self becomes whole only through an unselfish giving to the world in art and love. And yet Nietzsche must try very hard to believe that man's consciousness, so susceptible to corruption and ulterior motive, can fasten strongly enough on values potent enough to prevent his love of power from going awry, and becoming destructive" (288). Goethe's Faust, and Rand's Gail Wynand are equally destructive. Once he gains too much power and becomes as bored as

Wynand, Howard Roark will become just as destructive. Yevgeny Zamyatin's existential novel *We*, illustrates this idea, "And happiness . . . Well, after all, desires torment us, don't they? And, clearly, happiness is when there are no more desires, not one . . . What a mistake, what ridiculous prejudice it's been to have marked happiness always with a plus sign—the divine minus" (160).

Rand, Dostoevsky and Goethe represent the Nietzscheanized morality of the existential hero. According to William Barrett:

The Faust of the second part of Goethe's poem is already, as we have seen, something of a Nietzschean Superman, beyond ordinary good and evil . . . A process of self-development such as his cannot come to a close because a young girl whom he has seduced goes crazy and dies. The strong man survives such disasters and becomes harder. The Devil, with whom Faust has made a pact, becomes in a real sense his servitor and subordinate, just as our devil, if joined to ourselves, may become a fruitful and positive force; like Blake before him Goethe knew full well the ambiguous power contained in the traditional symbol of the Devil. Nietzsche's immoralism, though stated much more violently, consisted in not much more than the elaboration of Goethe's point: Man must incorporate his devil or, as he put it, man must become better and more evil; the tree that would grow taller must send its roots down deeper.¹⁰

Mephistopheles in *Faust* is a character in touch with the evil part of Faust, who simply helps him do what he's going to do anyway, Faust says "See here, get me that girl at once"(137) . . . Mephistopheles answers, ". . . Fourteen days at least I need/In order to scent out a way". . . Faust replies, "Had I but seven hours in all/I really should not need to call/The devil to lead that naïve thing astray"(138)! Toohey is just like Mephistopheles in that he helps Peter Keating lie to himself [by promoting him as a better architect than he really is] and convincing him to jilt the woman he really loves [Catherine] and marry the woman he doesn't love [Dominique]. Just like Barrett's point in analyzing Faust, Peter is more to blame than Toohey because Peter doesn't have enough self-realization or strength to do what he wants to do. Toohey serves Peter by doing what he wants him to do.

Peter Keating is a weak and evil man who does evil to himself. Gail Wynand fits more into the role of strong man whom Rand wants to portray as evil—who does evil to others. When Wynand's negotiating with Peter Keating a dishonorable deal of an architectural commission to

him for his wife, Wynand says, “No?. . . Just say that you don’t want any of it. I won’t mind. There’s Mr. Ralston Holcombe [another suitor for the same commission] . . . He can build Stoneridge as well as you could . . . Well, I have paid with my honor for the privilege of holding a position where I can amuse myself by observing how honor operates in other men” (**The Fountainhead** 422).

In her novel, Rand creates a wider range of the same morally existential heroes as Dostoevsky, Goethe and Nietzsche. Toohey’s evil can be seen as good in that he takes Peter’s selflessness and uses it for his creation of an altruistically mediocre society. Wynand’s evil can be seen as good in that he uses his newspaper to save Howard Roark. Roark’s good can be seen as evil in that he uses rape to create self-awareness in Dominique and bombs Cortlandt to ensure the integrity of his work is upheld.

Furthermore, just as Rand subtly does, the underground heroes of Dostoevsky’s **Notes From Underground** and Ralph Ellison’s **Invisible Man** both blur the lines between good and evil out of existence. Many of Rand’s heroes go underground as well. A major difference between the romantic hero/heroines [Werther/Emma] and existential heroes like the underground narrators of Dostoevsky and Ellison is that romantic heroes dream about optimistic things while existentialists ponder both the good and bad of life in general. For example, Werther continually dreams about his enjoyable times with Lotte and Emma dreams about fantasy lifestyles with her extramarital lovers. The narrator of Ellison’s novel contemplates his own pain and anxiety within the struggles for social acceptance:

And my problem was that I always tried to go in every-one’s way but my own. I have also been called one thing and then another while no one really wished to hear what I called myself. So after years of trying to adopt the opinions of others I finally rebelled. I am an invisible man . . . So I took to the cellar; I hibernated. I got away from it all. But that wasn’t enough. I couldn’t be still even in hibernation. Because, damn it, there’s the mind, the mind. It wouldn’t let me rest. Gin, jazz and dreams were not enough. Books were not enough. My belated appreciation of the crude joke that had kept me running, was not enough (**Invisible Man** 560).

After their careers reach their climaxes and they fail to stay on top in both their personal and professional lives, just like Ellison’s and Dostoevsky’s heroes, Peter Keating and Gail Wynand both go underground:

He [Peter] went to a shack he had rented in the hills of an obscure village. He kept paints, brushes and canvas in the shack. He spent his days in the hills, painting. . . He could not say that he liked to paint. It was neither pleasure nor relief, it was self-torture, but somehow, that didn't matter. . . There was no pleasure in it, no pride, no solution; only—while he sat alone before the easel—a sense of peace (**The Fountainhead** 565).

Also in **The Fountainhead**, when Wynand's wife, Dominique divorces him and leaves him for Howard Roark, Rand describes the hearing by stating, “. . . branding his wife [Dominique] as officially dishonored, granting him lawful sympathy, the status of injured innocence, and a paper that was his passport to freedom for all the years before him, and for all the silent evenings of those years” (687-88). Like the failed underground heroes, Wynand will spend countless hours in the privacy of his own home, contemplating his loss of happiness and peace of mind.

Roark's underground is a positive one. It is within himself. He keeps it to himself to enjoy and to never shares it with others. Just like the narrator in **Notes From Underground** shares the invisibility of Ellison's antihero, “I could have forgiven even a beating, but I could never forgive his moving me out of the way and ignoring me so emphatically” (47), Sharon Stockton argues that Roark is existentially invisible as well:

Roark's heroic status is established early as a function of the unique interiority of his vision and the certainty of its reflexive correspondence to external reality. Roark is described throughout as having an unreadable face and demeanor; his is an invisible and private reality, and he is generally disliked for this: ‘His face was closed like the door of a safety vault; things locked in safety vaults are valuable; men did not care to feel that.’¹¹ Roark is the private owner of his own essence—of what is, furthermore, not only his own value but value generally. Although his interior essence has a potential exterior worth, this is a wealth unacknowledged and so therefore unappreciated by the populace. This correspondence between the pure idea and the external object would seem to be—at least at first glance—the essence of competence in **The Fountainhead** and of Rand's use of reason in her Objectivist philosophy. Reason, for Rand, is that which validates through a gesture of ‘productive utility’ the juncture between interior and exterior truth (820).

In other words, Roark is invisible because he hides his inner self from the general masses. He

reveals his essence only to his well selected friends like Dominique and Gail Wynand because they are the only characters who are intellectually similar enough to properly appreciate it. The villain, Toohey recognizes it as well. The Invisible Man and the Underground Man, unlike Roark, reveal their inner selves only to be misunderstood and unappreciated. They go underground as a way to not only remove their valuable intellectual talents from the benefit of the society, but also to spitefully punish society.

Existentialist philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche, whom Rand greatly patterned much of her work after, advocated that the great hero hide his inner self. In his work **Thus Spoke Zarathustra**, his hero Zarathustra preaches:

So that no one might see down into my profundity and ultimate will—that is why I devised my long, luminous silence. I have found so many shrewd men who veiled their faces and troubled their waters, so that no one might see through them and under them. But the shrewder distrusters and nut-crackers came straight to them: straightway they fished out their best-hidden fish! But the clear, the honest, the transparent—they seem to me the shrewdest silent men: those whose profundity is so deep that even the clearest water does not—betray it.¹²

Roark's invisibility, unlike the underground characters, is reflexive. Roark can't see common men and women and in turn they can't see him. He's an invisible Clark Kent to the common masses and Superman to the elite bourgeoisie. While Roark couldn't care less about society and its mediocrity, existentially speaking, it still indirectly benefits from his individual greatness. A key idea portrayed by Rand in this novel is that mankind doesn't want to be great and Roark is forcefully coming to save it from itself. Or better yet, Roark, just like Rand's heroes of **Atlas Shrugged**, is coming to create a new and greater society of Nietzschean Supermen who will take over the lowly masses. Toohey wants to eliminate the elite bourgeoisie, Roark, like John Galt and the strikers of **Atlas Shrugged**, ultimately wants to eliminate the mediocre common men. Both worlds would create unhappiness and loss of identity just like those of **Nineteen Eighty-Four**, and **Brave New World** because there would be no great or mediocre individuals or outside worlds in which to compare them.

Societies are created from the minds of individual men. In quoting Nietzsche, “. . . In the final analysis one experiences only oneself” (**Thus Spoke Zarathustra** 173), Leslie Paul Thiele

asserts, “‘Mankind’ and ‘humanity’ are misleading abstractions. Apart from the herd, all that exists are individuals, each enclosed in his own world, each a world unto himself . . . the revocation of the individual’s membership in the community of mankind is accompanied by the constitution of the individual himself as a community” (37). The existential idea that Rand portrays is that society will ultimately be helped by the individual. The individual must save himself first and as an indirect result of this, his society will be saved. Nevertheless, each individual must discover the truth and come to his own existential self-realization before deciding to save himself.

Failed existential heroes are most common in literature. Great literary heroes are those who sacrifice or lose a part of themselves in an effort to save humanity. Ernest Hemingway’s character, Jake Barnes, the protagonist in **The Sun Also Rises**, is one of these types of heroes. Through his own self-realization, he saves himself, but becomes destructive to the group by trying to directly save his friends who are either already lost or don’t want to be saved. “All I wanted to know was how to live in it [the world]. Maybe if you found out how to live in it you learned from that what it was all about. I wished Mike would not behave so terribly to Cohn, though. Mike was a bad drunk. Brett was a good drunk. Bill was a good drunk. Cohn was never drunk. Mike was unpleasant after he passed a certain point. I liked to see him hurt Cohn. I wished he would not do it, though, because afterward it made me disgusted at myself” (**The Sun Also Rises** 152).

Just like Jake Barnes’ inner and outer conflicts, when the narrator of **Invisible Man** experiences one of the rare moments of self-realization and inner happiness, he encounters the existential problem that this prolonged contentment will cause:

This is all very wild and childish, I thought, but to hell with being ashamed of what you liked. No more of that for me. I am what I am! I wolfed down the yam and ran back to the old man and handed him twenty cents, ‘Give me two more,’ I said. . . Hot fried pies, I thought sadly, moving away. I would probably have indigestion if I ate one—now that I no longer felt ashamed of the things I had always loved, I probably could no longer digest very many of them. What and how much had I lost by trying to do only what was expected of me instead of what I myself had wished to do? What a waste, what a senseless waste! But what of those things which you actually

didn't like. . . because you actually found them distasteful? It involved a problem of choice. I would have to weigh many things carefully before deciding and there would be some things that would cause quite a bit of trouble, simply because I had never formed a personal attitude toward so much. I had accepted the accepted attitudes and it had made life seem simple. . . Continue on the yam level and life would be sweet—though somewhat yellowish. Yet the freedom to eat yams on the street was far less than I had expected upon coming to the city (**Invisible Man** 259-60).

Knowing what to believe in is not as simple for the traditional existential hero as it is for Rand's characters. Furthermore, Rand's heroes strive for goals of wealth and power along with their individual happiness. After happiness and self-realization is reached, a decision about what to do with it is not so easy—it gets old after a while and isn't always what we expect. Because he's already succeeded, Gail Wynand is bored with himself and must corrupt others for his petty amusement—Roark will become just as bored with himself after gaining more wealth and power than he can possibly need.

A goal of world domination following his own self realization is what keeps Ellsworth Toohey's life exciting and meaningful. Although Ellsworth Toohey is the villain of the novel who tries to destroy the individual in relation to the society, and make individuals as invisible as Roark portrays on the surface, his tactics look very similar to Dostoevsky's underground man. "I frightened him with my passionate friendship. . . he was a naïve and submissive soul; but when he had yielded to me completely, I immediately began to hate him and pushed him away from me—exactly as if I had needed him only to inflict defeat upon him" (**Notes From Underground** 65). This looks like the same type of victimization under which Ellsworth Toohey subjects Peter Keating. Toohey helps to take away this man's passion, essence and individual happiness. However, destroying the souls of others fills Toohey with disgust instead of joy: "Why should I help you lie to yourself? I've done that for ten years. That's what you came to me for . . . You're a complete success, Peter, as far as I'm concerned. But at times I have to want to turn away from the sight of my successes . . . I'm not pleased, I'm just sick. . . You make me sick" (**The Fountainhead** 633-35).

Because any of her main characters, good or evil, can fit so neatly into the role of existential hero and takes on so many similarities to these heroes in literature, good and evil in **The Fountainhead** are not as easily distinguishable as the author makes it seem. The respective

moralties of the individual characters can go as far as they decide. Morals are separated from greatness as an existential choice for the characters. Toohey never drinks or has casual sex and he's evil. Roark rapes and sleeps with a married woman and he's good. Gore Vidal says, "Ayn Rand's philosophy is nearly perfect in its immorality."¹³ Morality doesn't matter for existentialist heroes. The problem with Rand's heroes is that she claims they're morally good when they really are not.

More importantly, the existentialist hero must discover the truth of his own reality for himself and he must believe in what he's doing. William Barrett (1964) states, "The existential notion of 'authenticity' itself has a great deal to tell us about the progress of life under the bourgeois order. Let us speak for a moment like Nietzsche, who used to ask of other thinkers, 'What is his truth, and how does it measure against my truth?'—the point being that we completely grasp another doctrine only by taking the measure of the man who has brought it to utterance" (99). For this same reason, there are no villains in George Orwell's **Nineteen Eighty-Four**. There are only the rebellious or submissive inner souls of the individuals. Winston Smith, Julia and O'Brien all believe in what they're doing. Even when O'Brien is torturing Smith nearly to death, he believes that the success of the Party is more important than the individual spirit. The Party was created by individual spirits. Therefore, Winston and Julia are as responsible for creating the oppressive dictatorial society as O'Brien.

It doesn't really matter if the Party is stopped and replaced with a new regime or not. Somebody has to rule the world. "Nobody has ever seen Big Brother. . . Big Brother is the guise in which the Party chooses to exhibit itself to the world. His function is to act as a focusing point for love, fear, and reverence, emotions which are more easily felt towards an individual than towards an organization" (**Nineteen Eighty-Four** 863). Although Orwell gives the reader the optimistic hope that the Party and Big Brother will be defeated, as Winston says, "Life will defeat you" . . . "The Spirit of Man" (**Nineteen Eighty-Four** 899), the existence of life itself and the spirit of man is what created Big Brother and the Party in the first place.

Peter Keating is the only character in **The Fountainhead** who doesn't believe in anything. Thus, he becomes more of a victim of himself than of Toohey. His non passionate and non purposeful existence is worse than any evil that can possibly exist—his existence is worse than death. Albert Camus makes the existentialist point, "I rebel—therefore we exist" (**The Rebel** 22). In a talk with her father in the novel **Giant**, Leslie's existential self-discovery takes

on the same rebellious nature. When asked if she's interested in Texas, she answers, "Fascinated. But rebelling most of the time.' Her father replies, 'What could be more exciting! As long as you're fascinated and as long as you keep on fighting the things you think are wrong, you're living. . ." (350). As long as a person believes in something, he or she is living and the specific distinctions about how good or evil their passion is does not matter.

Just as Existentialism blurs good and evil in Rand's work, so does it in the work of Jean Paul Sartre and Simone de Beauvoir. According to Victor Brombert, Sartre and Simone de Beauvoir believe that values are in the world and man needs only to pluck them like pretty flowers and place them in a garden for his delight. Good and bad, existing as an objective reality [which Rand claims in her philosophy and refutes in her fiction] thus could be learned from infallible paternal lips.¹⁴ An example of this can be seen in Sartre's novel **The Reprieve**. Hazel Barnes says, Mathieu is standing alone on a bridge and he sees himself in relation to the rest of the universe. He finds himself not as Nausea but as freedom [the two, of course, are not really opposed to each other].¹⁵ Nausea is bad and freedom is good, Sartre's narrative shows that one is no better or worse than the other. Freedom is so good that it turns bad:

I am nothing; I possess nothing. . . Outside the world, outside the past, outside myself: freedom is exile, and I am condemned to be free. . . I am free for nothing. . . What did it matter? –go, or stay, or run away [during the threat of World War II beginning] acts of that kind would not call his freedom into play. And yet he must risk that freedom. . . He need only lean a little farther over, and he would have made his choice for all eternity. . . Why not? He had no special reason for letting himself drop, nor any reason for not doing so. . . At the moment it is true, I'm going to kill myself. Suddenly he decided not to do it. He decided: it shall merely be a trial (**The Reprieve** 363-64).

Albert Camus' **The Stranger** gives the same message that nothing really matters and the lines between good and evil, happiness and sadness, pleasure and pain are fine.

In **The Stranger**, Meursault doesn't care whether or not he loves his girlfriend, "Then she wanted to know if I loved her. I answered the same way I had the last time, that it didn't mean anything but that I probably didn't love her. 'So why marry me, then?' she said. I explained to her that it didn't really matter and that if she wanted to, we could get married" (41). He doesn't cry when his mother dies and he feels no remorse for murdering the Arab. When

asked if he felt sadness at his mother's funeral, he narrates, ". . . I answered that I had pretty much lost the habit of analyzing myself and that it was hard for me to tell him what he wanted to know. I probably did love Maman, but that didn't mean anything" (65). He hears the prosecutor say, "Has he so much as expressed any remorse? Never, gentlemen. Not once during the preliminary hearings did this man show emotion over his heinous offense'. . . I would have liked to have tried explaining to him cordially, almost affectionately, that I had never been able to truly feel remorse for anything" (100).

The Fountainhead presents this same idea as well in that the novel is more of a competition between characters to determine who will rule the world instead of good vs. evil. Rand's underlying message is that a balance of good and evil is necessary in all men. The bad guys of this novel don't suffer terrible fates. Ellsworth Toohey is fired from his job at **The Banner** for breaking Wynand's rules and trying to take over the paper. At the novel's end, he's hired at another paper where he begins his quest of world domination all over again. Peter Keating does end up a broke and unhappy third rate architect. Nevertheless, the only thing preventing him from being happy is himself. It's not too late for him to go to art school, marry his true love, Catherine, or do whatever he needs to do to be happy.

Gail Wynand loses the sweepstakes to be the most powerful man in New York. However, by losing only one paper in a national chain, he ends up the richest and second most powerful, only Roark is more powerful—not a type of fate over which we would usually kill ourselves. No matter who these characters are and what they do, "In the radio room across the hall somebody was twisting a dial. 'Time,' blared a solemn voice, 'marches on'"(**The Fountainhead** 690)! Life goes on. At novel's end, Roark and Dominique are so extremely good that after gaining wealth with their power, they will ultimately turn evil. Toohey can and will only prey upon more weak individuals, like Peter Keatings, who deserve it and allow him to take away their freedom.

Rand's novels end just at the right time—just before her majestic and Godly heroes will dominate the world. Ultimate power will corrupt the Howard Roarks and John Galts of the world and the world will be just as dictatorial as the regimes they have overthrown. In **The Rebel**, Albert Camus asserts, "Complete freedom, which is the negation of everything, can only exist and justify itself by the creation of new values identified with the entire human race. If the creation of these values is postponed, humanity will tear itself to pieces. The shortest route to these new standards passes by way of total dictatorship" (175). Thus, the individual spirit is the

true ruler of the world. How it is used is most important. It is both dangerous and beneficial to mankind. It can create either prosperity for individuals and societies or it can cause them the worst and most agonizing existence possible for any living creature. The only thing that can stop man from being free is himself. Mephistopheles and Toohey only help their victims carry out the evil and self destruction that exists within them already.

This same rebellion and submission of the human spirit can also be seen in Ayn Rand's most existential novel, **Anthem**. It is her anti-utopian spin on Yevgeny Zamyatin's **We**. This is a novel existentially loaded with ideas similar to those of **The Fountainhead**. "That means you love it. You are afraid of it because it is stronger than you; you hate it because you are afraid of it; you love it because you cannot subdue it to your will. Only the unsubduable can be loved"(We 64). This statement sums up Howard Roark's relationships with both Peter and Dominique. Dominique and Peter both love and hate Roark. They both love him in that they worship Roark like a God. They both love and hate him for the same reasons. Neither can subdue him and are afraid of his greatness. Therefore they worship it with great reverence and respect.**16**

Another point that looks very similar to one made in **The Fountainhead**, related to absurdity in existentialism is, "And I learned from my own experience that laughter was the most potent weapon: laughter can kill everything—even murder" (We 184). In Rand's novel, when Toohey is revealing his tactics for destroying egoism within the human soul, he says, "Kill by laughter. Laughter is an instrument of human joy. Learn to use it as a weapon of destruction. . . Tell them to laugh at everything. . . Don't let anything remain sacred in a man's soul—and his soul won't be sacred to him" (**The Fountainhead** 637). In comparing **We** in relation to the anti-utopian novels **Brave New World** and **Nineteen Eighty-Four**, E.J. Brown says:

Zamyatin's benevolent dictator appears in Huxley's work [**Brave New World**] as the World Controller and in Orwell's [**Nineteen Eighty-Four**] as Big Brother; the 'mephi' outside the wall in **We** have their counterpart in Huxley's 'savage reservation' and in Orwell's 'proles.' What is more important and perhaps not so obvious is that all three books share an implicit assumption: That the more complex and highly organized a society becomes, the less free are its individual members(38).

Rand's elite bourgeoisie heroes will cause society to progress as rapidly as possible. Non innovative architects of the past, who have ruled the profession before, will perish under Roark's

skyscrapers. Therefore, Rand wants more freedom for the wealthy and powerful bourgeoisie and less freedom for the common men.

According to E.J. Brown, Huxley's utopia sacrifices truth, beauty and freedom to happiness. Like the Benefactor in **We**, Mustapha Mond, the World Controller, patiently explains his philosophy, "Our Ford himself did a great deal to shift the emphasis from truth and beauty to comfort and happiness. Mass production demanded the shift. Universal happiness keeps the wheels steadily turning; truth and beauty can't."¹⁷ Both **Anthem** and **Brave New World** create both a happier and more comfortable life for the middle class intellectuals. In **Nineteen Eighty-Four**, the intellectuals are constantly watched and scrutinized.

Nineteen Eighty-Four and **Anthem** are contrasting works in relation to the causes of freedom and slavery. Orwell's protagonist believes, "If there was hope, it lay in the proles" (**Nineteen Eighty-Four** 868)! Only the common men can save the world of Orwell's novel. Through the hero of **Anthem**, Rand shows just the opposite, that only the elite men of intellect can save the world. "But what is freedom? Freedom from what? There is nothing to take a man's freedom away from him, save other men" (**Anthem** 118). By omitting the idea that man can take his own freedom away, the author shows that her hero has existentially conquered himself and is now ready to conquer the world and make the mediocre common men subservient to the great men of his tribe.

Winston Smith, the intellectual hero, such as Julia and O'Brien in **Nineteen Eighty-Four**, wants to conquer Big Brother and he has not even conquered himself. However, he ultimately finds out that his battles against Big Brother and himself are one and the same: "He gazed up at the enormous face. Forty years it had taken him to learn what kind of smile was hidden beneath the dark moustache. O cruel, needless misunderstanding! O stubborn, self-willed exile from the loving breast! Two gin-scented tears trickled down the sides of his nose. But it was all right, everything was all right, the struggle was finished. He had won the victory over himself. He loved Big Brother" (916). Orwell's society is controlled by pain and Huxley's by pleasure.

Just like the masses of the Roman Empire were controlled with Bread and Circuses, the society of **Brave New World** were controlled or made happy, with the same thing. Pleasure is a distraction from the truth. "There's one thing we can be certain of; whoever he may have been, he was happy when he was alive. Everybody's happy now" (50). Despite her agreement

with this point, Lenina, like a typical existential heroine, has the rebellious state of mind to realize that both her life, and the life of some other tribe, may not be happy: “ ‘I suppose Epsilons don’t really mind being Epsilons,’ she [Lenina] said aloud. ‘I’m glad I’m not an Epsilon,’ said, with conviction. ‘And if you were an Epsilon,’ (49-50) said Henry, ‘your conditioning would have made you no less thankful that you weren’t a Beta or an Alpha.’” Their soma, “He put away the soma bottle, and taking out a packet of sex-hormone chewing-gum”(40). . . , artificial touchy-feely sessions, “. . . Otherwise you won’t get any of the feely effects”(113), and infinitely repeated songs, “Hug me till you drug me, honey/ Kiss me till I’m in a coma/ Hug me, honey, snuggly bunny/ Love’s as good as soma” (112) are not greatly different from our sex, drugs and rock and roll.

Unlike these irretrievably wasted souls of even the inner society rebels of **Brave New World**, the hero of **Anthem** and Howard Roark both seek truth, beauty and self-realization before happiness and freedom. Winston Smith knows the truth before he even begins his rebellion against the Party. “The book fascinated him, or more exactly it reassured him. In a sense it told him nothing that was new. . .” (**Nineteen Eighty-Four** 859). Unlike Winston Smith, Roark and the hero of **Anthem** must discover the truth. Even when Smith knew the truth, it meant nothing and changed nothing. Roark used his inner truth to rise to the top of his profession. **Anthem**’s hero uses it to create a rebel society of greatness and knowledge. The existential individual and community is always in flux. “. . . but perhaps this [suicide] is the only way to resurrection. For only what is killed can be resurrected” (**We** 197). Just as Rand’s mediocre and common men ruled the world before her hero’s discovery and Howard Roark’s rise to greatness, they will also rule it again.¹⁸ Just like **Nineteen Eighty-Four** and **Brave New World** focus on the existentially recurrent death and rebirth of the greatness of the human spirit, so does **Anthem** and **The Fountainhead**.

Therefore, despite what its author says, **The Fountainhead** is more existential than she makes it out to be. Of Existentialism, Rand says:

The chief exponents of this category [Romanticism] were poets. The leading one is Byron, whose name has been attached to this particular ‘Byronic’ view of existence: its essence is the belief that man must lead a heroic life and fight for his values even though he is doomed to defeat by a malevolent fate over which he has no control. Today, the same view is advocated

philosophically by the existentialists, but without the grand-scale element and with Romanticism replaced by a kind of sub-Naturalism . . . the apostles of irrationality, the existentialists, the Zen Buddhists, the non-objective artists, have not achieved a free, joyous, triumphant sense of life, but a sense of doom, nausea and screaming, cosmic terror.**19**

Jean Paul Sartre counters this point by saying:

The basic charge against us is that we put the emphasis on the dark side of human life. . . . Consequently, Existentialism is regarded as something ugly; that is why we are said to be naturalists Yet, what can be more disillusioning than saying ‘true charity begins at home’ or ‘a scoundrel will always return evil for good?’ Commonplace remarks made when this subject comes up always add up to the same thing: we shouldn’t struggle against the powers-that-be; we shouldn’t resist authority; we shouldn’t try to rise above our station; any action which doesn’t conform to authority is romantic; any effort not based on past experience is doomed to failure. . . . there are those people who accuse existentialism of being too gloomy, and to such an extent that I wonder whether they are complaining about it, not for its pessimism, but much rather its optimism. Can it be that what really scares them in the doctrine is that it leaves to man a possibility of choice?**20**

Here Sartre is saying that, just like Romanticism, Existentialism is ambivalent. It can be either atheistic or Christian, **21** optimistic or pessimistic, naturalist or individualistic. No matter how much Rand tries to make Howard Roark an isolated individual, he, along with the novel’s other characters, reflects and represents his group of friends. Kristin Robinson argues that Rand’s philosophy is Humanistic when she states, “Rand was an outspoken proponent of humankind; in her philosophy and in her fiction, she portrayed humans as survivors, idealists, and heroes. The Randian hero is cooperative and aids others not simply because he or she learned to through socialization but because these characteristics are incorporated into a personal value system, a matter of personal integrity” (29).

An example of this is how every major character in the novel, except Peter Keating, whether good or bad, helps someone else. Roark helps Peter by doing his architectural work for him both in school and his career to boost him to fortune and fame. Early in the novel, Toohey

helps Peter by promoting his work in his column of **The Banner**. Dominique helps Toohey to destroy Roark's career and also helps Roark dynamite Corlandt homes at novel's end. Gail Wynand tries to help Roark to be acquitted of bombing Corlandt through the use of his newspaper. Thus, in this novel, Rand is more concerned with saving humanity as a whole than she appears to be on the surface. Furthermore, Humanism is a component of Existentialism. Hazel Barnes (1967) claims, "In so far as they [Objectivism and Existentialism] claim that man himself is his own end and purpose, both may properly be called humanistic"(125).

Even though Roark helps Peter too much and boosts him to fame and fortune, Peter's successful career ultimately ends. Although Wynand uses **The Banner** to defend Roark and his offense, Wynand's paper strikes and fails to save Roark, despite Roark's acquittal. Although Dominique is a good journalist and is capable of a great career on **The Banner**, she never desires to come to Gail Wynand's attention and rise to a great position on the paper. These failures in the novel, along with the fact that some of them happened even with help from other people, gives evidence to the existentialist idea of Rand's that the only thing that can stop man's greatness is himself. Just like Dostoevsky's characters, Roark uses the extremely dark side of himself to accomplish this greatness. Just like the underground man, Roark gets pleasure in pain and good out of evil. He laughs when he's kicked out of school and through verbal threats, is willing to endure firing at the hands of Dominique in the quarry and at the hands of Gail, poverty and starvation through a destroyed career.²² He's a more extremely evil version of Dostoevsky's underground man and Ivan Karamazov.

The ideas and morals of the characters of **The Fountainhead** look very similar to those of Dostoevsky's **The Brothers Karamazov**. Of the four brothers in the novel, Howard Roark looks most like Ivan. Thomas L. Jeffers says, "Ivan's rebellious position is at bottom egoistic [who is he to presume to 'correct' God's creation?]" (65). When asked why he wants to become an architect, Howard Roark intends to correct God's creation as well when he says, "But it's because I've never believed in God . . . Because I love this earth. That's all I love. I don't like the shape of things on this earth. I want to change them." (**The Fountainhead** 49). Just like Ivan, Roark is rational, high-minded, egotistical and atheist. Ivan, like Roark, is the rebellious intellectual hero of the novel. "And Ivan is the thinking mind of the human being in rebellion. . . He is also, of course, Dostoevsky himself, in his thoughtful, as apart from his passionate and inspirational self. Dostoevsky half hated Ivan. Yet, after all, Ivan is the greatest of the three

brothers, pivotal. The passionate Dmitry and the inspired Aloysha are, at last, only offsets of Ivan.”²³ The same can be said about Howard Roark, he is obviously presented as Rand’s greatest character. All the novel’s other main characters are offsets of Howard Roark as well.

It is interesting to note that Ivan represents evil and is a symbol of the devil. In the novel, when Ivan hallucinates and is visited by the devil, he says, “. . . You are my hallucination. You are an incarnation of myself, I mean of one aspect of me only, the personification of my worst and most stupid thoughts and feelings” (**The Brothers Karamazov** 766). D.H. Lawrence states that Ivan is the Grand Inquisitor. Jesus loves mankind for what it ought to be, The Grand Inquisitor [or the devil] loves it for what it is, with all its limitations. And he contends his is the kinder love. In Dostoevsky, nothing is pure.²⁴ Hazel Barnes quotes Rand’s point, “There are two sides to every issue: one side is right and the other is wrong, but the middle is always evil,”²⁵ and then interjects, “Existentialism, too, asks for commitment and proposes an either/or. But this refers to one’s basic choice of Being. When it comes to specific choices in the real world, existentialists are aware that the complexity of life is such that almost no action is pure and that still we must choose as best we can.”²⁶

In this same existentialist tradition, neither Rand’s heroes nor their actions are as good and pure as she makes them appear. The problem is that Rand argues for good and evil being a universalized morality based on rationality instead of the individualized morals of her egotistical heroes. For example, In **The Romantic Manifesto**, she refers to Gustave Flaubert as an ‘amoralist’ (41). While she doesn’t specify why she believes Flaubert is an amoralist, let’s just assume she’s referring to his character Emma Bovary and her two extramarital affairs. Morally speaking, Rand’s heroines don’t fare any better than Emma. Dominique Francon maintains an ongoing love affair with Howard Roark while married to Peter and Gail. She sneaks off to see him periodically. Dagny Taggart of **Atlas Shrugged** has an affair with Hank Rearden, a married man. Furthermore, she’s so bold about their affair that she flaunts the symbol of their love, a bracelet made out of Rearden Metal, at a public ball, and refuses to give it to Lillian, Hank’s wife.²⁷

Howard Roark is just like Dostoevsky’s Ivan, an atheist man of reason who is neither totally good nor evil. He also has the same inner struggles with good and evil that Ivan does. As existential heroes, Ivan and Roark both come face to face with evil due to their isolationism. After each character confronts this evil, his life is put in a proper perspective in its relationship to

society. According to Kenneth J. Smith, “both [Existentialism and Objectivism] are evangelical: they invite each individual man to assert and realize himself, and come into a new being worthy of dignity, worthy of being ‘saved’”(25).

Nathaniel Branden says, in the beginning of **The Fountainhead**, Howard Roark is alone and at one of his lowest moments. He’s been expelled from school and has no close friends. There’s no one with whom he can share his inner life or values. He [Roark] is serenely happy within himself. In relation to this condition, Rand’s novel shows this condition, not as a problem to be solved, but a condition to learn to be happy about—as Roark is. . . [Rand’s message here can be read as] Don’t bother working at making yourself better understood. Don’t try to see whether you can close the gap of your alienation from others.**28**

Roark does solve this problem. However, he solves it in a negative way. He represses all his bad feelings of anger and resentment for nearly one-third of the novel. Then, all at once, Roark violently releases these bad feelings in the rape of Dominique. This is how Roark confronts the evil within himself. His rape of Dominique represents his existentialist self-realization. Just like Roark’s architectural mentor, Henry Cameron turns to alcoholism, just like Ivan Karamazov fails to win Katerina’s love and his mental and spiritual repression turns to brain fever and hallucinatory meetings with the devil—all these characters realize that they all need someone or something to help them achieve happiness. Nobody, not even Rand’s great and idealistic heroes, can achieve happiness alone. The fact that he needs the love of Dominique to overcome all his obstacles in a healthy way represents the existentialist idea of this character and this novel of Ayn Rand.

The rape represents both his and her existential evolution, movement to another stage of their development. Just like in the essay **Existentialism**, Sartre states, “The existentialist will never consider man as an end because he is always in the making” (296). Rand counters Sartre’s point by saying, “The basic social principle of the Objectivist ethics is that just as life is an end in itself, so every living human being is an end in himself, not the means to the ends or the welfare of others. . . (**The Virtue of Selfishness** 27). Despite this claim by Rand, in the novel, the rape develops Dominique from the indifference of saying, “If you wish. I don’t really care one way or the other,” (**The Fountainhead** 142) when asked if she wants to be fired from her job, to the passionate purpose of, “You know that I hate you Roark . . . I will fight to tear every chance you want away from you” (**The Fountainhead** 273).

After the rape, Dominique's life is given a new purpose. Before the rape, Dominique's indifference about everything showed that she had given up on life, just like Ivan Karamazov did after failing to win Katerina's love. Existentially speaking, the rape gave both Roark and Dominique hope and a greater self-realization in life about their respective positions in relation to the outside world. Following the events, which are neither positive nor negative, and will change their lives, for either the better or worse, forever, the joyful musings of Dominique, after the rape, look very similar to those of Emma Bovary, after she makes love to Rodolphe for the first time. Dominique says, "I've been raped . . . I've been raped by some redheaded hoodlum from a stone quarry . . . I, Dominique Francon . . . Through the fierce sense of humiliation, the words gave her the same kind of pleasure she had felt in his arms (**The Fountainhead** 220). Emma Bovary says, "I have a lover! I have a lover!" and the thought gave her a delicious thrill, as though she were beginning a second puberty. At last she was going to possess the joys of love, that fever of happiness she had despaired of ever knowing"(**Madame Bovary** 140).

Wendy McElroy existentially explains this newfound hope for both Dominique and Roark:

Roark is the one man to whom Dominique has surrendered, the one ideal she has not abandoned in a self-destructive plunge through life. She cannot convince Roark to betray his ideals, and, as yet, she cannot embrace them fully herself. She has repeatedly attempted to end her inner conflict by turning away from Roark, only to be driven back each time by her own undeniable need for him. Dominique's sole weapon against Roark is the knowledge that he wants her passionately (167).

Both Roark and Dominique need each other. Roark has raped her as a way to release and reconcile all his negative inner feelings. Perhaps if Roark continued with these feelings, he would end up a hopeless drunkard like his mentor, Henry Cameron. Dominique now has a new hero to worship and desire that she never knew existed previously. According to Sharon Stockton, the rape is Roark's mastery over Dominique and the transmission of his own vision to her-that has awakened her (823). Also, in the context of this novel, Roark is so great that he could use another obstacle. Dominique presents this for him.

Roark is great but not morally good. An existential problem of Rand's is that she equates greatness with goodness. These two are not necessarily the same, in either real life or fiction. Just

like Dostoevsky does through Ivan and the underground man, Rand shows the dark side of human nature through Howard Roark. According to William Barrett (1958), like Nietzsche after him, Dostoevsky was the great explorer of resentment as a powerful motive in man. There was something of the criminal in him as well as the saint. There seems to have been a repulsive and unsavory side to his character that made Dostoevsky so incomparable a witness to man's existential truth (139-40).

Ivan is great in the fact that he's a good scholar and leads a productive life. However this has little or nothing to do with his moral character. In the novel, Rakitin claims that Ivan courts Katerina for her dowry, "he'd get Katerina, for whom he's pining, and along with her a dowry of sixty thousand rubles" (**The Brothers Karamazov** 94). When Ivan fails to win her love, he immorally chooses to give up on life at age thirty: "When I'm close to thirty and decide to throw down my cup of life, I'll come especially to have one more talk with you" (318). Roark is great in that he is an original architectural innovator. He is willing to tread new ground and exhibits a strong work ethic along with his exemplary talent as an architect. However, this also has little or nothing to do with his moral character. While Dominique is married to both Peter Keating and Gail Wynand, Roark is continually having a love affair with her.

While the existential hero is morally ambivalent, he or she is not ambivalent about the values and goals they want to accomplish out of life. "Ivan and Rebellion against God," Albert Camus (1967) argues, "Rebellion wants all or nothing" (74). Rand's heroes follow this idea along with many other existential heroes. When she's asked, " 'What do you want? Perfection?' Dominique replies, '—or nothing. So, you see, I take the nothing' . . . 'I take the only desire one can really permit oneself. Freedom, Alvah, freedom' . . . 'To ask nothing. To expect nothing. To depend on nothing'" (**The Fountainhead** 144).

This same type of indifferent sentiment can be found in Toni Morrison's anti-heroine Sula when her long time lover, Ajax, leaves her, she never even knows his real name during their relationship, "His name was Albert Jacks? A. Jacks. She thought it was Ajax. All those years. . . I didn't even know his name, then there is nothing I did know and I have know nothing ever at all since the one thing I wanted was to know his name so how could he help but leave me since he was making love to a woman who didn't even know his name. . . It's just as well he left" (**Sula** 117). Ivan rejects the idea of the good going to heaven because he wants all to be saved or none

to be saved. Roark wants to be the greatest and most powerful man in New York or he wants to be in jail.

Existential novels also tend to have the same types of all or nothing sentences in their meaningless trials. The existential heroes usually either get total freedom or extreme punishment. After bombing Cortlandt, in his testimony to the court, Roark admits that he did it. “Now you know why I dynamited Cortlandt,” (**The Fountainhead** 685). It’s not his guilt or innocence that’s being tried, but the validity and rationality of the action. In **The Brothers Karamazov**, it doesn’t matter whether Dmitry murdered his father or not. He might as well have—everybody knows that he’s capable of such an act and he must be punished for his criminal ways. When in jail and speaking to his brother, Aloysha, about it, they say, “ ‘It [the trial] was all fixed in advance, wasn’t it?’ ‘Whether it was or not, you would have been convicted anyway,’ Aloysha said with a sigh. ‘Yes, I suppose people around here got tired of seeing my face’”(923).

Although Bigger of Richard Wright’s **Native Son** looks nearly identical to Dmitry Karamazov in character, existentially, he’s more like Ivan. Just like Ivan is between the extreme good of Aloysha and the extreme evil of Dmitry, so is Bigger’s between the communist good of Jan and the capitalist evil of Mr. Dalton. **29** The same holds true for Gail Wynand. He’s trapped between the extreme good of Howard Roark and the extreme evil of Ellsworth Toohey. Furthermore, Bigger’s trial is just as useless as Dmitry’s and Meursault’s in **The Stranger**. Meursault’s ongoing life without his existential self-awareness would be worse than death. The hero can die happily once he experiences this knowledge of self. **30** When Bigger flees, he’s already sentenced himself to death. It doesn’t matter if it’s by suicide, execution, or killing spree.

Existentially, the endings of **Native Son** and **The Stranger** look very similar. Just like Camus’ hero, Bigger discovers a meaning for his life before he dies. “‘What I killed for must’ve been good!’ Bigger’s voice was full of frenzied anguish. ‘It must have been good! When a man kills, it’s for something. . . I didn’t know I was really alive in this world until I felt things hard enough to kill for ‘em. . . It’s the truth, Mr. Max I can say it now, ‘cause I’m going to die. I know what I’m saying real good and I know how it sounds. But I’m all right. I feel all right when I look at it that way’”(Native Son 392). Whether they fail or succeed, Rand’s characters all discover the truth as well. Peter discovers Toohey’s motives for helping him into self destruction. Wynand discovers that he is a servant of the people instead of their ruler. Dominique finds her proper role as subordinate to Howard Roark.

The existential hero as well as anybody, needs both someone to love and someone to hate—or a friend and enemy—something to fight for and against. In the existentialist tradition, Ayn Rand’s heroes are full of both love and hate for themselves, mankind, and their fellow men. Bigger ambivalently shows both love for Jan, by pulling a gun on him out of guilt, and hate for Mr. Dalton, writing the ransom note and getting financial help from this enemy who has given him a job.

Jean Blomar of Simone de Beauvoir’s **The Blood of Others**, feels the same way when his lover is dying as a result of the mission on which he sent her:

Because of me—first Jacques and now Helene. Because I did not love her and because I loved her; because she came so close to me and because she remained so far apart. Because I exist and she, free, solitary, and eternal, is bound to my existence, unable to avoid the brutal fact of my existence, fettered to the mechanical sequence of her life; and at this last link of the fatal chain, her very heart struck by the blind steel, by the hard presence of the metal, by my presence—her death. Because I was there, solid, inevitable, for no apparent reason. I should never have existed (4).

Not only are pieces of existentialist philosophy in Rand’s novels, but pieces of Rand’s philosophy of Objectivism are in existentialist novels. “Helene, I’ve told you fifty times that I am my work. I can’t choose not to be what I am. But such as I am, I love you” (**The Blood of Others** 97). This sounds just like the part of Rand’s philosophy where she says, “Productive work is the central purpose of a rational man’s life,” **31** and “. . . he [Aristotle] defined the basic principles of a rational view of existence and of man’s consciousness: that there is only one reality, the one which man perceives—that it exists as an objective absolute—that the task of man’s consciousness is to perceive, not to create, reality. . . that A is A” (**For the New Intellectual** 22). **32**

Ayn Rand’s philosophy forms a base not only from Existentialism, but from Marxism as well. Existentialism deals more with the individual and Marxism deals more with classes of individuals, or the state. Just like the existentialist individual is continually in the making, so is the Marxist state. “Since the Marxist timetable sees human society as developing from one social stage to another, a higher one, it follows that human nature reflects this progress and itself

improves” (Vickery 118). Just as Marxism is a left wing application of G.W.F. Hegel’s philosophy into literature, Rand’s literature is an extremely right wing version of this. It’s not so much that it’s the opposite of Hegel’s philosophy, but it’s Hegel’s philosophy backwards. Tibor R. Machan asserts, “So Rand saw the Marxian version as turning the truth on its head, ascribing achievement not to persons. . . but to impersonal forces in nature” (103).

According to Jerome Tuccille, “Objectivism—which following the publication of Rand’s major philosophical novel, **Atlas Shrugged**, in 1957, quickly became a kind of New Marxism of the Right. A generation earlier, the same converts now flocking to her would just as enthusiastically have joined the Marxist band wagon tearing down the rocky road of the thirties” (16). Just like Marx took Hegel’s philosophy and turned it political and religious for the application of the real world, so did Rand take Aristotle’s philosophy and do the same thing.³³ Marx and Rand were both Hegelian philosophers, or progressive progenies of the Prussian Aristotle. Marx simply took the left road and Rand took the right. Both Rand and Marx took Hegel’s philosophy to political extremes.³⁴ Rand’s strike of the great men in **Atlas Shrugged** is just like the proposed revolution of the working classes in **The Communist Manifesto**.

Objectivism and Marxism are simply two different sides to the same coin. Both sides are working for more money and power and more control of the world. Philip Gordon says, “Seemingly antagonistic, Toohey, **The Fountainhead**’s collectivist, and Roark, the individualist, in fact imply the same social, political, and intellectual control, just as the Soviet Union [increasingly] and the United States are both monopoly capitalistic societies, one through state collectivism and the other through private enterprise” (709). In **The Communist Manifesto**, Marx states, “You must, therefore, confess that by ‘individual’ you mean no other person than the bourgeois, than the middle-class owner of property. This person must, indeed, be swept out of the way, and made impossible” (99).

Marx doesn’t say what ‘swept out of the way’ means. It means that the lower class will become the middle class and the former middle class will become the lower class. This same point is made in Orwell’s **Nineteen Eighty-Four**, “Throughout recorded time, there have been three kinds of people in the world, the High, the Middle, and the Low. . . The aim of the High is to remain where they are. The aim of the Middle is to change places with the High. . .the aim of the Low. . . is to abolish all distinctions and create a society in which all men shall be equal.

Thus throughout history a struggle which is the same in its main outlines recurs over and over again” (860).

Ultimately, in any society, even those which claim to be classless, someone has to rule and someone has to be ruled. Marx says that the masses are slaves to the greedy capitalist owners. Rand says that the productive capitalist owners are slaves to the overly powerful government, she says that the businessman must live under the threat of losing everything he owns and has achieved in his life to any ambitious young bureaucrat who may use government pull against him (**Capitalism the Unknown Ideal** 50). In Marx’s **Communist Manifesto**, it states: “. . . But modern bourgeois private property is the final and most complete expression of the system of producing and appropriating products, that is based on class antagonisms, on the exploitation of the many by the few. In this sense, the theory of the Communists may be summed up in the single sentence: Abolition of private property (96). . . for those of its members [the bourgeois] who work, acquire nothing, and those who acquire anything, do not work (99). . . Let the ruling classes tremble at a Communistic revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win. WORKING MEN OF ALL COUNTRIES, UNITE!” (120-21).

When juxtaposed against a summation of Rand’s political thought, we see that, philosophically and politically, **The Communist Manifesto** is not so different from the ideas of Ayn Rand:

I am neither foe nor friend to my brothers, but such as each of them shall deserve of me. And to earn my love, my brothers must do more than to have been born. I do not grant my love without reason, nor to any chance passer-by who may wish to claim it. I honor men with my love. But honor is a thing to be earned. I shall choose friends among men, but neither slaves nor masters. And I shall choose only such as please me, and them I shall love and respect, but neither command nor obey. And we shall join our hands when we wish, or walk alone when we so desire. For in the temple of his spirit, each man is alone. Let each man keep his temple untouched and undefiled. Then let him join hands with others if he wishes, but only beyond his holy threshold (**Anthem** 111).

Both statements are against masters and slaves and class distinctions. Both have a religious tone

to them. And both are prescriptions for utopian societies. Throughout her literary career, Rand moved steadily to the right, from this moderate idea of utopia in **Anthem** to Howard Roark and Gail Wynand battling for the power throne and ultimately to the complete society of great men, or rulers in **Atlas Shrugged**. 35

This same Communism vs. Capitalism idea holds true in literature. Rand's capitalist heroes are usually the villains of Marxist literature and the heroes of Marxist literature are usually the villains of Rand's literature. According to Tibor R. Machan, "What Rand should be remembered for in connection with communism is her profoundly philosophical answer to Marx's ideas. If Marx is secularism's greatest defender of collectivism, Ayn Rand is its greatest champion of individualism" (110-11). Just like idea of **The Communist Manifesto's** Robin Hood-like idea of 'sweeping away' the middle class to make room for the poor, Rand created a Robin Hood for the rich, Ragnar Danneskjold in **Atlas Shrugged**. This hero's aim was, as Orwell put it in **Nineteen Eighty-Four**, to "help the high remain where they were." Michael S. Collins asserts, "If tycoons are saints in Rand's world, the welfare state is, of course, a devil that penalizes productivity and props up the idea that need and suffering have greater claims on wealth than either effectiveness or property rights. [Ragnar]Danneskjold casts himself as the defender of property rights and productivity and as destroyer of illusions that suffering rather than ingenuity moves ships and transports grain" (325).

The communist hero fights for the 'common good.' The protagonists, Mac and Jim, of John Steinbeck's novel, **In Dubious Battle**, sacrifice themselves for the common good and expect it of others, "I'm sorry for Anderson, but what the hell. If I can give up my whole life, he ought to be able to give up a barn" (242). The common good they're fighting for is a defeat of the capitalist evil in their valley, "When we get a whole slough of men working together, maybe—maybe Torgas Valley, most of it, won't be owned by three men. Maybe a guy can get an apple for himself without going to jail for it, see? Maybe they won't dump apples in the river to keep up the price. . . A guy that thinks food ought to be eaten is a God-damned red" (**In Dubious Battle** 206).

Rand says that no 'common good' exists and it's really a profit for collectivist rulers, "When the 'common good' of a society is regarded as something apart from and superior to the individual good of its members, it means that the good of some men takes precedence over the good of others, with those others consigned to the status of sacrificial animals. It is tacitly

assumed, in such cases, that ‘the common good’ means the good of the majority as against the minority or the individual” (**Capitalism the Unknown Ideal** 21).³⁶ Rand is more against the apparent lies used to hide the true nature of collectivism than the Marxist system itself. ³⁷

Furthermore, Rand’s **Atlas Shrugged** counters the idea above in **In Dubious Battle** to imply the point that the working masses [proletariat] are sustained and allowed to live by the tycoons’ productive capitalist system—thus, the individuals create more good than the masses, “How many tons of rail do you produce per day if you work for Hank Rearden [steel tycoon of *Atlas Shrugged*]? Would you dare to claim that the size of your pay check was created solely by your physical labor and that those rails were the product of your muscles? The standard of living of that blacksmith is all that your muscles are worth; the rest is a gift from Hank Rearden” (988). In George Orwell’s **Down and Out in Paris and London**, his personal experiences living with the poor and homeless street dwellers led him to learn that they aren’t thankful for charity—and perhaps nobody is or should be. Orwell concludes this work by saying, “I shall never again think that all tramps are drunken scoundrels, nor expect a beggar to be grateful when I give him a penny, nor be surprised if men out of work lack energy, nor subscribe to the Salvation Army, nor pawn my clothes, nor refuse a handbill, nor enjoy a meal at a smart restaurant” (213). Hazel Barnes claims that Rand’s proposed system would inevitably tend to give still further protection to the strong, who least need it.³⁸

Because they attempt to create social systems that will end slavery and cure man’s ills, both Marxism and Objectivism are like religions in themselves. According to M. Stanton Evans, “Miss Rand believes. . . that Christianity and capitalism are incompatible. . . she wants to keep the capitalism and let the Christianity go. The evil of the Christian faith, she says, is its emphasis on altruism” (1061). Objectivism worships the greatness of man and his creations, Marxism worships the utopia of a classless society. “‘We’ll own all that some day, Bigger,’ Jan said with a wave of his hand. ‘After the revolution it’ll be ours. But we’ll have to fight for it. What a world to win, Bigger! And when that day comes, things’ll be different. There’ll be no white no black; there’ll be no rich and no poor’”(Native Son 69).

In worshipping man’s greatness, Gail Wynand says, “I would give the greatest sunset in the world for one sight of New York’s skyline. . . The sky over New York and the will of man made visible. What other religion do we need? . . . When I see the city from my window—no, I don’t feel how small I am—but I feel that if a war came to threaten this, I would like to throw

myself into space, over the city, and protect these buildings with my body” (**The Fountainhead** 447). Ivan Karamazov says, “And those who do not believe in God will bring in socialism, anarchy, and the re-organization of society according to a new scheme. But, as you realize, it really boils down to the same damned thing—they’re all the same old questions, they’re just approached from a different angle” (**The Brothers Karamazov** 281).

Marxism is a more political, social, and less individualistic spin on Existentialism. In moving from philosophical to political literature, Existentialism tends to lean more towards Marxism and left wing literature. The capitalists and bourgeois are generally not embraced as existentialist heroes, “When I used the word ‘revolution’ to her, she flushed. ‘You’re only a child! You don’t know what you’re saying! . . . Everything that her heart and her mind condemned she rabidly defended—my father, marriage, capitalism. Because the wrong lay not in the institutions, but in the depths of our being (**The Blood of Others** 13). “‘The bourgeoisie doesn’t want war,’ observed Maurice suddenly. ‘They are afraid of victory, because it would mean victory of the proletariat’”(The Reprieve 14-15).

The ideas of both Marx and Rand are too extreme. When any group is oppressed, a true utopian society doesn’t exist. Rand and Marx present utopian heavens for their favorite classes and a hellacious slavery for their least favorite classes. Orwell’s **Nineteen Eighty-Four** gives the best solution to both the existentialist and Marxist dilemmas for man, on all class levels. Orwell’s politically moderate ideas provide a solution to the extremes of Rand and Marx. Although he doesn’t get as far as Equality 7-2521, Winston Smith finds what he thinks is his happiness and thinks he wants to create a more politically moderate society. Who can be sure? While Orwell doesn’t specifically say or show the ideal political system we want, he implies that it lies somewhere between Marxism and Objectivism—in moderation. Just like Howard Roark, man must create his own utopia for himself and not rely on the collectivist state or religion to do it for him. Just like Equality 7-2521 found out what his happiness was in **Anthem**, **The Fountainhead** and **Nineteen Eighty-Four** give us the best solutions to any problems in that man must find his own way in his own life—separate from other people or institutions.

CHAPTER 3

THE FOUNTAINHEAD AS POLITICAL LITERATURE: RAND'S OBJECTIVISM VS. GEORGE ORWELL'S SKEPTICISM

Just like her art and philosophy, Rand's politics are extreme and difficult to categorize. Politically speaking, Objectivism is like Conservatism without the Christianity, Libertarianism with stronger morals, Anarchism without the looting and Nazism without the gas chambers, machine guns and barbed wire fences.¹ The basic political theories of Objectivism, like separating morality from politics, less governmental control of the economy and more power for the productive individual to achieve success, are valid, reasonable and practically applicable to our lives. However, Rand takes it too far when she replaces freedom of religion with one of her own—man worship. The main political problem with Objectivism, as seen in Rand's fiction, is that it's radical in nature. According to Claudia Pierpont, Rand claimed that she never wanted to write about politics at all. That was simply what she had to do in order to help secure a world in which she could write what she really liked: romances, adventures, stories that would be like the American movies she had seen in Petrograd—exuberant stories of what she called 'the benevolent universe' (220).

Unlike Rand, Orwell believed that this 'benevolent universe' existed in political moderation somewhere between communism and capitalism. Based on his experiences fighting in the Spanish Civil War, George Orwell learned that just like Karl Marx's proletariat heroes turned into Vladimir Lenin and Joseph Stalin, bourgeois capitalist heroes Howard Roark and John Galt could just as easily turn into Benito Mussolini and Adolf Hitler. Orwell's life work was a battle against these dangerous political extremes. Rand was strongly anti-communist and Orwell was strongly anti-dictatorship. Furthermore, each of their political educations created different reactions. Rand's education was established out of the regime from which she formed a lifelong hatred and ideological escape. Her politics were more anti-communist than they were capitalist. The genius of Orwell's message is that he shows that Rand's extreme capitalism will fail for the same reasons as communism—unchecked power, or a disguised form of dictatorship. Orwell's political ideas were formed from his experiences in the Spanish Civil War in which he developed less hate for the enemy and less love for his own side.

While Rand was radically optimistic about the merit of political systems, specifically capitalism, Orwell was skeptical of even the democratic Socialism for which he fought and

nearly died in the Spanish Civil War. “His [Orwell’s] aim was to reform and strengthen, not to discredit the world to which he had pledged his loyalty: he was the Left’s loyal opposition” (Zwerdling 5). Despite the opposing natures of their political thought, in both their fiction and non-fiction, some of Rand’s greatest and most realistic heroes are all skeptics in the Orwellian tradition. Gail Wynand, Dominique Francon, Hank Rearden and Dagny Taggart, the heroes in the middle of her moral spectrums, are just like the neutrals Benjamin of **Animal Farm** and Julia of **Nineteen Eighty-Four**. This idea gives evidence to the point that the political theories of Rand and Orwell were not so different.

Rand and Orwell wrote about politics more out of necessity than out of choice. Their ideas were developed from personal experiences that would shape their political attitudes for the rest of their lives. “Ayn Rand, like any rational person, wanted nothing more from politics than not to have to be concerned with the subject. But from childhood she was confronted with the great political issues of the twentieth century, and in her work she could not avoid dealing with them” (Merrill 127). Christopher Hollis states, when the Spanish Civil War broke out, Orwell left for Barcelona. He originally planned to serve as a journalist, but, once he arrived, he enlisted in the P.O.U.M., militia and was sent to fight on the Aragonese front (92).

Both writers were educated in politics from the brutality of absolute power and its ensuing lies. “The people who wrote pamphlets against us and vilified us in the newspapers all remained safe at home, or at worst in the newspaper offices of Valencia, hundreds of miles from the bullets and the mud. . . One of the dreariest effects of this war has been to teach me that the Left-wing press is every bit as spurious and dishonest as that of the Right” (**Homage to Catalonia** 65). During the Russian Revolution, Alice Rosenbaum’s mother begged her father to consider fleeing the country. He refused because he didn’t want to leave his business. Soon there was no business to save. Along with all other private property, the banks were nationalized, and all safety deposit boxes were confiscated. Alice’s aunt lost her jewelry [the equivalent of losing one’s entire bank account]. Of the bloody Bolshevik rule, she learned that, “It [Communism] was the demand for the sacrifice of the best among men, and for the enshrinement of the commonplace, that I saw as the unspeakable evil of communism.”²

Both believed in the individual spirit of man. “. . . Orwell was to comfort himself with the hope that good might triumph over evil and decency prevail. ‘I myself,’ he writes, in **Looking Back on the Spanish War**, ‘believe, perhaps on insufficient grounds, that the common man will

win his fight sooner or later.’ In his poem to an Italian soldier, he writes, . . . ‘No bomb that ever burst/ Shatters the crystal spirit.’” (Hollis 107). Despite their political differences, a common theme in the fiction of both writers is that man needed only to have political power over himself to achieve happiness and well being. Nevertheless, Orwell’s political moderation, which is between the extreme left of Marx and the extreme right of Rand, is the best and most practical way to apply the ideas of Rand’s fiction to our lives. Throughout his life as a political writer, Orwell continually learned and moved to a moderate stance by showing a fairness to both the side he supported and that which he opposed. Orwell loved humanity with a desire for truth and a less class oriented progress of mankind more than the idea of ‘taking political sides’.

Christopher Hollis points out that, in **Homage to Catalonia**, the account of his experiences as a soldier for the Trotskyite P.O.U.M., Orwell found no difficulty in thinking and writing even of the enemy as a normal human being. “At this moment a man. . . was half-dressed and was holding up his trousers with both hands as he ran. I refrained from shooting at him. . . Still I did not shoot partly because of that detail about the trousers. I had come here to shoot at ‘Fascists’; but a man who is holding up his trousers isn’t a ‘Fascist,’ his is visibly a fellow-creature, similar to yourself, and you don’t feel like shooting him” (**Looking Back on the Spanish War** 254). ‘The whole experience,’ he [Orwell] wrote of the war at large, ‘has left me with not less but more belief in human beings’ (98-99). It wasn’t politics that Orwell disliked, but politicians and lies about their true aims in relation to society.

The idealistic characters in **The Fountainhead** are similar to those of Orwell’s novel **Animal Farm** because they represent ideas, philosophies and institutions as much or more than realistic characters. In their novels, both Rand and Orwell show examples of extreme Right-wing society. Orwell pessimistically shows the danger of these dictatorships, Rand takes the opposing optimistic view and shows prosperous results of her “extreme capitalism” and portray her leaders and creators of wealth as “capitalist heroes who rise above the masses” rather than dictators. Nevertheless, Orwell would have been skeptical of Rand’s capitalist heroes who rise above the masses. He wouldn’t believe that a Howard Roark could truly be as happy as he was in the novel. In relating this idea to novels of the early twentieth century on this subject, such as Jack London’s **The Iron Heel**, Orwell says, all described imaginary worlds in which the special problems of capitalism had been solved without bringing liberty, equality or true happiness any nearer.³

Due to this skepticism, Orwell's novels were full of anti-heroes as opposed to Rand's heroes. He would believe Roark as much a victim as a content "man above the masses." According to George Woodcock, ". . . like Winston Smith in **Nineteen Eighty-Four**, the central figure of every Orwell novel is a solitary, detached by some scar in his past from the world in which he finds himself, compelled to live the double existence of the misfit, and, after inevitable and ineffectual rebellion, doomed to fail and be destroyed or finally and hopelessly to be enslaved" (58). The typical Orwellian anti-hero looks more like Gail Wynand and Dominique Francon than Howard Roark because of his or her inner struggles.

However, just like Winston Smith, Roark does represent the role of misfit. Part of Winston Smith's character of **Nineteen Eighty-Four** represents Howard Roark's optimism and a desire for idealism and greatness. In his opposition to Big Brother's totalitarian society, he says to O'Brien, its representative:

. . . 'Life will defeat you.'
[O'Brien replies] 'We control life, Winston, at all its levels'. . .
[O'Brien says] 'Then what is it, this principle that will defeat us?'
'I don't know. The spirit of Man.'
'And do you consider yourself a man?'
'Yes.'
'If you are a man, Winston, you are the last man. Your kind is extinct; we are the inheritors. Do you understand that you are alone?'
(**Nineteen Eighty Four** 899-900).

This individual and unconquerable spirit of man against the masses is a main theme of all of Rand's fiction. In portraying this same theme, Rand sides with the Right and Orwell sides with the Left. Just like Winston, Howard Roark, The Wynand Building, Emmanuel Goldstein and The Brotherhood, both writers present last men and monuments to preserve the spirit of man before mankind destroys itself. No matter the politics or governmental system, both writers portray the idea that mankind wants to destroy itself, is hanging on by a thread [like Howard Roarks and partial inner spirits of Winston Smiths] and uses political power to commit suicide.

The ideological importance of Orwell in relation to Rand is not that his politics were different from Rand's, but that both writers shared some key similarities in their life experiences and their fiction, despite their political oppositions. Orwell states, "Every line of serious work that I have written since 1936 has been written, directly or indirectly against totalitarianism and for democratic Socialism, as I understand it".⁴ According to Chris Sciabarra, no kind words

about democracy can be found in Rand's writings. She thought that a majoritarian system would degenerate into mob rule in the absence of legally enforced rights, republican constraints, and a system of checks and balances.⁵ She views it as an agency established within a certain geographical area, holding a monopoly on the power to enforce rules of social conduct (282).

Orwell would have intelligently looked ahead to the ruling regimes of Howard Roark and the Strikers in **Atlas Shrugged**. Although Rand ends her novels just at the right place, before the capitalist heroes take over and have power over the collectivist regimes, we see evidence of what her capitalist heroes in power might look like. While it may be argued that Dominique was not forced to support Roark and his regime, through the rape, brutal means of persuasion are used for this. Orwell's skeptic argument would have been that in terms of power and its use and abuse, the world ruled under Howard Roark and the Strikers of **Atlas Shrugged** would look very similar to Ellsworth Toohey's regime, had he won, and that of the Strikers that we do see in **Atlas Shrugged**. The society of **Nineteen Eighty-Four** looks exactly like Toohey's desired regime and the anarchist society of common men of **Atlas Shrugged**. When asked what it is he wants, Toohey says, "I want power. I want my world of the future. Let all live for all. Let all sacrifice and none profit. . . Universal slavery—without even the dignity of a master. . . A great circle—and a total equality. The world of the future" (**The Fountainhead** 640).

Orwell would not have disliked either Toohey or Howard Roark, but he would have disliked the political systems that each character was moving society towards. He would probably have said that, in terms of political power, Rand's heroes are no different from her villains. In real life, both would be truly unhappy oppressors and victims. Orwell would have loved and felt sympathy for Rand's heroes at the same time. While even Rand's most extreme heroes are not on the same level with Adolf Hitler, what Orwell says about Hitler sounds like he's giving a precise description of Ayn Rand's heroes, both good and evil:

I have never been able to dislike Hitler. Ever since he came to power—till then, like nearly everyone, I had been deceived into thinking that he did not matter—I have reflected that I would certainly kill him if I could get within reach of him, but that I could feel no personal animosity. The fact is that there is something deeply appealing about him. One feels it again when one sees his photographs. . . . It is a pathetic, doglike face, the face of a man suffering under intolerable wrongs. In a rather more manly way it reproduces the expression of

innumerable pictures of Christ crucified, and there is no doubt that this is how Hitler sees himself. The initial, personal cause of his grievance against the universe can only be guessed at; but at any rate the grievance is there. He is the martyr, the victim, Prometheus **6** chained to the rock, the self-sacrificing hero who fights single-handed against impossible odds. If he were fighting a mouse he would know how to make it seem like a dragon. One feels, as with Napoleon, that he is fighting against destiny, that he *can't* win, and yet that somehow he deserves to. The attraction of such a pose is of course enormous: half of the films one sees turn upon such a theme.⁷

Just like Orwell's life experiences are important in that they taught him that politically, we should avoid extremes, so are Rand's just as important. Ultimately, Rand's experiences taught her that we should crush Communism and collectivism like a religious duty, greed is good, and American wealth, success and excess, or extreme power in any form, can never hurt us. Although Orwell's ideas are more practical, we would all like to be rich so that we could test Rand's theory about wealth and power never hurting us and we continually strive to achieve the American Dream so we can do so.

Rand's anti-Communism was like a reactionary political life movement against her traumatic experience with collectivist government. As a middle class Russian Jew, Rand experienced only the side of the bourgeois. However, her one bad experience with Bolshevik Russia created a lifelong dislike for the proletariat, or common man. "Alisa [Rand] was present in her father's shop the day Bolshevik soldiers broke in and affixed a red seal to the door, declaring his life's work the property of the Soviet people."⁸ Ronald E. Merrill states, "[Rand's] **We the Living** was an anti-collectivist novel, an attack on the totalitarian vision as such, rather than merely Soviet Russia or Bolshevism. Even so, it is notable that she never had much to say about Nazism; much as she opposed it, it seems never to have inspired her with the same visceral hatred that she felt for Communism" (127).

In relation to her politics, Camille Paglia says:

Also I am a little bit uneasy, OK, with the politics. I don't think that Ayn Rand is a fascist particularly, but I think there is a kind of contempt for ordinary people in Ayn Rand—a little bit. I love the high achiever. I am a great worshiper of the high achiever. But I also feel at home with people of the

working class. And I think that in Rand there's a little bit of a kind of snobbish elitism about those vulgar masses out there. That makes me a little uncomfortable with her (78).

Like Paglia, Orwell also felt at home with the people of the working class. Although Howard Roark may not be so easily defined as a dictator at the end of **The Fountainhead**, he would clearly be among the race of pigs in **Animal Farm**, unlike Peter Keating. Thus, the elitism of her fiction would probably embrace Orwell's fictional statement, "All Animals are Equal, But Some Animals are More Equal than Others" (**Animal Farm** 63).

Just like Rand's disgust for the common masses, Orwell's love for them stemmed from biographical experiences. Christopher Hitchens asserts, "Partly French on his mother's side to begin with, Orwell spent his formative years seeing the British at their absolute worst. The hellish snobbery and sadism of the prep-school system, and the dirty work of Empire, made indelible scratches on his mind, and furnished him with seams of material he was never to exhaust" (126). Orwell's political importance is not that he stood for a side, but that he experienced both bourgeois and proletarian sides. Despite this love for the common man, he wasn't supportive of revolution, or a 'so called' utopian society by either side. "It was not merely Marxism he [Orwell] distrusted, but any theory of history that claimed to predict the future in detail with such dogmatic self-confidence. Every previous revolution had created as many problems as it had solved, most of which could hardly have been anticipated beforehand."⁹

According to Alex Zwerdling, Orwell's quarrel was not so much with Marx as with Marxism (20). 'The main weakness of Marxism' Orwell wrote, is 'its failure to interpret human motives. . . As it is, a Marxist analysis' of any historical event tends to be a hurried snap-judgment based on the principle of *cui bono*?. . . Along these lines, it is impossible to have an intuitive understanding of men's motives, and therefore impossible to predict their actions."¹⁰ His sympathies for the common man came from his experiences with them. He wanted the common man to simply be told the truth and empowered more. He didn't want either side to be "swept out of the way" because these radical measures would lead to absolute power, whether Communism or Fascism, it would look the same on either side.

Politically, Rand and Orwell both wrote novels of heavy ideas and representations. While Rand showed the possibilities of mankind in a positive light, Orwell showed the same negatively. In **The Fountainhead** and **Atlas Shrugged** we see utopias and in **Animal Farm** and **1984** we

see anti-utopias. More importantly, the characters and the respective ideas they represent are more similar in these novels of Orwell and Rand than they are different. **Animal Farm** and **The Fountainhead** both represent the same political ideas in relation to their characters. Before comparing the character representations of Orwell's 1945 novel to those of **The Fountainhead**, it is first important to examine the ideas of Orwell's work first, because it has more characters in relation to ideas. As Orwell fairly claimed, **Animal Farm** 'was the first book in which I tried, with full consciousness of what I was doing, to fuse political purpose and artistic purpose into one whole' –and he succeeded. **11**

Rand learned to blend politics into her art from the libertarian Isabel Paterson. Rand showed the speeches of **The Fountainhead** to Paterson. She also gave Rand "one of the most valuable pieces of advice she ever got in regard to writing, "which was to leave out all contemporary political names and terms, so as to focus on the problem of 'collectivism'—any past, present, or future form of it".**12** Only in the book's last section, which Rand wrote in 1942 after many months of intense discussions with Paterson about political theory and American history and institutions, does she [Rand] develop the political meaning of Roark's experience.**13** Thus, many passages of Paterson's work, **The God of The Machine**, look similar to ideas of Rand's fiction. "It is neither the joint action nor thinking alike in conscious reasonable terms which induces this collective 'unity'; it is not thinking at all at the given moment or occasion. . . because thinking is an individual function" (**The God of The Machine** 153). "But the mind is an attribute of the individual. There is no such thing as a collective brain. There is no such thing as a collective thought" (**The Fountainhead** 680).

Through its characters as ideas, **Animal Farm** represents how this well intentioned individual thought in **The Fountainhead** turns to absolute political power—something we would all be happier without. Boxer represents the proletariat, "Boxer was an enormous beast, nearly eighteen hands high, and as strong as two horses put together. . . and in fact he was not of first-rate intelligence, but he was universally respected for his steadiness of character and tremendous powers of work" (**Animal Farm** 13). Man, initially represented in the beginning in the character of Mr. Jones, represents the capitalist who controls the means of production, "Man is the only creature that consumes without producing. . . Yet he is lord of all the animals" (**Animal Farm** 15). The pigs represent the bourgeoisie, or the elite race of Nietzschean Supermen. More specifically, Squealer is the propagandist, like Joseph Goebbels of the Nazi regime. Major is the

initiator of the Communist movement [Vladimir Lenin]. Napoleon is the totalitarian Communist [Joseph Stalin] and Snowball is the democratic Communist [Leon Trotsky].¹⁴

In moving power from the commune to the individual, as a representative of the American imagination, Mollie represents vanity, excess and ego—typical traits of Rand’s robber barons. She is the happiest character of the novel because she is removed from politics. She looks like an Americanized Kira [heroine of Rand’s **We the Living**] without the intellect. Both Mollie and Kira escape their anti-utopias in search of success and happiness. Although she is lazy and dumb, Mollie has the common sense to realize that she has no place in Animal Farm and it has no place for her. Like Kira, she leaves Communism in search of the American Dream, which is already ingrained into her attitude. “Mollie, it was true, was not good at getting up in the morning, and had a way of leaving work early on the ground that there was a stone in her hoof. . . Mollie refused to learn any but the six letters which spelt her own name” (**Animal Farm** 23,25). The dogs represent brute force and Benjamin represents independent thought not put into action-or neutrality, “Benjamin was the only animal who did not side with either faction” (**Animal Farm** 31).

All of the main heroes of **The Fountainhead** represent combinations of ideas from **Animal Farm**’s characters. Like the pigs, Howard Roark is among the elite race of men, like the dogs, he uses the brute force of rape and bombing Cortlandt, he’s a capitalist, like the men and he’s also like Benjamin in that he uses his independent thought. Ellsworth Toohey is almost totally representative of Squealer and lusts for power like Napoleon. Peter Keating is a combination of Boxer and Mollie. Like the proletariat, he works hard for something other than his own selfish interest. Just like Mollie wants to please farmers, “A fat red-faced man in check breeches and gaiters. . . was stroking her [Mollie’s] nose and feeding her with sugar. Her coat was newly clipped and she wore a scarlet ribbon round her forelock. She appeared to be enjoying herself. . .” (**Animal Farm** 30), Peter Keating uses vanity and excess to please his prospective customers. Based on his socioeconomic status of bourgeoisie, Peter is a faux pig, but in reality, his lack of ability or intelligence [like Mollie’s] render him a proletariat in the guise of an elite. Just like Peter, Dominique would also represent Mollie and is totally representative of Benjamin.

Benjamin represents not only independent thought, but also idleness or wasted ability. With all due respect to Orwell, Benjamin looks most like him. The same skepticism of Orwell and Benjamin can be seen in Dominique. “He [Benjamin] refused to believe either that food

would become more plentiful or that the windmill would save work. Windmill or no windmill, he said, life would go on as it had always gone on—that is badly” (**Animal Farm** 31). Just like Benjamin, Dominique is a brilliant character who is capable of great things, but never cares to achieve her full potential, she is skeptical of greatness in mankind and believes it [in the form of Howard Roark] will be destroyed. She says, “Roark, you won’t win, they’ll destroy you, but I won’t be there to see it happen. I will have destroyed myself first” (**The Fountainhead** 376).

Dominique is idle because she’s skeptical that anyone of great ability will succeed in such a mediocre world—even herself. Rand characterizes Dominique as “herself in a bad mood.”¹⁵ Douglas Den Uyl raises an interesting question in relation to Dominique’s character. He states that Rand’s fiction is optimistic. If Dominique is a part of Rand herself, and Rand’s work is typically hopeful and optimistic, then why is Dominique so pessimistic and skeptical (66)?

Barbara Branden (1986) refers to Dominique—as “a symbol of idealism frozen by contempt” (136). ¹⁶ Just like Dominique, so does Benjamin let his talent go to waste. He doesn’t use his intelligence to help himself or any other animals on the farm—except Boxer, when it’s too late. In fairness to their different conditions, Benjamin never uses his great wisdom to influence Boxer’s thinking. He could at least try to convince Boxer that he shouldn’t work so hard as to jeopardize his health. Even if it failed, he could have at least used his intellect to organize and lobby for a legitimate pension for Boxer. Just like the secret lay in the proles in **Nineteen Eighty-Four**, the secret in **Animal Farm** was in Benjamin—the most intelligent of the proles. Even though Snowball represents the leader closest to Orwell’s Trotskyite politics, it’s not necessarily true that Napoleon is the villain and Snowball is the hero. Nevertheless, Benjamin is worse than either Napoleon or Squealer because he’s not on any side—he’s idle. He’s indifferent, like a citizen who does not vote.

As Rand’s most intriguing character, Gail Wynand represents the greatest number of traits among the characters of **Animal Farm**. He’s among the elite bourgeois like the pigs, he’s excessive and vain like Mollie, he uses his wealth and power to get others to work for him, like the capitalist men. Like Benjamin, he uses his individual thought, and is skeptical of the uncorrupted greatness of man [equivalent to the utopian regime of Napoleon] like Benjamin and he lusts for more power than he already has, like Napoleon. Wynand is skeptical just like Dominique. Probably like Orwell, he doesn’t believe that incorruptible and ideal men actually

exist. Dominique asks him, “Do you love the heroic in man, Gail? [he replies]” “I love to think of it. I don’t believe it” (**The Fountainhead** 499). Gail says, “ ‘If lightning strikes a rotten tree and it collapses, it’s not the fault of the lightning.’ [Alvah Scarret replies] ‘But what do you call a healthy tree?’ ‘They don’t exist, Alvah,’ said Wynand cheerfully, ‘they don’t exist.’” (**The Fountainhead** 416).

Just like Wynand is skeptical of idealism in men, Hank Rearden and Dagny Taggart of **Atlas Shrugged** are both just as skeptical of ideal societies in that they are the last two robber barons in society to join Galt’s Gulch. They both would rather fight to save the collapsing world around them than to create a better one on their own. Just like Orwell, they would rather improve the imperfect world than recreate it to perfection. When the Strikers invite Dagny to stay, once she’s found the Gulch, and ask for her decision, they persuade her to stay by saying, “There will be one train a day, then one train a week—then the Taggart Bridge will collapse and. . .” / “No; it won’t!” [Dagny replies] (**Atlas Shrugged** 749). When Dagny hints to Hank that Galt’s Gulch exists and asks him if he’ll give up his mills and join it, he replies, “ ‘No!’ The answer was fiercely immediate, but he added, with the first sound of hopelessness in his voice, ‘Not yet’ . . . ‘We’ll fight the looters as long as we can. I don’t know what future is possible to us, but we’ll win or we’ll learn that it’s hopeless. Until we do, we’ll fight for our world. We’re all that’s left of it’” (**Atlas Shrugged** 801-802).

Just like those in Rand’s fiction, the characters most like Orwell--politically skeptical, in his novels, are those in the middle. In **Nineteen Eighty-Four**, Julia is the character most like the author. She’s between Winston’s desire for the success of the Brotherhood and a new regime and O’Brien’s love and support for Big Brother’s present regime. She creates her own happiness with no care or dependence on the political system to do it for her. “Life as she [Julia] saw it was quite simple. You wanted a good time; ‘they’, meaning the Party, wanted to stop you having it; you broke the rules as best you could. She seemed to think it just as natural that ‘they’ should want to rob you of your pleasures as that you should want to avoid being caught” (**Nineteen Eighty-Four** 821).

Although, just like Winston, she hates Big Brother’s anti-utopia, she doesn’t believe that Goldstein’s Brotherhood, if it even exists, will create anything better than the secret life and love that she enjoys with Winston. “She [Julia] hated the Party, and said so in the crudest words, but she made no general criticism of it. Except where it touched upon her own life she had no

interest in Party doctrine. . . She had never heard of the Brotherhood, and refused to believe in its existence. Any kind of organized revolt against the Party, which was bound to be a failure, struck her as stupid. The clever thing was to break the rules and stay alive all the same” (**Nineteen Eighty-Four** 821).

Julia’s character portrays Orwell’s theme that only individual and personal utopias can ever exist—not political or public ones. Despite their ideological oppositions to Orwell in their work, Niccolo Machiavelli, James Burnham, and even Rand’s political mentor, Isabel Paterson, all agree with his idea that utopian societies are dangerous and problematic. “Utopia means Nowhere. [Karl]Marx was a fool; he offered his scheme as a prediction of the future” (**The God of the Machine** 155). Of utopia in politics, James Burnham says, “. . . And this observation applies to rulers and ruled alike—no man is perfectly good or bad” (61). . . Naturally, as is the case with all Machiavellians, his goal is not anything supernatural or utopian; to be the best, a government must be first of all possible” (119). Orwell’s novels follow this line of thinking in that, unlike Rand’s, his novels have no heroes or villains. There is just the ruler and the ruled—both struggling for more power.

According to James Burnham, Machiavellism is concerned with politics, that is, with the struggle for power. . . Throughout history, there have always been two classes of people—a class that rules and a class that is ruled. . . The primary object of every elite, or ruling class, is to maintain its own power and privilege (92, 98). Even within a revolutionary doctrine like Marxism, the same battle for prosperity, health wealth and happiness is waged by the opposing classes. Richard Wright’s short story “Fire and Cloud” of **Uncle Tom’s Children**, shows that either side is capable of winning this power struggle at any given time. Furthermore, both classes want to escape their slavery into happiness and freedom. In the story, when Reverend Taylor gets the food for his starving masses from the oppressive bourgeois, it reads:

A baptism of clean joy swept over Taylor. He kept his eyes on the sea of black and white faces. The song swelled louder and vibrated through him. This is the way! he thought. Gawd aint no lie! He ain no lie! His eyes grew wet with tears, blurring his vision: the sky trembled; the buildings wavered as if about to topple; and the earth shook. . . He mumbled out loud, exultingly: ‘*Freedom belongs t the strong!*’ (**Uncle Tom’s Children** 180).

This euphoric celebration of a political win for the Marxist Left looks exactly like the triumph

for the Randian Right. When the robber baron Strikers overcome the oppressive Looters regime at the end of **Atlas Shrugged**, it reads:

The music of Richard Halley's Fifth Concerto streamed from his keyboard. . . It was a symphony of triumph. . . He [Galt] stood looking, not at the valley below, but at the darkness of the world beyond its walls. Dagny's hand rested on his shoulder, and the wind blew her hair to blend with his. . . But far in the distance, on the edge of the earth, a small flame was waving in the wind, the defiantly stubborn flame of Wyatt's Torch, twisting, being torn and regaining its hold, not to be uprooted or extinguished. It seemed to be calling and waiting for the words John Galt was now to pronounce. 'The road is cleared,' said Galt. 'We are going back to the world.' He raised his hand and over the desolate earth he traced in space the sign of the dollar" (1084).

Orwell claims that it's a cycle of power. Once the enslaved are freed of their chains, they are now the ruling class and have power over their former oppressors. Politics in the form of tyranny is truly slavery for both the rulers and the ruled. On this matter, Orwell says, " 'I perceived at this moment that when the white man turns tyrant it is his own freedom that he destroys.'"17. . .He [Orwell] is saying that a ruling class sacrifices its own freedom in more or less exact proportion to the degree of tyranny with which it exercises its power; in later books he carries this idea to its logical conclusion until in **Nineteen Eighty-Four** absolute power equals absolute loss of freedom to members of the party. The second point, that the ruled dominate the rulers, will be abandoned by Orwell once he begins to understand the nature of totalitarian power."18

Although much more vicious, Paterson's knock on the utopian aspect of Marxism is similar to Orwell's thought about it. Nevertheless, despite his skepticism of "a classless society," Orwell actually experienced a real life version of this during the Spanish Civil War in Barcelona. According to Christopher Hollis, he fell in love with it (104). It was the happiest time of his life. He actually experienced the utopia which he fought for, with the pen and the rifle. It was an actual utopia like those which Rand fictionalized:

I had dropped more or less by chance into the only community of any size in Western Europe where political consciousness and disbelief in capitalism were more normal than their opposites. . . Many of

the normal motives of civilized life—snobbishness, money-grubbing, fear of the boss, etc. —had simply ceased to exist. The ordinary class divisions of society had disappeared to an extent that is almost unthinkable in the money-tainted air of England. . . One had been A community where hope was more normal than apathy and cynicism, and where the word ‘comrade’ stood for comradeship and not, as in most countries, for humbug. One had breathed the air of equality (**Homage to Catalonia** 103-04).

“Then, returning to Barcelona, he found that this society had perished. It may have been the Communists who had in fact destroyed it, but fundamentally it had perished because, as Orwell recognized elsewhere, it was the sort of society that could not of its nature survive” (Hollis 105).

Despite this fact, fiction tends to overlook this nature and shows that it can survive. Jack London’s **The Iron Heel** and Edward Bellamy’s **Looking Backward** both show the same type of Randian utopia on the Left:

We were not mere gloomy conspirators. We toiled hard and suffered greatly, filled the gaps in our ranks and went on, and through all the labor and the play and interplay of life and death we found time to laugh and love. There were artists, scientists, scholars, musicians, and poets among us; and in that hole in the ground culture was higher and finer than in the palaces or wonder-cities of the oligarchs. In truth, many of our comrades toiled at making beautiful those same palaces and wonder-cities (**The Iron Heel** 290).

Although Jeff Walker refers to Edward Bellamy as “Rand on the Left,”¹⁹ some of the utopian ideas of **Looking Backward**, look very similar to her political statements. “Most of the purposes for which governments formerly existed no longer remain to be subserved. . . We have no departments of state or treasury, no excise or revenue services, no taxes or tax collectors. The only function proper to government. . . which still remains, is the judiciary and police system” (**Looking Backward** 155-56). Rand says, “The only purpose of a government is to protect man’s rights. . . The only functions proper to a government are: the police, to protect you from criminals; the army, to protect you from foreign invaders; and the courts, to protect your property and contracts from breach and fraud by others. . .” (**For the New Intellectual** 183).

In essence, Bellamy’s and Rand’s ideal societies look much the same. Bellamy’s utopian

society shares many of Rand's ideas portrayed in Galt's Gulch in **Atlas Shrugged**. While these two utopias have specific differences, both maintain the same ideas of cutting out the expensive middle man and each individual doing double-duty labor—for both self and society:

The goods. . . are all at the great central warehouse of the city, to which they are shipped directly from the producers. . . You avoid one handling of the goods, and eliminate the retailer altogether, with his big profit and the army of clerks it goes to support. . . Under our system of handling the goods, persuading the customer to buy them, cutting them off, and packing them, ten clerks would not do what one does here. The saving must be enormous (**Looking Backward** 94-95).

'It's the most expensive breakfast I'll ever eat, considering the value of the cook's time and of all those others' . . . 'Yes—from one aspect. But from another, it's the cheapest breakfast you'll ever eat—because no part of it has gone to feed the looters who'll make you pay for it through year after year and leave you to starve in the end' (**Atlas Shrugged** 663).

'How is this class of common laborers recruited?' I asked. 'Surely nobody voluntarily enters that.' 'It is the grade to which all new recruits belong for the first three years of their service. It is not until after this period. . . that the young man is allowed to elect a special avocation. These three years of stringent discipline none are exempt from, and very glad our young men are to pass from this severe school into the comparative liberty of the trades' . . . (**Looking Backward** 73).

' . . . The bacon is from the farm of Dwight Sanders—of Sanders Aircraft. The eggs and the butter from Judge Narragansett—of the Superior Court of the State of Illinois' (**Atlas Shrugged** 663).

These two systems are also the same in that they both have theoretical flaws. Rand's idea of judges, doctors and lawyers voluntarily becoming farmers, ditch diggers and plumbers for the society is no less outrageous than Bellamy's idea of all men in all professions and levels of ability in society being paid the same income simply because they are men, " 'His title is his humanity. The basis of his claim [to equal earnings with all men] is the fact that he is a man. . . Do you possibly mean that all have the same share?/ Most assuredly'" (**Looking Backward**

87). Both are pseudo-Marxist utopias.

However, Galt's Gulch and Bellamy's society differ in their respective scopes. Rand's is more practical in that it's just one township in the United States and Bellamy's is half of the world. ". . . the great nations of Europe as well as Australia, Mexico, and parts of South America, are now organized industrially like the United States. . . An international council regulates the mutual intercourse and commerce of the members of the union and their joint policy toward the more backward races, which are gradually being educated up to civilized institutions. . . You must understand that we all look forward to an eventual unification of the world as one nation" (**Looking Backward** 115, 117).

This imperialistic sounding idea is addressed by Niccolo Machiavelli. His famous work **The Prince** shows us that this is an unrealistic idea. ". . . Men live peacefully as long as their old way of life is maintained and there is no change in customs. Anyone who acquires these lands and wishes to hold on to them must keep two things in mind: first, that the family line of the old prince must be wiped out; second, that neither their laws nor their taxes be altered" (9-10). Bellamy's society sounds like a radical change of customs, especially within a hundred year period, around much of the globe which would create war and violence throughout much of the world.

Unlike Rand, Bellamy or London, Orwell doesn't show or claim any political system as a utopia, he simply points out that it lies "somewhere" between Marxism and Fascism. It's different for each individual and each man must find it for himself. Rand says that her heroes are our utopia and we'll find it if we would be more like them. Rand's longtime associate and psychologist, Nathaniel Branden, gives an example of his dealings with the personal problems of a Randian follower. He had a problem with his girlfriend because, "She isn't a Dagny Taggart." The fact that he was happy with her was not as important as the fact that she didn't live up to Rand's notion of what the ideal woman was supposed to be like. When I began by gently pointing out to him that he wasn't John Galt, it didn't make him feel any better—it made him feel worse!"²⁰ Prosperity and well being in the form of economic stability is the true American utopia and this is usually a result of economic stability. Instead of Howard Roark, Rand's utopia of progress, happiness and success is best portrayed through Gail Wynand, a fictional version of our Bill Gates or Donald Trump—images and icons of the American Dream of wealth, success and excess.²¹

While Rand's novels continually show a religiously optimistic view of her idealistic men and societies, perhaps she knew that the entire world would not look like this—only small bits and pieces. Rand's message in this is probably that both men and societies should strive for ideal perfection—common men should strive to be great and uncommon. This is a practical and realistic idea. However, the problematic aspect of her fiction is that her men become Gods and her heroes reach this ultimate perfection. Rand has “swept aside” all traditional religions to create her own. Claudia Pierpont says, “Rand easily converted to atheism and individualism all those whom J.D. Salinger had not already converted to Buddhism. Who is Howard Roark, after all, but Holden Caulfield with a heavy dose of testosterone—the unique young soul of integrity moving detached through a world of phonies” (216-17)? Objectivism's devoted and serious followers really believe that Rand's utopian men and societies truly can and should exist [or we should all be like Howard Roark and John Galt at all costs].

Dictatorships and cults are the only serious forms of man worship which we experience in the real world. This is why Objectivism has always been labeled as a cult. Rand's novels are intellectual wars against the common man and the collectivist state which protects him. While leaning towards the Left and fighting capitalist greed, Orwell's novels are intellectual wars against the lies and absolute power of both Communist and Capitalist rulers. “. . . In Spain, for the first time, I saw newspaper reports which did not bear any relation to the facts. . . I saw great battles reported where there had been no fighting, and complete silence where hundreds of men had been killed. . . This kind of thing is frightening to me, because it often gives me the feeling that the very concept of objective truth is fading out of the world” (**Looking Back on the Spanish War** 257-58).

In the search for truth, George Orwell maintained an ongoing political disagreement with James Burnham, whose work **The Machiavellians: Defenders of Freedom** served as a defense for Machiavelli's **The Prince**. Although Rand's political ideas don't fit into this dispute perfectly, her idealistic heroes, Howard Roark and John Galt, look more like Burnham's powerful “Machiavellians” than Orwell's “common men.” Therefore, generally speaking, Orwell's political ideas side with those of Bellamy's **Looking Backward** and those in Oscar Wilde's **The Soul of Man Under Socialism** while Rand's ideas are a lighter version of **The Prince** and **The Machiavellians**.

According to James Burnham, Machiavelli's principal innovation was that he divorced politics from ethics. He broke sharply from the Aristotelian tradition which dominated political thought. This was dangerous because it released politics from 'control' by ethical conceptions of what is right and good (43-44). Rand would never claim to break from any Aristotelian traditions and would disagree with this separation of ethics from politics: "The answers given by ethics determine how man should treat other men, and this determines the fourth branch of philosophy: politics, which defines the principles of a proper social system" (**Philosophy: Who Needs It** 4).

Despite what Rand claims in the above passage, her heroes treat the proletariat very unethically in terms of politics. Rand's heroes fail to admit a vital idea of politics stated by Machiavelli and Burnham: "The primary object of every elite, or ruling class, is to maintain its own power and privilege (Burnham 253) . . . The Machiavellians are the only ones who have told us the full truth about power. . .the primary object, in practice, of all rulers is to serve their own interest, to maintain their own power and privilege. There are no exceptions. No theory, no promises, no morality, no amount of good will, no religion will restrain power" (Burnham 277).

Orwell admits these ideas and opposes them in Burnham's thought. Orwell claims that power can be won without violence, but never without fraud. The masses must be lied to or given vague dreams of brotherhood because they would not cooperate if they knew they were simply serving the purposes of a minority. . . It is clear that Burnham is fascinated by the spectacle of power, and that his sympathies were with Germany [in WWII] so long as Germany appeared to be winning the war. . . It is curious that in all his talk about the struggle for power, Burnham never stops to ask why people want power. He seems to assume that power hunger. . . is a natural instinct that does not have to be explained, like the desire for food. Burnham. . . is really voicing a secret wish to destroy the old, equalitarian version of Socialism and usher in a hierarchical society where the intellectual can at last get his hands on the whip.²²

Rand proposes a lighter version of this very same thing by hiding the true power lust of her heroes as they sweep away the proletariat. What we see in Rand's novels looks very much like Burnham's and Machiavelli's regimes in the making. While Rand's proposed societies and regimes, in relation to those advocated by Burnham and Machiavelli, are not necessarily bad ones, in her novels, we continually get a problematic sense that Rand wants the proletariat to suffer. When asked to save the society, John Galt proposes, "'Then start by abolishing all income taxes' . . . 'Fire your government employees'" (**Atlas Shrugged** 1022).²³

This desire for the suffering of common men may be because of the bad things that the common masses [in the form of the Bolshevik regime] did to Rand and her family. Although on a much smaller scale, a similar experience and attitude is fictionally represented by H.G. Wells. When the protagonist of his novel fails to capture the knife that is stolen from him, he says, “And I was acutely enraged whenever I thought of my knife. . . It was the first time I glimpsed the simple brute violence that lurks and peeps beneath our civilization. A certain kindly complacency of attitude towards the palpably lower classes was qualified forever” (**The New Machiavelli** 61).

Despite being disguised as a bourgeois, Peter Keating is the “common man” or proletariat in **The Fountainhead**. He is the guinea pig of the novel. He is “swept out of the way” by all the other major characters in the novel. He represents Rand’s idea that the proletariat wants wealth and status without working for it—in essence, common men are looters and parasites. Roark uses him to get the Cortlandt commission. Toohey uses him as a puppet and pawn in his desired regime of universal slavery for all. By proposing marriage to Peter, Dominique uses him to not only to satisfy her desire for self destruction, but she also carries out Toohey’s plan [which is implied in the novel] to take away Peter’s chance of happiness by marrying his true love, Catherine. By offering Peter a lucrative architecture commission for his wife, Wynand uses him to prove his theory, skeptical of Objectivism, that all men are either corrupt successes or honest failures. As punishment for his/their unearned wealth and status, Rand believed that Peter Keating/the proletariat should be used up, for the benefit of the bourgeois, and thrown away—just like Orwell’s character, Boxer. **24**

Rand punishes the common man in her novels, and glorifies the bourgeois. However, it is very interesting to note that most of her heroes, like Howard Roark, Gail Wynand and Hank Rearden are self made men. Each of them emerge from positions of lower class labor to the greatness of upper class status. Since high school, Roark works in the building trades, Wynand shines shoes and steals from lunch counters and Hank Rearden slaves in a steel mill for twelve hours a day. Although she punishes them in her novels, just like Orwell’s **Nineteen Eighty-Four**, the secret to Rand’s great men and societies lay in, or emerge from “the proles”. Although his origin is omitted, John Galt works as a common railroad laborer in **Atlas Shrugged** in order to gain information about Dagny Taggart’s railroad in relation to his strike.

Rand uses the proletariat and portrays it more as a class that we should use, rise above

and emerge from more than one which we should embrace and empower. If for no other reason, the proletariat class is important in Rand's fiction because it represents humble and low beginnings to rise from which make her heroes look even greater. If all of Rand's great heroes are born into bourgeois wealth and privilege and rise to greatness from it, like Dominique Francon, Dagny Taggart and Francisco D'Anconia, none of her heroes would have to progress very far into greatness.

The fictions of Rand and Orwell both support this emergence of the underdog—they simply take on different political positions. Jeffrey Meyers says that Orwell wanted to experience and see things from inside rather than from a theoretical viewpoint. He wanted to fight “on the side of the underdog, always and everywhere,”²⁵ and to agonize over their sufferings; to extinguish, among out-castes, the sense of social class; to feel the pleasurable relief, the anxiety and guilt annihilating euphoria of going to the dogs and knowing you can stand it; to undergo the excitement of a sortie to the lower depths (534-35).

Just like Winston Smith is an underdog who, in the words of Orwell, “can't win but somehow deserves to win,” like Christopher Newman of **The American**, so are Howard Roark and John Galt. The fiction of Rand and Orwell show Orwell's idea that, “. . . When it comes to the pinch, human beings are heroic” (Woodcock 220). Unlike Orwell's and Henry James' characters Christopher Newman and Winston Smith, Rand simply gives her heroes the victory they deserve. This is partially why Rand's fiction sells so well, a key rule of American Pop Culture is--the good guy must win and the bad guy must lose.

Orwell wanted his protagonists to win too. The genius of his thought is that he could flawlessly see untruth, on both his side and his opponents, and expose it without changing loyalties. In his essay, **Looking Back on The Spanish War**, he argues, “. . . So long as some parts of the earth remain unconquered, the liberal tradition can be kept alive (259). . . the working class remains the most reliable enemy of Fascism, simply because the working class stands to gain most by a decent reconstruction of society. Unlike other classes or categories, it can't be permanently bribed (260). . . Shall people like that Italian soldier [the first he met in the war] be allowed to live the decent, fully human life which is now technically achievable, or shan't they? Shall the common man be pushed back into the mud, or shall he not? I myself believe, perhaps on insufficient grounds, that the common man will win his fight sooner or later, but I want it to be sooner and not later. . . That was the real issue of the Spanish war, and of the

present war, and perhaps of other wars yet to come”(266).

Despite the fact that Rand admired his work,²⁶ in his essay, **The Soul of Man Under Socialism**, Oscar Wilde portrays similar ideas in defense of human dignity, which go against much of Rand’s political thought:

The main advantage of Socialism is that it would relieve us from the need of living for others, it will lead to Individualism (1,4). . . Private property has led Individualism astray. It has made gain not growth its aim. The true perfection lies, not in what man has, but in what man is. . . With the abolition of private property. . . we shall have true, beautiful, healthy Individualism (12, 13). . . In the current system, man goes on accumulating property long after he has got more than he wants, or can use, or enjoy. . . in fact, he misses the true pleasure and joy of living. He is also, under existing conditions, very insecure (13) . . . All modes of government are failures. . . The State is to make what is useful. The individual is to make what is beautiful (22, 25). . . Is this Utopian? A map of the world that does not include Utopia is not worth even glancing at, for it leaves out the one country at which Humanity is always landing. And when Humanity lands there, it looks out, and, seeing a better country, sets sail. Progress is the realization of Utopias (28).

While Howard Roark is not far from Oscar Wilde’s ideal man of this essay, like Bellamy’s society, he cannot be content in simply being the best he can be. Unlike the progressive man of Wilde’s essay, the Randian Hero must compare him or herself to others and be the best at all costs. Not being the best, or among the elite class, is a failure for Rand’s ideal men and societies. Unlike the ideal men of Rand, of Wilde’s and Bellamy’s utopias, “. . .Require of each that he shall make the same effort; that is, we demand of him the best service it is in his power to give” (**Looking Backwards** 87).

Generally speaking, the best of the class of common men and women is simply not good enough for Rand. Although she put the masses and common men beneath her and her heroes, even Rand’s villains come from the bourgeois class. Unlike Howard Roark, neither Ellsworth Toohey nor Peter Keating have to work their way through college. The archvillain of **Atlas Shrugged**, James Taggart inherits his wealth and status from his ancestor, Nat Taggart. Many of

her heroes come from the proletariat class, but none of her villains. This is Rand's way of blaming, not classes, but individuals for the downfall of society. Orwell's fiction tends to contrast this trend as he blames political classes for unchecked power instead of individuals. Rand counters Orwell in this belief and thinks that unchecked power only corrupts evil men. Rand would believe that the goodness and integrity of her heroes are the only checks needed to prevent abused power.

While in total disagreement with Rand here, her ideas are valid in theory. All collective political agendas truly represent that of a ruling group or individual. Nevertheless, Orwell's skepticism of man's potential for corruption through power came from much of his personal experience. According to Christopher Hollis, as a result of the political corruption that Orwell witnessed in the Spanish Civil War, many innocent were pitilessly and shamelessly imprisoned and done to death. Two of Orwell's friends, Bob Smillie and George Kopp, who fought with him in the P.O.U.M., died in prison.²⁷ Of Smillie's death, he wrote with restraint:

Smillie's death is not a thing I can easily forgive. Here was this brave and gifted boy, who had thrown up his career at Glasgow University in order to come and fight against Fascism, and who, as I saw for myself, had done his job at the front with faultless courage and willingness; and all they could find to do with him was to fling him into jail and let him die like a neglected animal. . . . To be killed in battle—yes, that is what one expects; but to be flung in jail, not even for any imaginary offence, but simply owing to dull blind spite, and then left to die in solitude—that is a different matter. I fail to see how this kind of thing—and it is not as though Smillie's case were exceptional—brought victory any nearer (**Homage to Catalonia** 217).

He accused the Communists of seizing power in order to prevent a revolution and pleased the French capitalists, at their convenience, and established bourgeois democracy. The Communists had deliberately imposed inequality by force, and treacherous force at that (100-101). "The Communists had gained power and a vast increase of membership partly by appealing to the middle classes against the revolutionaries, but partly also because they were the only people who looked capable of winning the war" (**Homage to Catalonia** 63).

Based on shocking and disheartening experiences like these, Orwell developed the key theme of his fiction--power corrupts.²⁸ Orwell would say that Roark will turn into a Gail Wynand once he has wealth to go with his power.²⁹ Christopher Hollis says, "It was the

Orwellian thesis, right or wrong, that power inevitably corrupts and that revolutions therefore inevitably fail of their purpose. The new masters are necessarily corrupted by their new power. The second revolution would necessarily have failed of its purpose just as the first had failed. It would merely have set up a second vicious circle” (147).

While in total agreement with Orwell’s idea here, that Rand’s heroes are truly no different from her villains, Rand’s point is valid as well—that we need to continually strive for greatness—we need not only heroic men—but also heroic societies—stagnation will corrupt the powerful and enslave the weak. Rand would say that the failure of **Animal Farm** would be due to lack of progress. In discussing her own lack of progress, in **The Fountainhead**, Katie [the victimized niece of the villain, Ellsworth Toohey] says something very similar to the ending lines of **Animal Farm**, “You know it’s funny: it’s the masters who despise the slaves, and the slaves who hate the masters. I don’t know who is which” (**The Fountainhead** 364). “The creatures outside looked from pig to man, and from man to pig, and from pig to man again; but already it was impossible to say which was which” (**Animal Farm** 66). The purpose of Rand’s heroes is to motivate readers to strive for the same perfection. The problematic aspect of Rand’s work is that it never tells us we’ll never reach this perfection.

Orwell would say that we need more political moderation, or more of a blend between good and evil. Just like Orwell’s anti-heroes, Rand’s most realistic and practical heroes, like Gail Wynand, portray this very thing. In his novel **The New Machiavelli**, H.G. Wells portrays an idea in agreement with both Orwell and Rand’s character, Gail Wynand, that ‘power corrupts’ and no man is above corruption, “No Good Will is anything but dishonesty unless it frets and burns and hurts and destroys a man. That lot of yours have nothing but a good will to think they have good will. . . We are but vermin at best. . . and the greatest saint only a worm that has lifted its head for a moment from the dust. . . We are damned. . . But of all the damned things that ever were damned, your damned shirking, temperate, sham-efficient, self satisfied, respectable, make-believe, Fabian-spirited Young Liberal is the utterly damnedest” (279-80).

While Rand would disagree with this and never admit the danger of power, it can be seen in **The Fountainhead** and **Atlas Shrugged**. Power corrupts all of Rand’s heroes—including Howard Roark. Roark will use any means necessary to be the greatest architect in New York, he’ll rape, lie about commissions and bomb buildings. This is the same brutality and violence that Rand preaches against in her non-fiction. Just like Gail Wynand can’t be happy with just his

wealth and productive work, the tycoon Strikers of **Atlas Shrugged** aren't content enough to be productive multi-millionaires in an imperfect society.³⁰ They have to totally eliminate any and all opposition to them and have absolute power over all—just like Napoleon and Big Brother. The problem with most of Rand's heroes is not that they're greedy for more money and power—but they don't admit it. Gail Wynand is Rand's only character who admits that power corrupts and it has both victimized and empowered him to oppress others. Because they both admit their lust for power, Ellsworth Toohey and Gail Wynand are the two most honest characters in **The Fountainhead**. 31

Rand's personal experiences with absolute power were no less important than Orwell's. Rand's family lost their pharmacy to the state because of an evil individual rising to a high political position. Rand would say that men don't *turn* good or evil, but they are always one way or the other. Furthermore, her solution to evil societies would be to keep all the evil people in the lower classes with less power and put all the good people in the ruling class with all the power—as she does in **Atlas Shrugged**. Although this is not a practical solution, within our capitalist system, this theory already works in a non-utopian society such as ours.

Webster's New World Dictionary defines capitalism as, "The economic system in which all or most of the means of production and distribution. . . are privately owned and operated for profit, originally under fully competitive conditions: it has been generally characterized by a tendency toward concentration of wealth, and, in its later phase, by the growth of great corporations, increased governmental control, etc." My definition of capitalism is: A system in which production is rewarded by wealth. Based on my own definition, hard working and virtuous people will be rewarded with prosperity. Lazy and parasitical people of vice will be punished with poverty. However, the genius of the capitalist system is that everyone is given a choice about which of these two he or she wants and in America, these choices exist on the low, middle and high levels. Rand says we need more checks and balances on the groups of 'evil' individuals and Orwell says that we need more checks and balances on the 'evil' systems of absolute power. Rand faults misuse of the intellectual mind of man and Orwell faults man's underestimation of human nature. Both are equally valid claims.

In his ideas about human nature, Orwell's would say that all men, good or bad, have a savagery in them that must be controlled. Works of fiction like Joseph Conrad's **The Heart of Darkness** and William Golding's **Lord of the Flies**, portray this same idea. In Conrad's novella,

Kurtz, the most cultured man that Europe can create, is turned into a savage tribal murderer when his civilized environment is removed. On the remote island of Golding's masterpiece, hunting pigs for survival eventually becomes the savage fun of hunting and killing humans for sport. If power isn't properly checked through governmental politics, even the best leaders will turn into Napoleon or Big Brother. We can see real life evidence of this in how the well intentioned Communist theories of Marx turned into the brutal dictatorships of Lenin and Stalin. Orwell glorifies the physical labor of the proletariat which empowers the political leaders of society. Rand believes that intellectual labor is better and more important than physical labor. Rand's fiction shows what we want and Orwell's shows what we don't want. Because what we don't want [dictatorship] is easier to see than what we want [happiness and prosperity for all] Orwell's ideas, as represented in his fiction, look more practical than Rand's.

The ideas of Rand are not really any more right or wrong than Orwell's, because ultimately, all political regimes are the product of a man's mind [or a group of men's minds]. Rand places man's mind as the highest force in the universe—religion aside—it may or may not be. However, unlike Rand's, Orwell's fiction shows us anti-utopias which we have seen in the course of history—like Nazi Germany and Communist Russia. Unlike Orwell's work, a utopian society like Rand's has never existed [for any considerable length of time]. However, she would say that the great minds and innovations of capitalist heroes such as Lee Iacocca, Bill Gates and Ted Turner are mainly responsible for the greatest and most-utopian-looking political society in the world—America. While the America of Rand's novels was one of wealth, success and excess, it differed from the democratic Socialist government and culture of moderation in both life and politics in Orwell's England. **32**

According to Christopher Hitchens, "Orwell was suspicious of its [America's] commercial and mercenary culture, somewhat resentful of its imperial ambitions, and somewhat fastidious about its sheer scare and vulgarity. America, in other words is the grand exception to Orwell's prescience about the century in which he lived" (104). Although Orwell never visited America, his British colleague and contemporary, who much of his work is compared to, E.M. Forster, did. Of America, Forster said, You can find in it what you're looking for, it will probably be interesting and is sure to be large. The individuals were not to be representative—I never could get on with representative individuals—but people who existed on their own account and with whom it might therefore be possible to be friends—that is the America I looked for and

found. . . My general impression was of good temper and goodwill and hopefulness (**Two Cheers for Democracy** 332, 335). This is the same progressive, excessive and optimistic America as the “land of opportunity for the taking” in **The Fountainhead**. However, where Forster sees it positively, Orwell may have seen the same negatively—depending on what he would have been seeking.

In relation to America, or any other society, Forster agreed with Orwell’s key messages in **Nineteen Eighty Four**:

He [Orwell] found much to discomfort him in this world and desired to transmit it, and **Nineteen Eighty Four** he extended discomfort into agony. There is not a monster in that hateful apocalypse which does not exist in embryo today. Behind the United Nations lurks Oceania, one of his three world states. Behind Stalin lurks Big Brother, which seems appropriate, but Big Brother also lurks behind Churchill, Truman, Gandhi, and any leader whom propaganda utilizes or invents. Behind the North Koreans, who are so wicked, and the South Koreans, who are such heroes, lurk the wicked South Koreans and the heroic North Koreans, into which, at a turn of the kaleidoscope, they may be transformed. Orwell spent his life in foreseeing transformations and in stamping upon embryos. His strength went that way (**Two Cheers for Democracy** 61).

And he also points out a relative section of one of Orwell’s essays:

If a man cannot enjoy the return of spring, why should he be happy in a Labor-saving Utopia? . . . By retaining one’s childhood love of such things as trees, fishes, butterflies and toads, one makes a peaceful and decent future a little more probable. By preaching the doctrine that nothing is to be admired except steel and concrete, one merely makes it a little surer that human beings will have no outlet for their surplus energy except in hatred and hero worship (**Shooting an Elephant** 165).

Forster, like the ideas of essays by Orwell and Oscar Wilde, believed that true happiness for man was within and man had only to be his true self to find it. **The Fountainhead** shows true happiness for man coming in his achievements outside of himself—like building the tallest skyscraper in New York, standing above nature and conquering it. Worshipping the elite hero for his abilities is everything to Rand and her followers—nothing to Orwell, Forster, Wilde and

Bellamy.

Despite the fact that Forster's sentiments and ideas of **Two Cheers for Democracy** echo those of Orwell and Oscar Wilde, his anti-utopian **The Machine Stops** is a work which is ideologically similar to Ayn Rand's fiction. Just like **Nineteen Eighty-Four**, Forster's work attacks the idea of man's industrialization totally conquering nature both inside and outside of the individual spirit. Like Big Brother, The Machine controlled every aspect of life, " 'The Machine,' they exclaimed, 'feeds us and clothes us and houses us; through it we speak to one another, through it we see one another, in it we have our being. The Machine is the friend of ideas and the enemy of superstition: the Machine is omnipotent, eternal, blessed is the Machine'"(**The Machine Stops** 67).

However, just like the utopias that emerge from anti-utopias in Rand's **Anthem**, **The Fountainhead** and **Atlas Shrugged**, Forster's novella gives this same idea, contrary to Orwell, that the new order will be better, and different from the old:

'But, Kuno, is it true? Are there still men on the surface of the earth? Is this—this tunnel, this poisoned darkness—really not the end?'

He replied: 'I have seen them, spoken to them, loved them. They are hiding in the mist and the ferns until our civilization stops. Today they are the Homeless—Tomorrow. . .'

'Oh, tomorrow—some fool will start the Machine again, tomorrow.'

'Never,' said Kuno, 'never. Humanity has learnt its lesson' (**The Machine Stops** 84-85).

James Burnham, like Orwell, would be skeptical of this idea because he says, A revolutionary movement ordinarily claims that it's goal is to eliminate all the privileges of birth, but once in power, the aristocratic tendency reasserts itself, and a new ruling group crystallizes out from the revolution (118).

In this same vein, Orwell, unlike Rand, would point to the intellectual ideas of Friedrich Nietzsche and show how, in the bourgeois political class heroics, it turned into Hitler's Nazism and Mussolini's Fascism—the same dictatorships as Communism approached from a different angle. Orwell would say the robber barons of America are a few laws away from turning into Hitler and Mussolini. Rand would say that our great prosperity cannot exist without robber barons. The ideas of Rand and Orwell, which both developed from enlightening personal

experiences with political regimes, were equally important and valuable in their opposition and what they contributed to both morality and ethics in Communist, Socialist and Capitalist political theories. The two mainly oppose one another on their ideas about the best political system.

Despite the fact that Rand says that productive work is the most important aspect in the lives of her great and rational men, she ultimately glorifies bourgeois labor. Or, she puts intellectual labor above physical labor. She uses proletariat labor as a stepping stone to her glorified positions of architect [Roark], newspaper mogul [Wynand] and metal tycoon [Rearden]. While Orwell doesn't glorify the proletariat either and mainly shows and sympathizes with their plight, with the exception of Roark's carpenter friend, Mike Donnigan, and maybe Eddie Willers of **Atlas Shrugged**, Rand shows us no common laborers as heroes.

As a popular and interesting writer of the Victorian literary period, Harriet Martineau glorified the proletariat worker while also taking a similar political stance to Ayn Rand. According to Jeff Walker, "There are many parallels between the lives of Ayn Rand and Englishwoman Harriet Martineau. Martineau and Rand were both fiction propagandizers for laissez faire. . . In her book, **Illustrations of Political Economy**, she justified a celebration for the entrepreneur and advocated a clearing away of governmental controls. In her work, looters reduce her society to primitivism, but principled men espousing laissez faire arise to guide that society back to prosperity" (271).³³ ". . . is when men begin to fancy their interests opposed to each other,--which the interests of men in society can never be. Fair competition leads to the improvement of the state of all" (**Illustrations of Political Economy** 79). This looks very similar to, "that there is no conflict of interests among men, neither in business nor in trade nor in their most personal desires. . . There is no conflict, and no call for sacrifice, and no man is a threat to the aims of another—if men understand that . . . the unearned cannot be had, that the undeserved cannot be given" (**Atlas Shrugged** 742).

Other key political points made in **Illustrations of Political Economy** are, "I rather think even these thefts must arise from revenge more than from a desire for gain; for there is or ought to be no want at present through the whole extent of the fishery. . . but in such a season as this, there can be no absolute distress for any who are willing to work (78). . . Savages care for little beyond supplying the pressing wants of the moment. . . They make no savings; they have no capital; and their children die off as fast as poverty and disease can drive them out of the world. There is no growth of either capital or population among savages (82). . . these very

quarrelers go on marrying early, and raising large families—that is, they bring offspring into the world while they are providing as fast as possible for their future starvation (81).

While Martineau praises a good system and faults bad individuals, like Rand, Howard Roark subtly shows that hard work, along with some political pull, is an unbeatable combination to get to the top of any profession. In becoming New York's greatest architect, Howard Roark follows many of the key rules given in Niccolo Machiavelli's **The Prince**. In contrast to Martineau's and Rand's ideas, Orwell's novels don't simply blame politicians—but political systems. **Animal Farm** portrays both good and evil politicians. Major is a good politician—or at least his intentions are good. Rand's novels give the idea that the proletariat uses political pull to gain power and unearned wealth while the great men use only ability and hard work. Howard Roark is a great man of ability and a hard worker. However, just like Ellsworth Toohey, he also uses politics to gain wealth and power.

Orwell interprets an argument with similar ideas to H.G. Wells' **The New Machiavellians**, “Machiavelli and his followers taught that in politics decency simply does not exist, and, by doing so, [James] Burnham claims, made it possible to conduct political affairs more intelligently and less oppressively”³⁴ Roark follows this example by using his friendship with Peter Keating to gain the commission of Cortlandt. In **The Fountainhead**, Roark says to Peter, “I'll design Cortlandt. You'll put your name on it” (581). . . “We're partners now. You have your share to do. It's a legitimate share. This is my idea of cooperation, by the way. You'll handle people. I'll do the building. We'll each do the job we know best, as honestly as we can” (582). Here, Roark follows Machiavelli's idea that to maintain the state [or become New York's greatest architect, in Roark's case] the prince must often act against his faith, against charity, against humanity, and against religion. He should not depart from the good if it's possible to do so, but he should know how to enter into evil when forced by necessity (**The Prince** 61).

The problem here is not that Roark is a politician, but Rand tries to cloud his use of politics. Unlike the traditions of Burnham and Machiavelli, Roark is not admittedly a politician, or “pull peddler” as Rand would call it. Rand tries to make out her villains to be the best politicians and Toohey is the best politician in the novel. However, Roark is a better politician than Gail Wynand. Gail is not a good politician because he uses his money as an exchange for his favors—not friendship nor manipulation of people. No evidence in the novel is given that he

used any friendship to earn any of his wealth and power. Money and power are the only differences between Roark and Wynand—not integrity. In the Machiavellian tradition, “He [Hiero of Syracuse] received nothing from Fortune but the opportunity [to become ruler of Syracuse]” (**The Prince** 23). As Capitalist opportunist of the novel, money is Wynand’s power.

In Machiavelli’s analysis of the failures of King Louis of France,³⁵ he makes another rule that Roark strictly follows—A good politician will keep his friends weaker than him and on his side. Roark does this by raping Dominique, he lets her know that he’s the ruler and she’s the ruled. However, she’s still his friend and a potential ally, or ace in the hole, whenever he needs one. He continues to dishonestly do Peter’s architectural jobs for him. This makes Peter dependent on him as an ally and leads up to his opportunity to get the Cortlandt commission—which public favor would not allow him to get by honest means. If he never did Peter’s work for him, Peter would not depend on him. Although Wynand is not politically weaker than Roark, his resistance of Wynand’s corrupt offer allows their friendship to go on. If Roark was corrupted, they would have never seen each other again.³⁶

This leads to Gail’s help for Roark, by using his newspaper to defend Roark publicly when he’s jailed for dynamiting Cortlandt—which he doesn’t ask for, but doesn’t refuse either. Thus, Gail is on Roark’s side, and their friendship must at least mean a political truce between them. When Wynand fails to change public opinion with his paper, the truce is over and Gail is neither friend nor enemy to Roark. Wynand, like Dominique, always wanted a Howard Roark to succeed in the world, he just didn’t believe that it was possible. Gail has always been on Roark’s side, just like Dominique, their corruptions and oppositions to him are tests more than anything else. Although Howard Roark passes both these tests with flying colors, he is a politician just like Toohey. He simply has more hard work and ability to go along with his political connections than Toohey. This disguises Roark’s political prowess and the fact that he’s ultimately fighting for power just like Toohey.

Just like England and America differ, socially and culturally, so do the political ideologies of Ayn Rand and George Orwell. Whether we choose ideological sides with Rand or Orwell or not, the ideas of each are important to political theory in relation to the spirit of the individual. If any real heroes exist in the most popular fictions of these two authors, they are those most like George Orwell—the skeptical. Although Rand doesn’t portray her skeptical [between Good and Evil] characters as heroes, they remain the most intriguing and interesting of

her canon. While the heroic in our soul can take the form of either the common proletariat or bourgeois elite, we have as much to learn from Ayn Rand's utopias as we do from George Orwell's anti-utopias. Despite their political differences, each writer passionately took a side, fought for it and expressed his or her beliefs and searched for the individual man's happiness and well being. Furthermore, both tackled the controversial topic of politics that often isn't, but needs to be addressed. Both saw politics as a potential obstacle to the blossoming of the individual spirit—and both wanted to remove it. Nevertheless, whether we are for industrial Capitalist wealth or the prosperous “soul of man under Socialism,” man is best provided the opportunity to find himself and his own personal utopia within a society of political moderation.

CHAPTER 4

FRIEDRICH NIETZSCHE'S SUPERMAN IN AYN RAND'S HEROES *THE FOUNTAINHEAD'S TRUE HERO: GAIL WYNAND-- THE FOUNTAINHEAD'S TRUE VILLAIN: DOMINIQUE FRANCON*

In quoting Lord Acton, George Orwell says that power corrupts and too much power in the hands of either the proletariat or bourgeois is dangerous. Both Friedrich Nietzsche and Orwell focused on this dark side of man's nature. Nietzsche and Rand both show and state that the elites will ultimately take power. Rand follows the Nietzschean idea of eternal return as well—Roark is the next Henry Cameron. Equality7-2521 of **Anthem** is a continuation of the great secret society of individual men killed in battle. Orwell says that man can't help himself—power corrupts. Nietzsche says, so what--let the strong rule and crush the weak. Rand says a milder version of what Nietzsche says—let the strong overcome the weak and leave them to suffer.

Rand's fiction gives us the idea that the masses should worship and subordinate themselves to her Superman heroes. Just like Nietzsche's Zarathustra, Rand's great men majestically take the place of God. Although the same Nietzschean representations exist in both **We the Living** and **The Fountainhead**, unlike the popular 1943 work, **We the Living** is not an American novel. The Nietzschean idea of the Superman rising up above the petty masses remained a constant of all Ayn Rand's novels. The problem with this is not the thing in itself, because Nietzschean heroes are an important part of both popular and intellectual American culture. The problem is that Rand clouds and disguises the fact that she turned the Europeanized Nietzscheanism of ruling the masses in **We the Living** into **The Fountainhead's** American Nietzsche-lite idea of the elites competing for the most wealth, power and excess along with control of the minds of the masses.¹

Of Rand's early exposure to and education from Nietzschean philosophy, Barbara Branden (1986) cites, "It [**Thus Spake Zarathustra**] was an exciting first discovery of a spiritual ally. This writer felt as she did about man. He saw and wanted the heroic in man and thought that man should exist for his own happiness and selfish motives. He defended individualism and despised altruism. . . [quoting Rand] 'The first book I bought myself in America was an English version of **Thus Spoke Zarathustra**, and I understood all my favorite sections'. . . she was aware that Nietzsche was 'equivocal about the issue of power. I assumed he

really meant spiritual power, the conquest of nature, not power over others. . . I took it metaphorically. I believed that the superior man could not be bothered enslaving others, that slavery is immoral, that to enslave his inferiors is an unworthy occupation for the heroic man'. . . When she read further in Nietzsche, and discovered, in **The Birth of Tragedy**, that he was 'statedly anti-reason,' her early enthusiasm began to abate. He said that reason is an inferior faculty, that drunken-orgy emotions were superior. That finished him as a spiritual ally" (45).

Despite the claims of both Rand and her critics, she never breaks from Nietzsche's idea of the weak being subordinated to the strong in her fiction. According to Whittaker Chambers, Rand is more heavily indebted to Nietzsche than Aristotle (595). Gene Bell-Villada claims that, "The Uberfrau [Rand] never owned up to her debt to Nietzsche, and she publicly repudiated his anti-rationalist and relativist tendencies" (236). Robert Sheaffer confirms this point by saying, "Nietzsche is the one philosopher whose style and tone almost perfectly match Rand's. Both bitterly denounce altruism, pity, and Christianity. Both ceaselessly emphasize self-reliance, and express scorn for those who fail to meet their high standards. . . More than seventy-five years before Rand shocked a generation by proclaiming selfishness a virtue, Nietzsche's Zarathustra praised 'glorified selfishness, the sound, healthy selfishness, that issues from a mighty soul' (**Thus Spoke Zarathustra**, Bk.III, chap.54, pg.208). Indeed, Nietzsche even poses the question 'Who is Zarathustra?' (Book. IV, sec.11) in virtually the same manner as does Rand in **Atlas Shrugged**: 'Who is John Galt?' He is the Overman, the son of Zarathustra" (313-14).

Although Nietzsche was more blunt than Rand about advocating the use of brute power, the two philosophers were more similar than they were different. Ronald Merrill claims that, "He [Nietzsche] like Rand, knew what he was against—socialism and statism—far better than he knew what he was for" (24). According to Jeff Walker, "Among the elements of Nietzsche's thought which might particularly have struck her [Rand] were his egoism and anti-altruism, his hostility to Christianity and contrasting admiration for the Jews, his anti-statism, individualism and his dislike of Kant" (275). Both writers denounced pity. "Christianity is called the religion of pity. . . pity is practical nihilism. To say it again, this depressive and contagious instinct thwarts those instincts bent on preserving and enhancing the value of life: both as a multiplier of misery and as a conservator of everything miserable it is one of the chief instruments for the advancement of decadence—pity persuades to nothingness" (**The Anti-Christ** 118)!

Rand shows this same denunciation of pity in her fiction. In **Atlas Shrugged**, when Hank

Rearden's mother is telling him to go easy on his brother when Hank threatens to throw him out of his house, his mother says:

'But he's your brother. . . Doesn't that mean anything to you?'
'No'. . .
'You can't be hard on a man who needs you, it will prey on your conscience for the rest of your life.'
'It won't.'
'You've got to have some pity.'
'I haven't' (**Atlas Shrugged** 440).

Of Christianity, Nietzsche says, "What is more harmful than any vice? –Active sympathy for the ill-constituted and weak—Christianity. . . Christianity has taken the side of everything weak, base, ill-constituted, it has made an ideal out of opposition to the preservative instincts of strong life; it has depraved the reason even of the intellectually strongest natures by teaching men to feel the supreme values of intellectually as sinful, as misleading, as temptations" (**The Anti-Christ** 116-17). Rand says, "According to the Christian mythology, he [Jesus] died on the cross not for his own sins but for the sins of the nonideal people. . . a man of perfect virtue was sacrificed for men who are vicious and who are expected or supposed to accept that sacrifice. If I were a Christian, nothing could make me more indignant than that: the notion of sacrificing the ideal to the nonideal, or virtue to vice. And it is in the name of that symbol that men are asked to sacrifice themselves for their inferiors."²

Of altruism, Nietzsche says that "An altruistic morality, a morality under which egoism languishes—is under all circumstances a bad sign. . . The best are lacking when egoism begins to be lacking. . . Man is finished when he becomes altruistic" (**Twilight of the Idols** 87). What Rand says about it sounds very similar, "Altruism declares that any action taken for the benefit of others is good, and any action taken for one's own benefit is evil" (**The Virtue of Selfishness** Introduction viii). . . "Altruism holds death as its ultimate goal and standard of value—and it is logical that renunciation, resignation, self-denial, and every other form of suffering, including self-destruction, are the virtues it advocates" (**The Virtue of Selfishness** 34).

Just as Rand maintains similar ideas to Nietzsche in her work regarding concepts, her attempts at disguising his types of hero in her fiction are futile. "Furthermore, Randian Man, in his ruling caste, has to be held 'heroic' in order not to be Beastly" (Chambers 595). According to Stephen Cox (1998), Rand's 'Nietzschean' conceptions about power and freedom were clearly related to her literary desire for intense characterizations. Thinking of the character that Howard

Roark needed to be, she wrote in 1936: ‘He has a tremendous, unshatterable conviction that he can and will force men to accept him, not beg and cheat them into it. He will take the place he wants, not receive it from others.’³

In Rand’s novel, when Roark’s architecture job with John Erik Snyte was, “. . . less than he wanted and more than he could expect” (**The Fountainhead** 104). . . and “The employees had been trained not to intrude on the occasions when Snyte brought a client into the drafting room” (126). . . Roark intrudes on the client’s drawing and takes his rightful place to having the job of John Erik Snyte’s client all to himself. . . “He seized the sketch, his hand flashed forward and a pencil ripped across the drawing. . . Snyte felt free to whirl on Roark and scream: ‘You’re fired, God damn you! Get out of here! You’re fired!’”(127). This is a beastly move of Nietzschean Dionysian passion by Rand’s hero. Despite subtly brutish Nietzschean tradition characterizations like this in the work, Ronald E. Merrill argues that **The Fountainhead** is Ayn Rand’s explicit and final renunciation of the morality of Friedrich Nietzsche (47). . . Roark’s courtroom speech at the novel’s climax decisively cuts her ties with Friedrich Nietzsche (55). M. Stanton Evans claims, “The resemblances to Nietzsche are unmistakable, but they end precisely where the will to power begins”(1060).

Ultimately, Rand never breaks with Nietzsche and the strong show their power over the weak all throughout her fiction. Rand only pretends to break with Nietzsche. She simply waters it down for popular American readers. Jeff Walker argues, “Rand is what a European Nietzschean looks like after transplantation to late 1920s America. . .Rand wanted to re-vitalize business values by injecting their seemingly dull Apollonian nature with a shot of Dionysian Nietzsche” (277). Rand’s Nietzscheanism goes from her hero, Kira of **We The Living**, saying:

‘Can you sacrifice the few? When those few are the best? Deny the best its right to the top—and you have no best left. What are your masses but millions of dull, shriveled, stagnant souls that have no thoughts of their own, no dreams of their own, no will of their own, who eat and sleep and chew helplessly the words others put into their brains? And for those you would sacrifice the few who know life, who are life? I loathe your ideals because I know no worse injustice than the giving of the undeserved. Because men are not equal in ability and one can’t treat them as if they were. And because I loathe most of them’ (**We The Living** 70-71).

To Hank Rearden's reply to his brother, Phillip, when he asks for a job, in **Atlas Shrugged**:

'Don't try to buy me off with cash! I want a job!'
'Pull yourself together, you poor louse. Do you
hear what you are saying?' . . .
'I only—'
'To buy you off? Why should I try to buy you off—
instead of kicking you out, as I should have, years ago?' . . .
'Phillip. . . get out of here. . . And don't ever try to
enter these mills again, because there will be orders
at every gate to throw you out, if you try it'
(**Atlas Shrugged** 863-865).

Nietzsche would say that Hank's feeling of power over his brother and Kira's hatred of the mediocrity of the common masses are what make them happy. According to Nietzsche, "The first effect of happiness is the feeling of power: this wants to express itself, either to us ourselves, or to other men, or to ideas or imaginary beings. The most common modes of expression are: to bestow, to mock, to destroy—all three out of a common basic drive."⁴

In all of Rand's novels, from **Anthem** to **Atlas Shrugged**, her heroes and villains are all fighting for the same Nietzschean goal, control over the minds of the weak masses. "Rand also uses Toohey to subtly celebrate Nietzsche in her finished novel. Nietzsche becomes a persistent target of Toohey's derision. . . Through Toohey's character, Rand presents the thesis 'that only mental control over others is true control.' Toohey seeks a spiritual communism, in which each individual is spiritually subordinated 'to the mass in every way conceivable.'" (Sciabarra 110). Just like Wynand, Roark succeeds in just the opposite side of the same goal—the opinion of the masses is subordinated to elite and strong minded individuals such as Roark. Both Howard Roark and the Strikers control the minds of the masses by showing them both what they want, Roark's architecture and a laissez faire Capitalist state, and what they don't want, total anarchy and classical architecture of the past.

Jeff Walker says, that Rand's torchbearers try to minimize Nietzsche's important influence on her. In calling Rand a Nietzschean, she didn't necessarily share all of his views. However, she was a 'vulgar Nietzschean'. . . The theme of the disgustingness of non-heroic average humanity would be a constant in all Rand's novels. . . Objectivism absorbed Nietzsche, vulgarized or otherwise, at its core (275-77). Chris Sciabarra also supports this point by claiming, "[In Rand's] portrayal of Howard Roark, the influence of Nietzsche can still be

detected” (108). Robert Sheaffer agrees by stating, “The specter of Nietzsche has long hovered uninvited over the Randian canon, and from time to time an exorcism is attempted. However, the Nietzsche-Rand connection is much too powerful to deny” (313).

All throughout Rand’s fiction, we see examples of the *Übermensch* and her idea of selfish happiness for the individual going beyond both Christian and social notions of good and evil. In **The Fountainhead** and **Atlas Shrugged**, in relation to Nietzsche’s *Übermensch*, all of Rand’s major characters fall into one of three categories. These are: Supermen, subordinate supporters of the Superman and underachieving villains or “second handers” who are truly among Rand’s common masses who can create nothing and want to destroy the Superman and take over his position of wealth and power without earning it. H.L. Mencken cites Nietzsche in referring to them as three different castes:

In every healthy society there are three broad classes. . . .
The first class comprises those who are obviously superior to the mass intellectually; the second includes those whose eminence is chiefly muscular, and the third is made up of the mediocre. . . . To this highest caste belongs the privilege of representing beauty, happiness and goodness on earth. . . . The second caste includes the guardians and keepers of order and security—the warriors, the nobles, the king. . . . They execute the mandates of the first caste, relieving the latter of all that is coarse and menial in the work of the ruling. . . . At the bottom are the workers—the men of handicraft, trade, agriculture and the greater part of art and science. . . . In them the mastery of one thing—specialism—is an instinct.⁵

As members of the second caste, Dominique of **The Fountainhead** and Eddie Willers of **Atlas Shrugged** both carry out the mandates of the Supermen heroes, Roark and Dagny Taggart.

Dominique, in support of Roark, quits her writing job at **The Banner** and never aspires towards individual greatness for herself.⁶ Her sole purpose for existence is to be supportive of the Superman and subordinate herself to him and sacrifice her own aspirations of greatness to make way for the *Übermenschen*. In **Atlas Shrugged**, Eddie Willers is the assistant to Dagny Taggart- the *Überfrau* heroine of the novel. Eddie loves Dagny and is both loyal to her and supportive of her leadership in running the Taggart Transcontinental Railroad. Near the end of the novel, after Dagny and the other Supermen have gone on strike to “Galt’s Gulch” and the

world is in chaos, Eddie is on one of Dagny's trains. When it breaks down in the Arizona desert as a result of no competent minds or Supermen to guide and lead the world, Eddie struggles to try to get the train running. Even after the passengers of the train are rescued by a wagon train, Eddie is so loyal to Dagny and eager for his Uberfrau to succeed that he doesn't let it go. He continues to stay alone with the stranded train in order to try to get it running.⁷

The key Nietzschean idea here is that, when Dagny and the other Supermen return to the world after the strike, they may come rescue Eddie and they may not. The fact that Rand leaves this part of the novel unfinished implies that this subordinate supporter of the Superman is dependent on them. Eddie's fate is in the hands of the Ubermensch. This example is Rand's way of showing that the Supermen who move the world are the difference between civilization and chaos, productive wealth and parasitical looting, life and death.

In **Atlas Shrugged**, the elite and mediocre classes are divided into groups of good and evil. The productive good are the 'strikers' and the parasitical evil are the 'looters.' **Atlas Shrugged** is the most Nietzschean work of her canon. The idea here is that without the minds and productive virtues of these Nietzschean Supermen, the world cannot run properly. These Supermen are so strong, productive and virtuous that, like the mythical Atlas, they carry the burdens of both themselves and all of us on their shoulders. Of his heroes, which are popularized and applied to real life by Rand, Nietzsche says, "They consider the hard task a privilege, to play with vices which overwhelm others a recreation" (**The Anti Christ** 178).

Selfish pleasure in both work and play is the name of the game for Rand's superheroes. According to Nietzsche, "Sensual pleasure, lust for power, selfishness: these three have hitherto been cursed the most and held in the worst and most unjust repute—these three will I weigh well and humanly" (**Thus Spoke Zarathustra** Part III, 206). Also in the Nietzschean tradition, the morality of Rand's heroes goes beyond good and evil. However, in terms of moral character, the heroes are no more righteous than the villains. Ellsworth Toohey, the archvillain of **The Fountainhead**, although he wants to destroy individuality in men and take over **The Banner**, he works for his living and never steals, sleeps with married women or uses drugs, etc. Howard Roark is less of a gentleman than Toohey as he brutishly takes whatever he wants by force instead of work—whether it's a drawing or Dominique, as single Miss Francon, or sleeping with her as either Mrs. Keating or Mrs. Wynand. Where Toohey uses cunning, backstabbing and manipulation, Roark uses brute force.

Rand's heroes are not good, they just represent a different and/or lesser form of evil than her villains. Rand's heroes would suit Nietzsche just fine. "Man is evil. . . For evil is man's best strength. Man must grow better and more evil—thus do I teach. The most evil is necessary for the Superman's best" (**Thus Spoke Zarathustra** Part IV, 299). As long as they are members of her elite group of heroes, they are not immoral in having meaningful extramarital affairs and showing them off publicly—the world is theirs and they are free to do anything they wish. The problematic aspect of this is not that the morality of these elite heroes go beyond social and Christian notions of good and evil.

The problem is that Rand makes the immoral acts of the elite appear different from those of the lower classes—and they're not. The differences between her heroes and villains in play are non-existent. The heroine, Dagny, sleeps with a married man, Hank Rearden, just like the villain, James Taggart, sleeps with Hank's wife, Lillian. The only difference between the heroes and villains in work is that the heroes use more hard work and less politics in order to gain power. **Atlas Shrugged** portrays the unrealistic idea that no good and virtuous tycoons have any "Friends in Washington" while the parasitical villains rely solely on this form of political profit.⁸

In **Atlas Shrugged**, Dagny has an affair with another Superman character, Hank Rearden. Hank is a married man. At a ball, when Hank's wife, Lillian, catches Dagny with a bracelet made of her husband's signature metal, she asks Dagny to give it to her. Dagny blatantly refuses to turn over the bracelet made of the tycoon's metal. Hank offers his wife anything she wants, alimony, divorce, etc, except a stoppage of his extramarital affair with Dagny. When the affair, adulterous by Christian and social notions of morality, is exposed on a public talk show, Dagny proudly boasts about this form of her selfish happiness to the world. Within the morals of her characters that are labeled as good, Rand shows that morals should go beyond both Christian and social standards of good and evil, whenever necessary, to make us happy.⁹

Rand transforms the roles of power in the same way in both novels. Rand gives the true Supermen masks of subordination for two-thirds of both novels. It is no coincidence that these transformations come at similar points in both works. In the first two-thirds of Rand's two major novels, the class of *Übermensch* appears to have little or no power. Rand gives them masks of subordination [similar to Nietzsche's mask in **Thus Spoke Zarathustra**] to the lower classes of men and women.¹⁰ On levels of class and race, for both philosophers, power continually went back and forth in order to create or expose strong or weak individuals or groups. In contrast, the

purpose of Nietzsche's power struggles was to create more greatness in man. Rand's purpose was to uncover the greatness that already existed in man.¹¹

In **Atlas Shrugged** Hank Rearden is a Superman who is controlled by his family. His family makes him feel guilty about his individual wealth and power. Despite the fact that Hank supports them all with this wealth, he subordinates himself to their every beck and call because of the guilt they make him feel. However, once he begins a love affair with Dagny Taggart, Rearden's role becomes transformed and he no longer submits to his family's power. He exerts his powers over them. In one scene, when Phillip, Hank's brother, is speaking out against wealthy tycoons, Hank transforms from subordinate Superman to superior Superman when he threatens to throw his brother out of the house if he continues this kind of talk. He shows that he has power over his brother's words. Phillip says, "They [Rand's heroes] pursue a ruthless, grasping, grabbing, antisocial policy, based on nothing but plain selfish greed. . . and I think it's contemptible. . . Hank replies, "Phillip. . . say any of that again and you will find yourself out in the street, right now, with the suit you've got on your back with whatever change you've got in your pocket and with nothing else" (**Atlas Shrugged** 439-40).¹²

These are tactics by Rand to delay and hide the true and stark depictions of the Superman. In **The Fountainhead**, Wynand's character appears about halfway through the novel. Although Roark has the same *Urbemensch* characteristics as Wynand [egotism, atheism, selfishness and ultra morality], Wynand's blatant Nietzscheanism waters down the same aspects in Roark. Nevertheless, Rand disguises the Superman in Roark by comparing him to the most Nietzschean character in her canon – Gail Wynand. Gail Wynand, like Roark, is a self made man who earns his Superman status by giving the masses what they want. He runs his famous newspaper, **The Banner** rigidly and rules strongly over his subordinates.

Although Roark doesn't subordinate others to himself like the bossy Wynand, Dominique voluntarily sacrifices herself to him. It doesn't make Roark any less of a Superman simply because others choose to sacrifice themselves to him. Furthermore, Wynand is not a parasitical "second hander." He is a hard working self-made man with many of Roark's same qualities. Although an opportunist, he has worked hard and honestly for his wealth and power. Rand also gives Roark a god-like description at the novel's end, "The line of the ocean cut the sky. The ocean mounted as the city descended. She passed the spires of churches. She passed the crowns of courthouses. She rose above the pinnacles of bank buildings. Then there remained only the

ocean, the sky and the figure of Howard Roark” (**The Fountainhead** 695). This description is worthy of any god or Nietzschean Superman. No matter how much she tries to disguise, delay or downplay it, except for perhaps Kira in **We The Living**, Rand’s *Übermenschen* always end up on top of the world with all the wealth and power. “Nevertheless, at the end, Rand’s victorious Superbeings emulate wise Zarathustra and descend from the heights” (Bell-Villada 236).

This race of heroes is above both God and men, their selfish happiness is the purpose of their lives and this morality goes beyond both Christian and social notions of “Good and Evil.” Despite the fact that they both battle one another professionally, Roark and Gail are friends. Friends are usually more alike than different and often have much in common. This is more evidence to the idea that Roark is a Nietzschean Superman just like Gail Wynand. “Roark’s friendship for Wynand is not a transitory one that ends in some discovery of what Wynand is like. Roark remains true to Wynand until the end” (Den Uyl 59).

In **The Fountainhead**, Rand divides her Nietzschean hero into good and bad characters. She was not the first author to do such a thing. “[Maxim Gorky’s] novel **Clim Samgin** contains over twenty references to Nietzsche, all of them negative. In general, Gorky assigned ‘good’ Nietzschean traits to his heroes—strength of will, heroism, rebelliousness, self-overcoming, defiance of society and convention [traits of Howard Roark]—and ‘bad’ Nietzschean traits to his villains—cruelty, ruthlessness, hedonism, exploitativeness [traits of Gail Wynand]. In effect, he divided humanity into heroic [master] and unheroic [(slave)]” (Rosenthal 36). One of Gorky’s such negative references to Nietzsche states, “There was gradually arising a skeptical criticism of ‘the significance of personality in the creative process of history,’ a criticism which ten years later gave place to inordinate rapture before a new hero, the ‘blond beast’ of Friedrich Nietzsche” (**Bystander** 7).¹³

Just like Howard Roark, Clim is optimistic, innovative and a personification of greatness:

His father explained to him at great length, but of all he said Clim remembered only one thing: there are yellow flowers, and there are red ones. He, Clim, was a red flower; yellow flowers are dreary (**Bystander** 12)
... “Clim believed his father: everything that was worth while was the result of invention—playthings, candy, books with pictures, poems—everything” (14)
... Clim concluded that they envied his reputation—the reputation of a boy of exceptional abilities (29).

The character Boris Varavka, like Gail Wynand, is domineering and lustful of power:

He [Boris Varavka] compelled submission to himself, and in all games he assigned to himself the leading roles . . . and having brought the opposing players to such a state of exhaustion that they refused to play longer, he would taunt the vanquished: ‘What—have you lost the game? Are you giving up? Oh, you quitters!’ (**Bystander** 29). . . Turoboev and Boris [Varavka] demanded that Clim submit to their will just as meekly as his brother (41). . .

Boris, also like Gail, in the Nietzschean tradition, believes that man either rules or is ruled and is skeptical of goodness in man:

[Boris says] ‘Nonsense! Every reasoned action of a man will inevitably be a coercion over a fellow-man, or over his own self’ (**Bystander** 27). . . ‘. . . beware of believing a good Russian man. He’s a deucedly charming fellow—yes!. . . But . . . he doesn’t realize how mournful is his role of an infant that, walking dreamily in the middle of the street, is going to be run over by horses driven by experienced, but not at all polite, drivers’ (**Bystander** 231).

Just like the moral Nietzschean odd couple, Roark and Gail are friendly foes in **The Fountainhead**, so are Boris and Clim of Gorky’s novel. Despite their clashes with one another, “He [Clim] attempted to command, to teach, but succeeded only in evoking angry rebuffs from Boris Varavka. This dexterous, boisterous boy frightened and even repulsed Clim by his imperious manner” (**Bystander** 29), the two are friends and even if Clim may not like some of his ways, he is somehow attracted to him, “Varavka was the one adult most interesting and comprehensible to Clim” (**Bystander** 27). As Nietzschean odd couples of good and evil, Clim, Roark, Boris and Gail all look to be leaning on the moral borders: Roark and Clim as good leaning towards the edge of bad and Gail and Boris as bad leaning towards the edge of good.

Just as Gorky’s two characters help to blur Nietzschean morality out of existence, Rand always makes her evil Nietzscheans morally neutral—between good and evil—never totally good or bad. Wynand just *appears* to be a more evil version of Roark. “The aging Leo Tolstoi criticized Maxim Gorky for creating Nietzschean heroes who have no clear idea of good and evil.” (Clowes 319).¹⁴ In his novel, **The Story of Sergei Petrovich**, Leonid Andreev does a similar type of creation of good and evil Nietzschean heroes, between whom there is a fine moral line, just like Gorky and Rand:

Two Nietzschean characters appear in **The Story of Sergei Petrovich**: Sergei Petrovich's best friend, Novikov, and Sergei Petrovich himself. Novikov, who introduces Sergei Petrovich to Nietzsche's philosophy, is a copy of [a] vulgar Nietzschean antihero. He is inconsiderate, arrogant, and often cruel. He disdains the people closest to him, especially Sergei Petrovich. When Sergei Petrovich, inspired by a vision of the superman, wants to transform his own character, Novikov scoffs at the irony of Sergei Petrovich's infatuation with Nietzsche. Nietzsche, he says, 'who so loved the strong, has become the teacher of the weak and the poor in spirit' (Clowes 321).

In this same Russian Nietzschean tradition, Rand never makes her evil Nietzscheans the villains. Hank Rearden—**Atlas Shrugged's** equivalent of Wynand—is not a villain. Rearden and Wynand look exactly the same—both imperfect men with the potential for greatness. Rearden's wife, Lillian, tries to destroy him just like Dominique tries to destroy Gail. No equivalent to Peter Keating exists in **Atlas Shrugged**. Rearden is as guilty of destroying passion in others as Wynand. He has made his family too dependent by carrying them as long as he has. They have no passion, goals or ambitions because they have come to depend on his sustenance. He should have encouraged passion by refusing to offer financial handouts all along instead of letting them live off him. Him allowing them to live off him is just as bad as his family's dependence on it. Rearden's family doesn't look real either. If he struggles from humble beginnings of twelve hour work days in the mills, it seems unrealistic that during this time, two able bodied adults would depend solely on his income.

Despite shortcomings like this one, all Nietzschean heroes are a blend of the art and science of his Apollo and Dionysus. Rand's fiction is no exception to this rule. Caroline Picart categorizes Nietzsche's literary career into three different phases. These are Pre-Zarathustran, Zarathustran and Post-Zarathustran. The most important work of the Pre-Zarathustran period is *The Birth of Tragedy* (5-7, 25). This work depicts two different forms of art, Apollonian and Dionysian. Apollonian art is individual art such as dreams and sculptures while Dionysian is communal art such as music and intoxication. In relation to *The Birth of Tragedy*, Rand and Nietzsche were the Apollonian and Dionysian 'odd couple.' Ronald Merrill asserts, ". . . unlike

Nietzsche, who portrayed himself as a worshipper of Dionysus, Rand comes down on the side of the Apollonian worldview” (26).

Despite Merrill’s claim, Rand’s fiction were failed attempts to disguise and separate the Dionysian side of man. Although she disliked his focus on the brutal and darker side of human nature, these same things are not hard to see in her fiction. When publicly confronted about it in the novel, Dagny openly and freely admits that she’s sleeping with a married man:

‘For two years, I had been Hank Rearden’s mistress. . . I am saying this, not as a shameful confession, but with the highest sense of pride. . . I had slept with him, in his bed, in his arms. . . Did I feel a physical desire for him? I did. Was I moved by a passion of my body? I was. Have I experienced the most violent form of sensual pleasure? I have. . . We are those who do not disconnect the values of their minds from the actions of their bodies. . . I wanted him, I had him, I was happy, I had known joy, a pure, full, guiltless joy. . .
(**Atlas Shrugged** 792).

Even though she took an opposing side to Nietzsche and tried to oppose everything natural in both her fiction and non-fiction, she appreciated Nietzsche’s symbolism of these two sides of man in relation to art and science. “We may accept Nietzsche’s symbols, but not his estimate of their respective values, nor the metaphysical necessity of a reason-emotion dichotomy” (**Return to the Primitive** 100). Caroline Picart disagrees with Rand’s point here by stating that, “The Apollinian and the Dionysian are intertwined in a complex, erotic embrace at the heart of nature and genuine art” (45). These two art forms need each other and Nietzsche’s love for the Dionysian was a major thing Rand disliked about his philosophy.

Furthermore, the less Rand says about an artist, philosophy or political idea, the more it’s like her own. Ronald Merrill states that she said little about Nazism/Fascism.¹⁵ She says even less about Friedrich Nietzsche’s philosophy. Within her entire canon of non-fiction, she says less than three paragraphs about him:

Philosophically, Nietzsche is a mystic and an irrationalist. His metaphysics consists of somewhat ‘Byronic’ and mystically ‘malevolent’ universe; his epistemology subordinates reason to ‘will’ or feeling or instinct or blood or innate virtues of character. But, as a poet, he projects at times [not consistently] a magnificent feeling for man’s greatness,

expressed in emotional, not intellectual, terms. . . **16** Nietzsche's rebellion against altruism consisted of replacing the sacrifice of oneself to others by the sacrifice of others to oneself. He proclaimed that the ideal man is moved, not by reason, but by his 'blood,' by his innate instincts, feelings and will to power—that he is predestined by birth to rule others and sacrifice them to himself, while they are predestined by birth to be his victims and slaves—that reason, logic, principles are futile and debilitating, that morality is useless, that the 'superman' is 'beyond good and evil,' that he is a 'beast of prey' whose ultimate standard is nothing but his own whim. Thus Nietzsche's rejection of the Witch Doctor consisted of elevating Attila into a moral ideal—which meant: a double surrender of morality to the Witch Doctor. . . **17** Apollo, in Nietzsche's metaphysics, is the symbol of beauty, order, wisdom, efficacy—i.e., the symbol of reason. Dionysus is the symbol of drunkenness or. . . wild, primeval feelings, orgiastic joy, the dark, the savage. . . the symbol of emotion . . . Apollo represents the principle of individuality, while Dionysus leads man 'into complete self-forgetfulness' and into merging with the 'Oneness' of nature.**18**

Despite his ambivalence with both forms, Nietzsche was more partial to the Dionysian form of art. Although Rand claimed that her art was totally of the Apollinian form, it really was not. H.L. Mencken would categorize Roark as a Dionysian when he says, "The Dionysian state would see the triumph, not of drunken loafers, but of the very men whose efforts are making for progress today: those strong, free, self-reliant, resourceful men whose capacities are so much greater than the mobs' that they are often able to force their ideas upon it. . . The strong man. . . would acknowledge no authority but his own will and no morality but his own advantage. . . The 'captain of industry' is not uncommonly the reverse of a Dionysian. . . Jenner [the innovative father of vaccination]. . . was a real Dionysian, because he boldly pitted his own opinion against the practically unanimous opinion of all the rest of the human race" (197-98).

"Despite her initial attraction to Nietzsche's work, Rand necessarily rejected his Dionysian impulses" (Sciabarra 103). In relation to this point, Robert Sheaffer concludes:

Attempting to deny and/or repress the Dionysian, Rand sought to attribute love and sex to Apollo alone. This was a great mistake. If Dominique Francon had understood love to be the highest of rational values, she would have felt no ambivalence about her desire for a man who seemed to meet all her criteria. It would not have been necessary for her to

devise a cat-and-mouse game to lure him into her bedroom: she could simply have conversed with him about philosophy, and after discovering that they held compatible philosophical premises, they could merrily have hopped into bed (315).

Again, the problem here is not that Rand uses the Dionysian, but it's that she doesn't "erotically embrace" it. She gives us a mostly Apollinian novel with Dionysus subtly sneaking through the back door. Instead of artfully embracing man's darker and sexual side, like D.H. Lawrence or Gustave Flaubert:

He [Gerald] took the throat of Gudrun between his hands, that were hard and indomitably powerful. And her throat was beautifully, so beautifully soft, save that, within, he could feel the slippery chords of her life. And this he crushed, this he could crush. What Bliss! Oh what bliss, at last, what satisfaction, at last! . . . He was watching the unconsciousness come into her swollen face, watching the eyes roll back. How ugly she was! What a fulfillment, what a satisfaction! . . . The struggling was her reciprocal lustful passion in this embrace, the more violent it became, the greater the frenzy of delight (**Women In Love** 527).

She [Emma] would eagerly throw off her clothes, pulling her thin corset string so violently that it hissed like a snake winding itself around her hips. . . And yet, in that forehead covered with beads of cold sweat, in those stammering lips, those wild eyes and those clutching arms, Leon felt the presence of something mad, shadowy and ominous. . . Like a virtuous mother, she [Emma] inquired about his friends and acquaintances. She sometimes said to him, 'Don't see them, Don't go out, don't think about anything but us; love me!' (**Madame Bovary** 244).

Rand grudgingly released a repressed, instead of a smoothly flowing, Dionysus to sensationalize her own work. Both Rand and Nietzsche used both Apollonian and Dionysian art as power to control ideas about reality. According to Caroline Picart, Nietzsche blamed Romanticism, Christianity and woman as the three sickly masks of modernity (60). He wanted to build up and destroy modernity at the same time. Ambivalence is a key ingredient in great art and individuals.

Nietzsche introduces pessimistic art in **The Birth of Tragedy** when he says, ". . . there is a need for a whole world of torment in order for the individual to produce the redemptive vision and to sit quietly in his rocking rowboat in mid-sea, absorbed in contemplation" (34). He refers

to this as a type of individual ‘oneness’ that is a tragic art that leads to the downfall of the masses and the glorification of the individual. Nietzsche praises the Apollonian form of art here. This same downfall of the masses and glorification of the individual man is the major purpose of Rand’s writing. She claimed that the purpose of writing was: “To the Glory of Man.” She shares these same ideas with Nietzsche by creating struggles for her heroes to overcome and ultimately achieve what Nietzsche calls ‘principium individuationis, or original oneness.

In **The Birth of Tragedy**, art is power and pessimistic art represents more of real life. The author claimed that much optimism is disguised pessimism. “. . . life at bottom is indestructibly joyful and powerful, was expressed most concretely in the chorus of satyrs, nature beings who dwell behind all civilization and preserve their identity through every change of generations and historical movement” (**Birth of Tragedy**, 50). I interpret this passage to mean that pessimistic life and art are powerful because they help to develop and maintain identity. This same philosophical construct exists all throughout Rand’s **The Fountainhead** and **Atlas Shrugged**.

Because of his integrity, Howard Roark is disliked by most of the architectural profession, has trouble finding work and must even close down his practice for a while due to the lack of commissions. Nevertheless, he ultimately wins all his struggles to become the greatest architect and ends up on top of the world. In **Atlas Shrugged** the strikers [Supermen] have to carry the financial and productive burdens of the parasitical looters and are subordinated to their laws and political powers that they gain from “friends in Washington.” But after striking in exile to “Galt’s Gulch,” the race of Supermen finally gain power to control the world.

Caroline Picart refers to the Chandala race in Nietzsche’s work, for example. This is a race of sick and weak slaves who exist for the sole purpose of protecting four races of India from sickness. Their purpose is to sacrifice themselves in order to maintain ‘pure blood,’ humanity and power for the Manu race that oppressed them (134-37). Despite the fact that Rand speaks out against this type of self-sacrifice to the Superman in her non fiction, it is present in her fiction. It is just on a much smaller scale than Nietzsche’s. Rand will make self-sacrifice look good in only one or two characters that are considered ‘good’ characters like Dominique Francon in **The Fountainhead** and Eddie Willers in **Atlas Shrugged**.

Just like Nietzsche talks about the class and power differences between Germans and Jews in **Beyond Good and Evil**, so does Rand do the same thing between her heroes and

villains. In **Atlas Shrugged**, for example, the group of villains known as the ‘looters’ parasitically drain wealth and power from the elite race of Supermen. This class of Supermen is so productive, virtuous and strong that they can afford to carry their own burdens and those of others as well. Again, throughout most of the novel, the Supermen look more like Nietzsche’s weak Chandala race than the strong Manu race. Rand’s Strikers are the Manu race and the Looters, along with the rest of the society are the Chandala race. The roles of each look reversed until Rand turns the tables of the power structure and ends each work with the Superman on top of the world.

In bringing the “Superman on top of the world” Russian Nietzschean literary tradition to America, Rand’s heroes continually vulgarize the Nietzschean Superman for general readers by demonstrating their individual greatness. D. Barton Johnson proclaims, that Alisa Rosenbaum was of the affluent bourgeoisie whose family reading matter tended towards such bestselling writers as Leonid Andreev, and Mikhail Artsybashev. Their ideological potboilers [such as **Sanine** and **The Life of Sergei Petrovich**] featured socially and sexually emancipated heroines and heroes spouting half-baked Nietzscheanism. With sensationally overwrought plots and clumsy prose, their novels, at least in part, find their Russian origin in Chernyshevsky’s **What is to be Done?** The literary line of descent from Chernyshevsky’s mess of pottage through the Andreev, and Artsybashev school, to Ayn Rand’s ideological epics of the forties and fifties is clear enough. . . Rand’s heroes and heroines are direct descendants of those of Andreev and Artsybashev, popular vulgarizers of Nietzsche (105).

Just like Rand’s, Artsybashev’s heroes are selfish and never fail to show off their greatness as Nietzschean Supermen and Superwomen. “Why of course I am pretty. You should have said indescribably pretty!. . . I intend to please myself” (**Sanine** 15-16). “Just plain chicken-wire fences, made of Rearden Metal, that will cost a few pennies a mile and last two hundred years. . . And ocean liners that one won’t be able to dent with a torpedo” (**Atlas Shrugged** 88). Both vulgarize the Nietzschean Superman. “The individual is a cipher. It is only they who emerge from the masses, yet are never out of touch with them, and who do not oppose the crowd, as bourgeois heroes usually to—it is only they who have real strength. . . Ah! There you go! You’re a super-man, and want happiness of a special kind to suit yourself” (**Sanine** 336). “I am rich and am proud of every penny I own. I made my money by my own effort . . . I refuse to apologize for my ability—I refuse to apologize for my success—I refuse to apologize for my

money” (*Atlas Shrugged* 451-52).

Edith M. Clowes criticizes the vulgarization of Nietzsche’s Superman in both Artsbyshayev’s *Sanine* and Leonid Andreev’s *The Life of Sergei Petrovich*.¹⁹ Of the vulgarizations in these two novels, she says:

Both Andreev and Artsybashev created interesting and in some ways sympathetic heroes, using as thematic material some widespread misinterpretations of Nietzsche’s superman. It is important to ask what effect such heroes, themselves popularly held representatives of Nietzschean thought, had on Nietzsche’s public image. In my view, they helped to discredit the German philosopher. The texts themselves and the critical discussions surrounding them called into question the validity of the idea of the superman. Because very few critics distinguished Nietzsche’s actual idea from vulgarizations, Nietzsche’s reputation suffered as well . . . Nietzsche’s difficult philosophy. . . should have been read and studied only by a few caring devotees. It is perhaps a great irony that it should have become so popular. However, the Nietzschean fashion lasted only a very short time: the idea of the superman, at first hailed as the panacea of the age, soon became its sickness. It became a name for every bad trend among Russian youth. And because the public—most writers, critics, and readers—could not distinguish Nietzsche’s real thought from the various vulgarized images of the superman, Nietzsche’s popular reputation soon failed as well. . . Vulgar Nietzschean works, ironically, undermined the view they set out to support. These stories were pervaded by a mood of contempt for the ordinary person [which can clearly be seen in Rand’s novels] who tries to distinguish himself (Clowes 326, 328).

Clowes defines vulgarization as, “. . . An idea presented without regard for the author’s original intention. It is identified with superficially similar, but essentially different phenomena—whether situations, stereotypes, or ideas—which bring about its ultimate discrediting” (317). She also gives an example of this in Max Nordau’s book *Degeneration*. “In this novel, Nordau consistently concretizes, personifies, and dramatizes abstract ideas, such as Nietzsche’s “master” or “superman,” linking them to clearly abhorrent theories, situations, and character types.”²⁰

In agreement with Clowes’ claim about Nordau, he does unfairly and negatively attack both Nietzsche, the man, and his ideas. “Hence the real source of Nietzsche’s doctrine is his

Sadism,” (**Degeneration** 451), but he also attacks and negatively labels ideas that Rand shares from Nietzsche such as selfishness and egotism. “Nietzsche’s fundamental idea of utter disregard and brutal contempt for all the rights of others standing in the way of an egotistical desire, must please the generation reared under the Bismarckian system” (**Degeneration** 470). He takes specific lines and labels them as representations of Nietzsche’s entire body of philosophy. Of Nietzsche’s lines in **Thus Spoke Zarathustra**, “Man must become better and more evil,” Nordau says, “This is Nietzsche’s moral philosophy which [disregarding contradictions] is deduced from separate concordant passages in his various books. . .” (**Degeneration** 426). “The ‘bullies’ gratefully recognize themselves in Nietzsche’s ‘over-man,’ and Nietzsche’s so-called ‘philosophy’ is in reality the philosophy of ‘bullying’” (**Degeneration** 470).

Antithetical to this type of vulgarization, Clowes defines popularization as, “. . . a simplified but largely accurate explication of an abstract idea or theory. The purpose of popularizing work is to make the idea comprehensible to nonspecialist readers. The author’s tone is generally sympathetic and balanced. He summarizes essential points, using examples familiar to a reader from a particular social and cultural background. . . For example, the German novelist Hermann Hesse helped to popularize Nietzsche’s works in the years following World War I. Emil Sinclair, the hero of Hesse’s novel **Demian** (1919), reads Nietzsche and is led to deny traditional Christian morals and rethink his own personal values” (316).

In this novel, Sinclair learns to rethink his own personal values from a Nietzschean Superman type of character, Max Demian, as much as from reading about Nietzsche. Hesse’s novel shows that Nietzschean philosophy is not one of bullying, as Max Nordau claims. Hesse’s Superman character, Demian, actually prevents Sinclair from being bullied by using, not Howard Roark’s type of brute force, not the hedonism of Sanine, but the same type of reason that Rand advocates in her philosophy. Although Demian contemplates using brute force at first against the bully by saying, “. . . you ought get rid of this bastard! If there’s no other way of doing it, kill him” (**Demian** 41). . . and it’s possible for him to use it, “. . . when the strongest boy in Demian’s class had taunted him, calling him a coward when he refused to fight back, Demian had humiliated him. . . Demian had grasped the boy with one hand by the neck and squeezed until the boy went pale” (**Demian** 33). . . he doesn’t.

After telling Sinclair what he did to get the bully, Kromer, to leave him alone, he says, “. . .No, that’s [fighting] not my way of doing things. I merely talked to him as I did to you and was

able to make it clear to him that it is to his advantage to leave you alone” (**Demian** 43). The character of Max Demian represents a practical and realistic application of Nietzsche’s philosophy, using powers of the mind instead of the body to find self-fulfillment for both himself and his friend.²¹ This same idea of Nietzschean philosophy being used to achieve self-fulfillment is misrepresented and overblown through hedonism, brute force, suicide, and bullying in the works **Sanine**, **The Fountainhead**, **The Life of Sergei Petrovich** and **Degeneration**.²²

In relation to **Demian**, an excellent contemporary version of a realistic and popularized version of Nietzsche’s philosophy is James Dickey’s novel **Deliverance**. The four characters of the novel, Ed, Bobby, Lewis and Drew, journey to the depths of nature and are perilously engaged in a battle for survival against the primal natives. The Jack London type of Nietzschean Superman, who is one with nature and easily capable of winning a battle for survival against the rural natives, Lewis, realistically becomes injured when their canoe spills in the river rapids. “‘Lewis,’ I said./ ‘My leg’s broke,’ he gasped. ‘It feels like it broke off.’” (**Deliverance** 126). Ed, the urbanized ‘common man,’ must rely only on the advice, “. . . ‘don’t have any mercy. . . kill him. . . here we are, at the heart of the Lewis Medlock country’” (**Deliverance** 136-37), and what he learned from Superman in order for himself and his friends to survive, “One of the remaining ones [arrowheads] was fairly straight; I spun it through my fingers as Lewis had taught me to do. . .” (**Deliverance** 134).

Unlike **Demian** and **Deliverance**, that show the Superman in more realistic ways, Rand’s novel is idealized vulgarization of Nietzsche just like Nordau’s and Andreev’s. The common trait of all three is the word “dramatization.” They all give the idea that a person must be a Nietzschean Superman, a Howard Roark or Sergei Petrovich, before true inner searching can begin. They must be the unrealistic Nietzschean Supermen at all costs. Roark and Petrovich are heavily dramatized to be so majestic that they’re unreal and too good to be true. “Sergei Petrovich’s view of the ideal self reflects the commonly held identification of the superman with Dostoevsky’s idea of the man-god. The goal of Sergei Petrovich’s life is to transform himself into an independent and spiritually elevated person. His tragedy is that he succeeds in overcoming personal mediocrity only by ending his life” (Clowes 322).

Even Nietzsche himself believed that, unlike what we see of Howard Roark’s optimistic portrayal, his superman could not experience total joy without some pain. “Nietzsche, however, is quite clear about the kind of person who is capable of continual inner searching. Few people

have the power to divine their own higher goal in life and to live by that goal. Such a person is alone and does not enjoy the support of other people. The ultimate danger, as Nietzsche sees it, is spiritual emptiness and despair. In all European history, Nietzsche picks out only a handful of such people, for example, Julius Caesar, J.W. Goethe, Stendhal, Heinrich Heine, and Arthur Schopenhauer” (Clowes 318).

Rand’s vulgarization of Nietzsche is different from Artsybashev and Andreev. **The Fountainhead** takes the Nietzschean ideas of individualism and greatness of the Superman and incorporates them with the American imagination of wealth, success and excess. Rand was not the first author to do this either. According to Jeff Walker, “Actually, depicting the American business tycoon in Nietzschean terms in fiction had already been done long before by Theodore Dreiser. Rand came to see that, luckily, rights in America for the inferior many would also protect the superior few” (277). She portrayed this same idea in **The Fountainhead**, a more dramatic, vulgarized, slightly campy, pop culture and religiously egotistical and Nietzschean version of Theodore Dreiser’s **The Titan**.

In the same tradition of the American Capitalist novel, Douglas Den-Uyl claims that American individualism is a long-standing part of the American consciousness. **The Fountainhead** is but another expression of that tradition—arguably the best statement ever made of the American individualist tradition. The novel is a unique statement of the meaning of American individualism (15-16). Gene Bell-Villada disagrees with this and labels Rand’s novels as more Russian than American:

Along with her Nietzsche-through-Russian-eyes, Rand poured her potent American brew into a very Russian vessel: the novel of ideas. The grand debates that breathe life into **The Brothers Karamazov** have long moved and excited many a college youth, and Rand indeed acknowledged in Dostoevsky a kindred literary [if not philosophic] spirit. Even Tolstoy, formidable realist though he was, felt called upon to insert those essays on historical determinism that freeze the flow of events in **War and Peace**. No major Anglo-American author has so passionately evoked intellectual battles as do the Russians, both the canonized and the lesser fry. What Rand wrote to a great extent, then, was Russian novels with U.S. settings (237).

D. Barton Johnson claims, “Ayn Rand wrote Russian novels in English, transforming the traditional Russian didactic novel of ideas into something that we might loosely label ‘Capitalist

Realism' . . . Rand remained stalled at the intersection of ideology and aesthetics" (107). My categorization of **The Fountainhead** is a Russian-American novel, or an Americanized Russian novel of "pop" Nietzsche.

Despite this difficulty in categorizing the 1943 work, American readers like this 'pop' Nietzscheanism of Rand's. Her book sales attest to that. The way that Rand magnifies and dramatically exalts this greatness or "Glory of Man" through her fictionalized majestic Nietzschean heroes, is her most captivating and effective literary trait. This is the main and only way that Rand taps into the reader's emotions. This is her bestselling fictional ingredient.

In relating this idea to art, Jeff Walker says, "For Rand, visual art must represent entities. . . among other anti-modernisms it is the socialist realism of the Stalinist era to which most critics compare Rand's romantic realism. But Norwegian neo-Objectivist literary scholar Kirsti Minsaas also claims that the Nazi ideology's 'cult of ideologizing art,' typified by Leni Riefenstahl's films such as **The Triumph of the Will**, bears a 'disconcerting resemblance to the Objectivist esthetics.'"²³ "When they talk about the intricate plot of **Atlas Shrugged**, well, there is a lot of mechanical moving around," yet "it's poorly done." The characters aren't real in **The Fountainhead** either, "but they do have this kind of sticky, gooey, pulpy, drama happening for them that will strike a certain spot on an unsophisticated person's emotional switchboard. . ." ²⁴

In terms of Nietzscheanism in relation to this point, Rand's general readership doesn't have to be necessarily unsophisticated in order to have this emotional switchboard struck in them. General American readers admire Rand's novels in the closet. Few people, especially adults and/or academic scholars, admit reading or admiring her work—beyond adolescent years, on the surface. "Most writers would kill to be able to sell the quarter million or so books Rand sells annually, decades after their publication" (Walker 327).

Readers want their emotional switchboards struck—they don't really care so much about how it is done or how high the level. The masses of readers couldn't care less how poorly **The Fountainhead** is written. Rand's Nietzschean "Glory of Man" is the American Dream of greatness that we all want to at least dream about—even if we know we can't really have it—whether we admit it or not. If nothing else, Rand's fiction gives us this dream. Even if Rand gives us this American dream through poorly written Nietzschean Romances in the tradition of **Sanine**, the popularity of her novels attests to the idea that people on many different levels, will take her optimistic dreams any way they can get them—even if they know it's silly fantasy.

A character doesn't have to be a Nietzschean Superman or Superwoman in order to follow all the rules of Ayn Rand's philosophy of Objectivism. However, the elite few who follow her rules are mostly the *Übermensch* heroes and the ones who don't follow her rules are usually the villainous representatives of the mediocre masses. In relating Rand's heroes to Nietzsche's Superman, a definition is in order. Just like the Nietzschean Supermen, Rand's heroes are a special breed—not just anybody can be categorized this way. Although Rand's non-fiction never states that her ideal men and women are those of exceptional talent and ability, the mediocre and common men, by definition, can qualify to meet all of Rand's criteria of her "Rational Men." Mike Donnigan in **The Fountainhead** and Eddie Willers in **Atlas Shrugged** are two common men who Rand characterizes favorably.²⁵

Although their lifestyles and prosperity can go beyond traditional and social notions of "Good and Evil," they must do four things: 1) deal in productive work 2) live by their own effort 3) have a selfish purpose. 4) respect individual rights of themselves and others by not using brute force to gain power. Ultimately, her rational men must think and live by their own productive effort. In defining the requirements of her ideal and rational men, in her essay "The Objectivist Ethics" of **The Virtue of Selfishness**, Rand says:

The basic social principle of the Objectivist ethics is that just as life is an end in itself, so every living human being is an end in himself, not the means to the ends or welfare of others—and, therefore, that man must live for his own sake, neither sacrificing himself to others nor sacrificing others to himself. To live for his own sake means that the achievement of his own happiness is man's highest moral purpose (27). . . Since everything man needs has to be discovered by his own mind and produced by his own effort, the two essentials of the method of survival proper to a rational being are: thinking and productive work. . . If some men attempt to survive by means of brute force or fraud, by looting, robbing, cheating or enslaving the men who produce, it still remains true that their survival is made possible only by their victims, only by the men who choose to think and to produce the goods which they, the looters, are seizing. Such looters are parasites incapable of survival, who exist by destroying those who are capable, those who are pursuing a course of action proper to man (23). . . Productive work is the central purpose of a rational man's life, the central value that integrates and determines the hier-

archy of all his other values. Reason is the source, the pre-condition of his productive work—pride is the result (25).

For example, Tony Montana in the movie **Scarface** is not a Randian hero because he doesn't deal in productive work. Drug dealing is destructive work and he lives off the sickness of others. Keanu Reeves in **The Devil's Advocate** is a Randian hero because he does productive work and lives by his own effort. He does cheat and bend the rules a little to get to the top, but he does not depend on the weakness of others and is not morally or ethically any worse than Roark's brutal optimism or the circles of extramarital affairs of Dagny Taggart in **Atlas Shrugged**.

When measuring Rand's rules for her heroes against the characters of her canon—Who breaks the fewest of these rules?—Gail Wynand. Who breaks the most in the most diabolical ways?—Dominique Francon. Thus, in reality, Gail Wynand is Ayn Rand's true hero and Dominique Francon is her true villain. While Rand tries to make it look as if Howard Roark [the hero], Ellsworth Toohey [the villain] and Gail Wynand [conflicted between heroism and villainy] have different morals and goals, they really are all the same. In both of Rand's two major novels, a moral spectrum exists. The more we move away from Rand's morally extreme characters [ie-Howard Roark-Good/ Ellsworth Toohey-Bad] the more realistic these characters become. Peter, Dominique and Gail are the three most realistic characters of the novel.

In **We the Living**, Kira is between Communist good and evil, represented through the characters Leo and Andrei. In this novel, a moral spectrum of only three main characters exists. For the Americanized 1943 work, Rand takes the same heroine type figure, Dominique and puts her between an individualist [Wynand] and altruist [Keating]. Rand then puts two unrealistic extremes of good and evil outside of this trio, Roark and Toohey. If Roark and Toohey are removed from this spectrum, we truly have the heroic individualist, Wynand, the victimized common man, Peter, and the villainous anti-heroine who will try to destroy anyone, Dominique.

Gail meets all requirements of the Randian hero. He sustains his life by productive work. Rand tries to make his newspaper, **The Banner**, look like a product of evil because it's trashy yellow journalism that scandalizes the Howard Roarks of the world. Despite this fact, it supplies a public need for society. This is all that's required of any legal business in America. Gail is passionate about his paper because he treats it like his mistress and never apologizes for it. He shouldn't have to apologize. In the Randian tradition of reason and free trade, the reader is free

to choose to subscribe to it or not. Whether Gail believes in what his paper publishes is not as important as Rand tries to make it. It's Capitalist supply and demand. "It [**The Banner**] accepted the same goal—to stun, to amuse and to collect admission. . . 'Men differ in their virtues, if any,' said Gail Wynand, explaining his policy, 'but they are alike in their vices' . . . 'I am serving that which exists on this earth in greatest quantity. I am representing the majority—surely an act of virtue?'" (**The Fountainhead** 409).

In terms of Nietzschean morality, Gail Wynand's character looks exactly like Theodore Dreiser's protagonist, Frank Cowperwood, in **The Titan**. Both are great robber barons and dynasty creators who rule like a Nietzschean Superman should. They both rise to greatness from humble beginnings and know they are destined to succeed. "When Frank Algernon Cowperwood emerged from the Eastern District Penitentiary in Philadelphia he realized that. . . He must begin again. . . The race is to the swift. . . Yes, and the battle is to the strong. He would test whether the world would trample him under foot or no" (**The Titan** 1, 2).

"Gail Wynand was sixteen when his father died. He was alone, jobless at the moment. . . He decided that the time had come to decide what he would make of his life. He went, that night, to the roof of his tenement and looked at the lights of the city, the city where he did not run things. . . He asked himself a single question: what was there that entered all those houses. . . what reached into every room, into every person? They all had bread. Could one rule men through the bread they bought? . . . The course of his life was set. . . Next morning, he walked into the office of the editor of the **Gazette**, a fourth-rate newspaper [when he asked for a job and was refused]. . . 'I'll hang around,' said Wynand. 'Use me when you want to. You don't have to pay me. You'll put me on salary when you'll feel you'd better'"(**The Fountainhead** 406).

In terms of Nietzschean characters, Gail is the most realistic looking Randian hero who, unlike Roark, admits that he's not perfect:

The kind of hero in whom Aristotle [in Rand's artistic interpretation of his ideas] is most interested is hardly an example of perfection and success: He is a tragic hero, an essentially good man—'or one better rather than worse'—who nevertheless suffers as the result of some 'flaw.'²⁶ This is a kind of character that is common enough in life. Yet it is a kind that is conspicuously excluded by Rand's moral theory of art—with peculiar effects on the picture of life in her novels. Many of Rand's

most interesting characters have the makings of tragic heroes, yet their tragic possibilities seem almost to embarrass her. Only Gail Wynand, in **The Fountainhead**, is allowed to develop the complex role of a good man who falls by his own error.²⁷

The same holds true for Cowperwood who, like Gail, admits that he's selfish and greedy for wealth and power. "His [Cowperwood's] private and inmost faith is in himself alone. Upon the majority he shuts the gates of his glory in order that the sight of their misery and their needs may not disturb nor alloy his selfish bliss" (**The Titan** 526-27). According to Patrick Bridgewater, Frank Cowperwood comes into his own in **The Titan** where he's seen in Nietzschean terms. He's portrayed as an exceptional man who is individualistic in character without any true democracy. "I satisfy myself" was his private law. He reflected his dreams of grandeur, reflecting his own sense of mastery and desire to dominate.²⁸[Just like Kira in Rand's **We the Living**] He was offended by and had nothing but contempt for the common herd (171).

The morals of Cowperwood, Roark and Wynand are Nietzschean and go beyond good and evil. They both set and live by their own set of moral rules and go beyond what's socially acceptable. Wynand and Cowperwood both have mistresses. Donald Pizer claims, Cowperwood has eleven minor affairs [within the trilogy]. . . They are sexual in nature and strongly indicate that varietism in sexual experience, with an attractive partner, is itself an aesthetic pursuit with an aesthetic goal (191). As long as they live by their own productive effort, and Wynand does, and don't steal, kill and be unproductive parasites, they can morally do whatever they want—according to Rand's ideas. In terms of Rand's heroes and Nietzsche's Supermen, Wynand is no more evil than Roark.

In **The Fountainhead**, Roark is an aspiring *Urbemensch* who honestly works his way to the top. At the novel's beginning, he is an honest failure. Wynand believes that all men are either corrupt successes or honest failures. Although he befriends Roark in the novel, he tries to corrupt Roark's integrity. Unlike Wynand, Roark is a man of integrity and artistically builds in his own way and refuses to "force or be forced" by the desires of the masses. When Wynand challenges Roark's integrity, it is a battle of Supermen. Ultimately the Superman with the most integrity wins. "Wynand, of course, is not a villain in **The Fountainhead**, but he is the embodiment of all that Rand believed was wrong with the Nietzschean ethos" (Sciabarra 401-note 36).

Both the good and evil sides of the Nietzschean superman are also portrayed in Edna

Ferber's **Giant**. However, unlike Gorky and Rand, she incorporates both good and evil traits into one man—Bick. Leslie and her father are both speaking of the same man in two different ways. Leslie calls Bick, “Power-mad. Dictator. His thoughts and energies and emotions are bounded by the farthest fence on the remotest inch of Reata Ranch. . .” While her father calls himself and Bick, “Dedicated men. Men primarily in love with their work”(Giant 349). Real Nietzschean heroes are like Bick and Gail. They're not flawless and accept the naturalness of both themselves and the world.

Bick, Gail and Cowperwood are Capitalist Nietzschean Supermen who are greedy for money and power. In contrast to this group, Howard Roark looks more like one of Jack London's Socialist Supermen, who are just as great as the Capitalist version, but long more for self-fulfillment and integrity than money and power. A description of one of London's Socialist Superman heroes, Ernest Everhard, reads, “I have said that he was afraid of nothing. He was a natural aristocrat—and this in spite of the fact that he was in the camp of the non-aristocrats. He was a superman, a blond beast such as Nietzsche has described and in addition he was aflame with democracy” (**The Iron Heel** 6).

This love of democracy is the main thing that separates the Socialist and Capitalist Supermen. Howard Roark's strong integrity is only a more individualized version of this type of democracy which we see in London. Roark, like Ernest Everhard and Leslie in **Giant**, who rebels against the mistreatment of Mexicans on her husband's ranch, are all aflame with democracy more than greed and power. Bick, Gail and Cowperwood are greedy and power lusting—more in line with the true tradition of Nietzscheanism than Howard Roark.

Geoffrey Harpham interprets, “Merging the vision of the Just Society with the idea of the romantic hero, London was merely advocating the most popular and influential form of literary conservatism—as well as literary socialism—in the first decade of the century” (23). Rand's Howard Roark, cares more for this ‘just society’ than Dreiser's Cowperwood. Earlier in the novel, Roark turns down a lucrative architecture commission with only a few slight classic architectural additions to it.²⁹ However, when Cortlandt is changed, Roark uses Nietzschean brute force to ultimately gain money and power as he bombs it. “Roger Enright bought the site, the plans and the ruins of Cortlandt from the government. . . He hired Howard Roark to rebuild the project” (**The Fountainhead** 687).

Unlike a true capitalist, Roark uses nature [his brutishness] to conquer nature.

Cowperwood and Gail use their minds to supply what the public must demand. “At the same time Cowperwood’s financial genius was constantly being rewarded by many new phases of materiality (**The Titan** 471). . . This plan [to maintain a fifty-year franchise]. . . was a thing more or less expressly forbidden by the state constitution of Illinois. . . Yet, ‘What is a little matter like the constitution between friends, anyhow?’ (**The Titan** 477). . . Yet none the less did he [Cowperwood] hesitate to press the measure which was to adjust his own future, to make profitable his issue of two hundred million dollars. . . to secure him a fixed place in the financial oligarchy of America and of the world” (**The Titan** 479). Gail says, “I took automobiles, silk pyjamas, a penthouse, and gave the world my soul in exchange”(**The Fountainhead** 605). Rand’s use of the word ‘soul’ is nothing more than a more religious variation of the words ‘just society’ and ‘democracy’ used to describe Jack London’s Socialist heroes.

Of London’s novel, **The Iron Heel**, Geoffrey Harpham comments, “There is no better guide to the confusion of the contemporary socialist movement than the reception of this book since its appearance, in 1907, to an astonished public” (28). Howard Roark is even more confused than Ernest, because, as a Nietzschean Superman, he’s morally between Capitalism and Socialism. He hypocritically claims that he doesn’t want to rule, although he refuses to work under anybody, even to get to the top. Roark claims that the Socialist idea of integrity of the soul is more important to him than lust for wealth and power.

However, he befriends a man with no integrity of soul, Gail, and uses his friendship for the lucrative and prestigious commission of the Wynand Building at novel’s end. In his hesitation to truly claim one moral/political side of the Nietzschean Superman, Howard Roark is the embodiment of true hypocrisy within the American Imagination. Gail, Bick and Cowperwood are all clearly on the side of Capitalist Supermen and Ernest Everhard is clearly on the side of Socialist Supermen. Of this hypocrisy, Geoffrey Harpham claims, “For, in a sense, superman socialism is merely a caricature Of the contradictory aspirations of a democratic society which advocates universal social justice while placing almost no upward bounds on individual self-aggrandizement” (33).

Howard Roark’s uncompromising integrity actually stems from remnants of democracy and the altruistic socialism that Rand forcefully meant to show him adamantly opposing.³⁰ Howard Roark’s character looks as confused as London’s. Both are neither totally Nietzschean nor totally Capitalist. They are Nietzsche-lite, not totally selfish and power lusting in the

Nietzschean tradition, but also torn between integrity, or democracy, and individuality. London's heroes are more credible in that they claim to be Socialist. Howard Roark claims Capitalism, but shies away from its true nature in his actions and thinking. Although Roark says, "I don't propose to force or be forced. Those who want me will come to me" (**The Fountainhead** 26), he still enjoys the spoils of Capitalism at the novel's end, such as getting the girl, Dominique; which he forced his way into throughout the novel.³¹ He's far from a robber baron, but he's not a socialist either. Roark doesn't resemble true Capitalist heroes who lust for greed and power like Cowperwood, Dagny Taggart and John Galt. Capitalism is more in line with pro-Nietzschean ideas like selfishness and power lust than Socialism.

Just like Howard Roark fails to emulate the true Capitalist hero, unlike Gail Wynand, London's 'so called' Nietzschean heroes stray from some of the German philosopher's key ideas as well. Gerd Hurm argues, "**The Call of The Wild** reveals a telling departure from Nietzsche's design when the story proceeds beyond the stage at which Buck becomes a dominating overdog. . . Eventually, he reaches his highest destination:

When the long winter nights come on and the wolves follow their meat into the lower valley, he may be seen running at the head of the pack through the pale moonlight or glimmering borealis, leaping gigantic above his fellows, his great throat-a-bellow as he sings a song of the pack.³²

Buck's true nobility thus finds its congenial expression in and through the collective. In London's typically idiosyncratic manner, the proto-socialist tale fuses Marx. . . in order to transcend Nietzsche. Not individualism, but cooperation, altruism, and collectivism constitute the root and goal of evolution for London" (126).

Hurm goes on to say that, "**The Iron Heel** recasts [Friedrich Nietzsche's **Genealogy of Morals**']³³ struggle between altruism and egoism in the form of a utopian novel. Its hero Ernest Everhard successfully fights an oligarchy of industrialists. He is a Nietzschean character with a difference, however, since he is also [afire with democracy]. His movement will eventually succeed in the future, leaving behind Nietzsche's antediluvian positions" (129). In the novel, Ernest says, " 'For this time lost, dear heart,' he said, 'but not forever. We have learned. Tomorrow the Cause will rise again, strong with wisdom and discipline" (**The Iron Heel** 351).

Just like Jack London's Ernest will make way for a new Superman, so will Ferber's Bick and Rand's Gail represent Nietzsche's idea of eternal return to new Supermen of either Capitalist or Socialist form. Both Gail and Bick have created dynasties that ultimately fall and make way for new ones. Gail's dynasty makes way for the next Nietzschean ruler-Howard Roark. Gail says to Roark, "It [The Wynand empire] will last my lifetime. But it will end with me. . . I told you once that this building was to be a monument to my life. There is nothing to commemorate now. The Wynand Building will have nothing—except what you give it. . . Build it as a monument to that spirit which is yours. . . and could have been mine" (**The Fountainhead** 692-93).

Just as the Nietzschean Capitalist trait of power lust led to Gail's downfall, **34** so does the same happen to London's hero, Martin Eden. "[London's] Martin Eden records a further stage in London's political disillusionment. In the novel [Martin Eden], both the Nietzschean individualist Eden and the socialist poet Brissenden signal despair and defeat by committing suicide. Nietzsche's stance again is partly celebrated:

Nietzsche was right. . . The world belongs to the strong—
To the strong who are noble as well and who do not wallow
in the swine-trough of trade and exchange. The world belongs
to the great blond beasts, to the non-compromisers, to the
yes-sayers (**Martin Eden** 848-49).

Ultimately, however, Martin Eden fails, as London explained, 'because he was an individualist. . . of the extreme Nietzschean type. I live because I am a socialist and have a social consciousness'" (Hurm 129-30). **35** Rand makes Gail Wynand fail, just like London's Martin Eden, because he was an extreme Nietzschean individualist. Thus, Rand makes her true and honest Nietzschean hero fail and her confused and hypocritical semi Nietzschean—between true Capitalism and Socialism, Howard Roark, succeed.

Just like Gail's, Bick's dynasty makes way for the next king and queen of the family [not necessarily Nietzschean], when his son and daughter both don't want to follow the family tradition of running Reata Ranch and pursue other careers of their own. Ferber's Nietzschean hero, who's not the villain, like Gail, sees this as a failure, "Things are getting away from me. . . I swear to God I sometimes feel like a failure" (**Giant** 447). The protagonist wife of the Nietzschean hero sees it as a success. ". . . maybe Jordan and I and all the others behind us have been failures. . . In a way it has nothing to do with ranches and oil and millions. . . And then I thought about our Jordan and our Luz and I said to myself, well, after a hundred years it looks as

if the Benedict family is going to be a real success at last” (**Giant** 447).

Just like power transforms for the Benedict family from wealth to self-fulfillment, Gail moves back and forth from self-fulfillment to wealth back to self-fulfillment near novel’s end. Gail uses his self-fulfillment to gain wealth and once he gains this wealth, he uses it to gain self-fulfillment on a different and higher level. Gail says to Roark, “I’m a millionaire who’s never owned anything. . . I’ve sold my life, but I got a good price. Power. I’ve never used it. . . But now I’m free. Now I can use it for what I want. For what I believe. For Dominique. For you” (**The Fountainhead** 604,606).

The same thing happens to Cowperwood. Joseph C. Schopp proclaims, Cowperwood’s initial lust for material power is gradually transformed into higher, more refined forms of power which reflect the Nietzschean Will to Power. . . generating ever new and surprising creations of the self (151-52). “Cowperwood’s theory of things began to appeal to her. One must create one’s own career, carve it out, or remain horribly dull or bored. . . if men were so dull—well, there was one thing she could do. She must have life, life—and money would help some to that end. . . He [Cowperwood] was so much better than most of the others, so very powerful” (**The Titan** 531).

Cowperwood and Gail are the same in their eccentric tastes for different versions of the spoils of Nietzschean money and power. According to Joseph C. Schopp, “Dreiser enacts the process of Cowperwood’s self-surpassing on three different levels: Wealth, Woman and Art. How closely these levels are interrelated, may be illustrated by the following quotation:

Wealth in the beginning, had seemed the only goal,
to which had been added the beauty of women. And
now art, for art’s sake—the first faint radiance of a
Rosy dawn—had begun to shine in upon him, and to
the beauty of womanhood he was beginning to see
how necessary it was to add the beauty of life—the
beauty of material background—how, in fact, the only
background for great beauty was great art.**36**

The hierarchy of the three levels deserves closer attention because it is here that Dreiser shows his greatest indebtedness to Nietzsche’s philosophy” (146). The same holds true for Gail. Once he becomes bored with the typical mistresses as artworks, Dominique becomes a new and special work of art—a woman to love in place of **The Banner**. His newspaper, Dominique and Roark all become his works of art over which he asserts his possession as his private property. On his way to achieving wealth, **The Banner** is Gail’s work of art.**37** Once he obtains wealth, Dominique

becomes his work of art, followed by his friend, Howard Roark.**38**

The Nietzschean goals of wealth and power are ultimately the same for Roark and Wynand at the end of the novel. Unlike a true Nietzschean hero, Roark takes a more difficult and roundabout way to achieve the same goal. If he really wanted to, there's nothing that Roark has which Gail cannot buy if he really desires it. He believes he could even buy the integrity of his paper. He says to his employee, Toohey, "I could make you reverse yourself publicly and I would enjoy it, but I prefer to forbid the subject to you entirely" (**The Fountainhead** 546). Roark's false sense of integrity isn't as important as his brutish nature that he uses to gain power. Roark uses brute force, more than integrity, to gain power.**39**

Wynand is more powerful than Roark because he has wealth—Roark doesn't. For this reason, Wynand is capable of crushing Roark. When making Roark the corrupt offer, he says, "It would be easy for me to arrange that no commission be available to you anywhere in this country" (**The Fountainhead** 532). However, in the Nietzschean tradition, Gail wants 'greatness in man' to succeed just like Roark does. After Roark refuses his corrupt offer, he says, "I don't want to try [executing the fierce destruction of Roark's career]. Not because you'd probably hold out to the end. But because I couldn't hold out" (**The Fountainhead** 534). When Gail asks Roark if he knew he was taking a terrible chance in refusing his corrupt offer, under threat of career destruction, Roark says, ". . . I had an ally I could trust" [Gail replies] "What? Your integrity?" [Roark responds] "Yours, Gail" (**The Fountainhead** 534). Thus, Gail is a Howard Roark with wealth and success. He can relate to Roark's emerging Superman status—because he was once in the same position.**40**

Howard Roark breaks more rules of the Randian hero than Gail Wynand. Just like a totalitarian dictator of a poor country, in his career, Roark uses rape and violence to gain power in the absence of money. Of Roark's violence, Phillip Gordon interprets, "Violence, as strong action finds ample rationalization [in **The Fountainhead**]. Never mind that a basic principle of Rand's Objectivist philosophy is the prohibition of the initial use of physical force against others. . . While Roark's violence might not be with a gun or his fists, his actions are distinctly violent and perhaps unexpectedly from the heroic figure Rand calls 'the portrait of an ideal man.' Ignore for the moment 'the violence' of his drawings and his 'violent' signature; it is in the expression of love, the most human of feelings. . . that Roark's violence becomes intense"(704-5).

On his way to the top, Wynand doesn't use violence, only his capable mind and virtuous work. "At the end of the week, in a rush hour, a man from the city room called Wynand to run an errand. Other small chores followed. He obeyed with military precision. In ten days he was on salary. In six months he was a reporter. In two years he was an associate editor" (**The Fountainhead** 406).

Gail is much better at survival than Roark because we assume that he comes up from harsher upbringings [being raised in Hell's Kitchen].⁴¹ Unlike Roark, who goes to college, he educates himself and survives long enough to gain a position of status and economic gain [a job]. If his first true love was reciprocated early in his life, his life would be complete. He would get pleasure and amusement from a wife instead of from corrupting others. Furthermore, he is Rand's true hero in this novel because, all throughout his life, he has needed less help than any of the other characters. "He was fifteen when he was found, one morning, in the gutter, a mass of bleeding pulp, both legs broken, beaten by some drunken longshoreman. . . He had crawled, able to move nothing but his arms. He had knocked against the bottom of a door. . . It was the only time in his life that Gail Wynand asked for help" (**The Fountainhead** 406).

Unlike Roark, Wynand offers his victims a choice. Except for Peter Keating, all **The Fountainhead's** heroes destroy passion in someone else—yes, even Howard Roark. Roark destroys any chance for Dominique to be among the group of Superman by raping her. Dominique contemplates Roark being whipped in prison, she wants to physically control him. According to Robert Sheaffer, "Dominique Francon is told that Roark may have been in jail: 'She hoped he had. She wondered whether they whipped convicts nowadays. She hoped they did' (**The Fountainhead** 208). Apparently, for Dominique, the contemplation of the whipping of the man for whom she lusts is a source of erotic pleasure" (312).

After the rape, she no longer tries to control him physically. He has ultimately made it her goal to test his convictions, instead of striving for achievement and greatness for herself. Toohey destroys passion in Keating. Dominique helps Toohey to destroy passion in Keating and she also destroys passion in Gail Wynand. Although we don't know for sure, it seems like Wynand only succeeds at corrupting potential Randian heroes before they reach Superman status.

Of all the characters who kill passion in Rand's novel, Gail Wynand is the only one who offers money in exchange for destroyed passion. Roark rapes Dominique and in return, she can be a subordinate Mrs. Roark to the Superman [she's not quite a slave—but she's not the boss of

the relationship with high goals and achievements of her own, either]. Toohey kills happiness in Peter and ridicules him in return. Roark and Wynand are also at different stages of their careers. **Atlas Shrugged** picks up where **The Fountainhead** leaves off. Rand's robber barons, Gail Wynand, Hank Rearden and Francisco D'Anconia are what Howard Roark will look like after his struggles to achieve success are over and he has wealth to go along with his power. Once he reaches the status of robber baron, Howard Roark will be more dangerous than Gail Wynand. He will have money to go along with his brutal means to achieve whatever he wants.

Wynand is Rand's greatest hero because he is the only one who does not *pretend* that he's not Nietzschean. Rand waters down this Nietzscheanism in all her other heroes. "Other 'good' characters, such as Hank Rearden in **Atlas Shrugged**, are usually maneuvered into mending their potentially fatal flaws."⁴² All Rand's heroes seek more money and power. They are all egotistically greedy and proud about it—Wynand is the only character in Rand's 1943 novel who bluntly admits it. Dreiser's Nietzschean hero, Cowperwood, also bluntly admits the same thing.

Donald Pizer argues, "Cowperwood in **The Titan** discards hypocrisy for an open declaration of his nature, methods, and goals and thus achieves a kind of Satanic magnificence which to Dreiser is a heroic magnificence" (190). Just like, " 'I satisfy myself,' had ever been his [Cowperwood's] motto," (**The Titan** 448).⁴³ Gail Wynand says, "The voice of his masses pushed me up and down. Of course, I collected a fortune in the process. . . Yet people call me corrupt. Why?. . . I wanted power over a collective soul and I got it" (**The Fountainhead** 605).

Rand hypocritically makes Howard Roark look like a saint who cares more about the 'glory' and integrity of his soul instead of power, like Wynand and Cowperwood. "He [Roark] thought: I haven't mentioned to him [Wynand] the worst second-hander of all—the man who goes after power" (**The Fountainhead** 609). While it's true that Roark isn't very concerned with wealth, at least in this stage of his career, he will stop at nothing to gain the "glory" or "power" of being New York's greatest architect. Roark's fight is one for power—not integrity. Just like Gail, Roark doesn't take orders well, he's like Herman Melville's *Bartleby* on a power and ego trip. He loses two jobs because he refuses to take orders from superiors. Unlike Gail, Roark abuses his own power whether he has earned it or not.⁴⁴ Despite the fact that Rand hides and disguises this fact in the novel, Roark's brutal fights are for power.

Like Wynand, all of Rand's heroes show off their egotistical greed. Dagny Taggart can

have Hank, Lillian's husband, and show it off in public. Roark can show Dominique that he's the man and she belongs to him and must ultimately serve him by raping her. Hank Rearden has power over his brother's words. Francisco D'Anconia shows that he can have several mistresses and that he's above them all by not sleeping with any of them. He's too good for them and they're all beneath him.

At least Wynand uses his mistresses for the purpose in which they should be used—his own selfish pleasure. When Gail is in the company of a typical mistress, it reads, “The line of her arm, when she raised a crystal goblet of water to her lips, was as perfect as the lines of the silver candelabra produced by a matchless talent—and Wynand observed it with the same appreciation. . . He reached into his pocket and took out a diamond bracelet; it flashed a cold, brilliant fire in the candlelight. . . He tossed it across the table. . . ‘Thank you, Gail,’ she said. . . Later, when they had walked into the drawing room. . . toward the darkness where the stairway to his bedroom began. . . ‘To let me earn the memorial [bracelet], Gail?’ she asked. . . ‘I had really intended that,’ he said. ‘But I’m tired.’”(**The Fountainhead** 399).

Just as with his mistresses, and everything else he does, Gail gives value for the value he receives. A man should either decide to have a mistress or not. D'Anconia's pretend mistresses look more like groupies than friends—they're slaves to D'Anconia's greatness. Unlike Wynand, D'Anconia doesn't use the mistresses for his own personal pleasure, but to show others that he's great enough to have any trophy mistress that he wants. D'Anconia gives his play-play mistresses a raw deal. He wastes their time, ruins their reputations, exploits them to show the world that 'he's the man' and gives them no money, attention, friendship or sexual pleasure in return. He dehumanizes them for not even the thrill of his own whimsical pleasure.

He says, “I've spent a lot of money on the most ostentatiously vulgar parties I could think of. . . being seen with the appropriate sort of women. . . I have never slept with any of those women. I have never touched one of them. . . I gave those bitches what they wanted. . . food for their vanity. . . I gave them a chance to see themselves in the scandal sheets in the roles of great seductresses. . . my secret is safe because each one of them thinks that she was the only one who failed, while all the others succeeded, so she'll be the more vehement in swearing to our romance and will never admit the truth to anybody” (**Atlas Shrugged** 462-63).

Gail learns that money is power at an early age. “Politics and corruption had never disturbed him; he knew all about it. . . But when Pat Mulligan, police captain of his precinct, was

framed, Wynand could not take it; because Pat Mulligan was the only honest man he had ever met in his life” (**The Fountainhead** 407). If he was heartless and couldn’t relate to Roark’s greatness and struggles, he would have crushed Roark’s career. Roark succeeds at the end because Wynand lets him succeed. Just like Ellsworth Toohey, Wynand is an honest character. The power created by Gail’s wealth is the only thing that keeps Toohey from taking over his paper. “Wynand looked at his wrist watch. He said, ‘It’s nine o’clock. You’re out of a job, Mr. Toohey. *The Banner* has ceased to exist. . . Yes, you had worked here for thirteen years. . . Yes, I bought them all out, [the stockholders of *The Banner*] Mitchell Layton included, two weeks ago”(**The Fountainhead** 690). Wealth and power are the end results of the greatnesses of Wynand and Roark. Roark will take up where Gail left off and pick up the wealth and power torch from him and take his place as the ultimate Nietzschean Superman of wealth and power. These are the only two characters in the novel who can truly create wealth and power.

Also, architecture and a newspaper are two different professions. Architects, lawyers, professors and doctors have more creative individual leeway than newspaper publishers and television broadcasters. This is because, unlike architects, media companies must deal with advertisers. Thus, the middle man of the advertiser makes media moguls deal less directly with their consumers. For Ted Turner and Rupert Murdoch, it doesn’t matter whether or not they believe in what their stations show. As long as they give the public a good quality product, make money and stay within bounds of the law, and Gail Wynand does all of these things, they can show whatever they want. If Gail did not give them a high quality product, he would not be rich and his paper would not run efficiently.

The Banner is not a realistic newspaper. Wynand’s paper is something between **USA Today** and **The National Enquirer**—real important news with scandalous and defaming exaggerations. A newspaper is either total entertainment, yellow journalism, with personal and scandalous exaggerations, like **The National Enquirer**, or the biased and slightly entertaining true news of a **USA Today**. Wynand’s paper is neither. Rand tries to make Gail’s paper look unethical because it’s against Howard Roark and the greatness of man. A paper is not good or bad because of its opinions, different newspapers cater to different audiences. A paper is good or bad because of its quality as a product.

Rand also knocks Wynand for having no integrity. However, none of the characters in **The Fountainhead** have any integrity. One mystery of characterization in **The Fountainhead**,

according to Douglas Den Uyl, “. . . is Roark’s willingness to do Keating’s work despite his fierce belief in individualism” (60). Roark says to Peter, “It’s I who have destroyed you, Peter. From the beginning. By helping you. There are matters in which one must not ask for help nor give it. I shouldn’t have done your projects at Stanton. . . the Cosmo-Slotnick Building. . . nor Cortlandt” (**The Fountainhead** 612-13). Just like **The Brothers Karamazov**, **The Fountainhead** represents a moral spectrum. Starting with Rand’s ‘ideal man,’ none of her characters are perfect in integrity or traditional morality.

Gail’s only mistake is when he mixes his personal and professional lives and changes the stance of **The Banner** to save Howard Roark. He doesn’t do it for Dominique. He says to her, “I’ve never apologized for **The Banner**. I never will. . . Don’t expect me to change **The Banner** or sacrifice it. I wouldn’t do that for anyone on earth” (**The Fountainhead** 488). Through nearly all of the novel, he maintains a clear separation of his personal and private life. Rand unrealistically changes Gail’s attitude about his paper overnight.⁴⁵ Why change his paper to save Roark? Gail has nothing to prove—he’s already the most powerful self-made man in New York. Why change an opinion that has made you rich? Why take an unnecessary risk like this?

A better use of Gail’s power would have been to pull strings to get Roark acquitted. Roark is acquitted anyway. The only flaw in Gail’s character is here when Rand makes the richest and most powerful man in the novel care about honesty and integrity. Gail’s changing of his paper’s stance, simply because he’s met a man of integrity, is unrealistic. Even with his revelation about how “he doesn’t run things around here,” Gail is still wealthier than Roark. Wealth and power is all that any true Nietzschean or Randian hero cares about—the integrity and honesty used in acquiring it aren’t as important as the necessary ability and opportunism.

In moving from the true hero to the true villain, the same aspect of realism exists in Rand’s most evil character: Dominique Francon. Dominique tries to destroy Roark. She helps Toohey to destroy both Keating and Wynand. She’s like Toni Morrison’s Sula. She has no true purpose for herself. She’s an artist with no art form. Sula looks exactly like Dominique. Both characters love neither themselves nor others, destroy out of boredom and rebel against social structures—just because they can.

Dominique, much like Peter Keating, allows herself to be victimized by both good and evil. Unlike Leslie in **Giant**, she destroys with her idleness and refusal to join a side and fight for it. While talking to his daughter and speaking about her rebellion against Bick, Leslie’s father

says, “What could be more exciting! As long as you’re fascinated and as long as you keep on fighting the things you think are wrong, you’re living. It isn’t the evil people in the world who do the most harm. It’s the sweet do-nothings that can destroy us. Dolce far niente. That’s the thing to avoid in this terrible and wonderful world. Gangrene. The sweet sickening smell of rotting flesh” (**Giant** 350).

Just like Brett Ashley of **The Sun Also Rises**, Dominique hates herself and others—and destroys both. Both Brett and Dominique are idlers who distract and weaken males with their sexual allurements. Barbara Grizzuti Harrison says, “Rand says that she appeals to ‘rational egoists.’ I think, on the contrary, that she appeals both to narcissism and to self-hatred, traits which are apparently mutually exclusive but which in fact often coexist in one fragmented personality: scratch a narcissist, and you often find, beneath the veneer of braggadocio, a frightened self-loather” (74-75).

This self-hatred is much easier to see in Dominique than in Roark. She’s a pain freak who doesn’t fight for a side, but is idle while she enjoys being beaten and used. “Rand gave us women who were ruthless with those they perceived to be their inferiors, but who blissfully received ‘dark satisfaction in pain’ from the men they adored. From there, of course, it’s a skip and a jump to sadomasochism. . . if women want S&M dream trips, they have only to read Ayn Rand” (Harrison 74). Note also how the name “Dominique” sounds much like “Dominatrix” or “Dominate.”

She’s an opportunistic slave of both sides, good and evil, and plans to jump on the bandwagon of the winning side once the battle ends. She destroys others and pretends to be a heroine while doing it. That’s more deceitful and two-faced than Toohey. At least Toohey chooses a side—evil, and stays true to it. He maintains a consistent purpose of destruction. Unlike Toohey, Dominique switches sides at her convenience. She always jumps onto the side winning at the time. She fights against Roark at first when others are succeeding at destroying him. Then she marries him at the end when she sees that he’s winning and becoming successful. She drops Wynand after his paper loses popularity.

Dominique breaks Rand’s most important Objectivist rule—“. . . Man must live for his own sake, neither sacrificing himself to others nor sacrificing others to himself” (**The Virtue of Selfishness** 27). She sacrifices herself for Howard Roark. Dominique says to Roark, “But I will live for you, through every minute and every shameful act I take, I will live for you in my own

way, in the only way I can” (**The Fountainhead** 376).

In breaking Rand’s cardinal rule, she adheres to Nietzsche’s advice about self-sacrifice in making way for the Superman. “I love him who works and invents that he may build a house for the Superman and prepare earth, animals, and plants for him: thus he wills his own downfall” (**Thus Spoke Zarathustra** 44 prologue, ch. 4). Just like Dagny Taggart [Superwoman heroine of **Atlas Shrugged**] Dominique is smart and talented enough to easily embrace her role as Superwoman, but she refuses it. Although she takes her place as servant to the Superman, Dagny is also a Superwoman railroad tycoon. Douglas Den Uyl proclaims that Dominique is little else in the novel but Roark’s lover and destroyer. . . she lacks a certain development as a whole person (72-73).

Dominique is neither a Nietzschean Superwoman nor one of Ayn Rand’s heroines. By sacrificing herself to the Superman, this means that she herself cannot be a Nietzschean Superwoman and she remains among the common herd of mediocrity. But Dominique possesses the necessary talents to be great and becomes a subordinate to the Superman by choice—unlike most common and mediocre characters—like Peter Keating. Peter wants to be a Superman and can’t be, Dominique can be a Superwoman and doesn’t want to be. Dominique is a waste of a woman who doesn’t appreciate or desire to utilize her great talents.

Furthermore, any type of self-sacrifice also makes her unable to be even a ‘common woman’ type of Randian heroine, such as the men Mike Donnigan or Eddie Willers. She works to destroy everybody in between extreme good and evil—Roark on his way to the top, Wynand and Peter. Like Peter, she works against herself. “Dominique is, in some respects, a person divided against herself” (Den Uyl 71). She never tries to destroy the novel’s villain, Ellsworth Toohey, but she allows Toohey to destroy her. She wants to destroy herself and bring everybody else down with her. Just like Toohey wants a world of only “common” and mediocre men, Dominique unrealistically wants a world of totally extreme good or extreme evil—no in between. Dominique is a sick and stifled character of Nietzschean Superwoman ingredients and a Randian villainess more dangerous than Ellsworth Toohey.

She does more work for Toohey than for Roark. Dominique is more of what a Randian villain would look like in real life. Parasites usually manipulate their victims for selfish gain. Toohey is evil, but not what a real villain would look like in real life. When compared to his parallel character in **Atlas Shrugged**, James Taggart, their motivations are different. James

Taggart, just like Dominique, is a parasite for the purpose of gaining unearned wealth. Toohey represents evil for evil's sake—with no profit for himself. Whether good or bad, rulers usually want some personal gain out of their efforts to rise to the top. Ronald E. Merrill agrees when he states that Rand pays a price for making Toohey so perfect an representation of evil. This makes his character lose reality. Rand uses Toohey not really as a character but as a personification of evil. He might be best compared to Goethe's Mephistopheles (52).

As a realistic version of Toohey's evil, Dominique teams up with him to destroy Roark and Peter. Toohey says to Dominique, "You need me, Dominique. . . The Lindsay home was better—Roark was definitely considered, I think he would have got it but for you. The Stonebrook Clubhouse also—he had a chance at that, which you ruined. . . You've done remarkably well, my congratulations. . . My dear, surely you haven't forgotten that it was I who gave you the idea in the first place. . . This is a pact, my dear. An alliance. . . It is not necessary to have a noble aim in common. It is necessary only to have a common enemy. We have. . . Stop mentioning him in your column every other day or so. . . You're keeping his name in print, and you don't want to do that. . . Another tip: Mr. Gilbert Colton—you know, the California pottery Coltons—is planning a branch factory in the east. He's thinking of a good modernist. In fact, he's thinking of Mr. Roark. Don't let Roark get it. It's a huge job—with lots of publicity" (**The Fountainhead** 279-281).

Dominique marries Peter and Gail for parasitical financial sustenance—not love. She offers marriage to Peter only to destroy his potentially happy marriage to Catherine. It is implied that Ellsworth Toohey is behind Dominique's proposal.⁴⁶ When considering her evil motives, Douglas Den Uyl says:

Apart from wondering why a woman as self-sufficient and strong willed as Dominique would surrender to any man, and why romance cannot take place without either partner 'surrendering' to the other, it is hard to imagine why one would devote an extraordinary amount of effort to destroying the life of the one to whom she is to surrender! The answer just given, that one wishes to protect what one loves, seems somewhat less than convincing with a character as strong and able as Roark to take care of himself and to asses his own risks. . . Of course, we could say that Dominique is trying to protect not Roark but rather herself, from having to witness what the world might do

to Roark or, more plausibly, from having to witness its lack of appreciation of him. But it is hard to find much rationality in this. Wouldn't it make more sense to allow herself to appreciate and enjoy what Roark can accomplish, however limited and unappreciated it may be, than to destroy it before she can witness it? Does it really make sense to allow an idea [or its manifestation] to exist only when the environment for its reception is perfect and people will appreciate it as they ought? If Dominique were to succeed in destroying Roark, what exactly would she gain? Moreover, why would it not be worthier to fight for the cause, however hopeless, than to try to destroy it (64-65)?

My only explanation for Den Uyl's considerations of Dominique's actions is that she's a true parasitical villain, like Lillian Rearden of **Atlas Shrugged**. She's a true and tragic hero in the Nietzschean tradition, although she's more evil than good, like Lillian, Rand simply saves her, like Hank Rearden.

Just like Gail's tragic Nietzschean good is realistic, so is Dominique's evil realistic—Rand's saving Dominique and making her from tragic evil to heroine at novel's end is not realistic. When Dominique is compared to her parallel character in **Atlas Shrugged**, Lillian Rearden is most like her. Lillian is a parasitical and idle woman who has bitten the hand that has fed her all her life. She lives off of Hank's wealth and schemes with James Taggart and the other looters to take away his main source of happiness—his steel mills. Dominique looks nothing like Hank Rearden, the moral-middle of the way character. Gail Wynand looks most like Rearden, the metal tycoon, whose guilt turns to greatness among the heroes of Galt's Gulch.

Dominique is more of an opportunist than Gail Wynand. Gail's success is based on a profitable opportunity he took to create a newspaper empire based on his own work and effort. Dominique's success at the novel's end is based on a profitable opportunity she took to become a wife with these men, not out of love, but for the titles. She's with them only for the time that they were successful and on top, she lives off them, achieves nothing and does no work for herself, then leaves them when she's bored and they're out of money or less popular. At the novel's end, Howard Roark better remain New York's architect for the rest of his life, because if he doesn't, Dominique will leave him to be, at least the mistress of the successful man on top of the world.

Rand's main shortcoming in **The Fountainhead**, in relation to Nietzscheanism, is that she doesn't bluntly show what she really means. Howard Roark wants to be the true Nietzschean

Superman that Gail Wynand is—not the watered down and hypocritical version which he is: between Gail and Jack London’s Socialist Supermen. In terms of the Nietzschean “will to power”, Howard Roark is an unrealistic and hypocritical character. In reality, the Nietzschean Capitalist Superman, like Frank Cowperwood and Bick Benedict, doesn’t give a damn about personal integrity. Rand’s version doesn’t care about it either, but Howard Roark pretends to care. Personal integrity, while it’s not a bad thing, earns Roark no more money or power than he would have earned anyway.

Being a Nietzschean Superman, especially for such an extreme advocate of capitalism such as Rand, is more about obtaining wealth and power than integrity of the soul, democracy or a just society advocated by London’s Supermen. Roark’s goal, to be New York’s greatest architect, brings new wealth and power with it that Roark has never had at his disposal. Roark has never had the wealth and power of a Cowperwood or Gail. Rand ends her novel before Roark gains this corrupting power. Once Roark experiences wealth, women and art, he will turn from the perfect incorruptible hero into a Nietzschean Superman with a lust for power greater than Gail Wynand or Ellsworth Toohey. Unlike Dominique, Howard Roark is a Nietzschean Superman, but he’s so watered down and imitated that he’s the same unrealistically extreme opposite to Toohey’s evil. Roark’s false and melodramatic image of integrity and goodness loses reality in his character. In the Nietzschean tradition, Gail Wynand is what a true Capitalist Superman hero looks like in the American Imagination and is Ayn Rand’s greatest hero.

CHAPTER 5

Rand's Literary Legacy: Writers Possibly Influenced by Rand's Fiction

In studying the possibilities that the fiction legacy of “the Russian Radical” lives on today through literary, contemporary and obscure authors, a few points must be considered. Because Rand is so openly hated and seldom regarded as a serious novelist in both scholarly and mainstream literary circles, few scholars would even ponder the idea that her work has influenced anyone other than America's massive pop culture of adolescent readers. That being said, the purpose of this chapter may mistakenly be taken as a wholesale “selling” of Ayn Rand's fiction through impractical and unreasonable literary avenues by a fan of her fiction. Although this chapter will relate Rand's name and fiction to writers who probably have never been considered in the same sentences, or even books, with her, defense of the literary merits of **The Fountainhead** and **Atlas Shrugged**, by studying who they've influenced, isn't the aim here.

We must first consider a very important and guiding question for Rand's possible progeny as well as for any writer: what determines literary influence? Because Rand's fiction is so scarcely studied and criticized by scholars, literary or otherwise, fewer pieces of evidence exist on this consideration than most others. Jeff Walker's thorough study of Rand's literature cites Oscar Wilde, H.G. Wells, Rose Wilder Lane, Albert J. Nock and Mark Twain as writers who influenced Rand.¹ However, when considering literary heirs of Rand, Walker says, “The literary historian of the future will be hard put to it to find any discernible influence of Rand's literary example upon contemporary writing, but instead will find traces of an awareness of the cult and its ideological ripples” (328).

Gene Bell-Villada agrees when he argues:

Rand's work will most likely go unread fifty years from now, although her name will probably linger on and stand for something. Remember Samuel Smiles, or Horatio Alger? Literary curiosities, their pulp fictions are now known mostly to cultural historians; yet millions once devoured the recipes for success dished out by those two scribes. Rand had much vaster intellectual pretensions, and through sheer drive and chutzpah plus lots of help from her apostles she won a niche for herself on the fringes of political respectability. As an artist, however, her contribution is nil. . . There is nothing that a self-respecting writer might

learn specifically from her screeds other than how not to write. Rand's twofold compatriot Nabokov, by contrast, stretched the limits of fiction. . . A.S. Byatt's **Possession**, D.M. Thomas' **The White Hotel**, and Ariel Dorfman's **Widows** simply could not exist without the dazzling example of Nabokov's **Pale Fire**. Rand has no such writerly heirs" (240).

Although I am not in total agreement with Bell-Villada's argument about Rand here, my purpose is not to "prove him wrong." Even though this chapter will show some evidence against these points by studying possible writerly heirs of Rand's, her possible lineage will be a more obscure and less acclaimed group compared to the likes of D.M. Thomas. Furthermore, a little more scholarly evidence has evolved on Rand's possible influences since the above article by Bell-Villada was published; most notably, Erika Holzer's **Ayn Rand: My Fiction-Writing Teacher**.

This chapter will examine post 1943 [year of **The Fountainhead**'s publication] works of literature that may *possibly* be influenced by Ayn Rand. It will attempt to make comparative connections to academic, contemporary and obscure works of the mid to late Twentieth Century and early Twenty First that show traces of similar literary form, content, characterization and ideology to Rand's fiction. While the greatness of her fiction and its legacy can never be seriously compared among the best, like Vladimir Nabokov, perhaps Ayn Rand's fiction did leave a legacy which holds some degree of importance to both the American Imagination and literary establishment, no matter how rebellious and unconventional it may seem.

"Of course, mere mentions of Rand do not necessarily translate into influence, especially when many of the mentions are negative. But there is truth to Oscar Wilde's maxim, as enunciated in **The Picture of Dorian Gray**: 'There is only one thing in the world worse than being talked about, and that is not being talked about'.² The fact that Rand has so profoundly entered the Zeitgeist is something that needs to be celebrated. . . In the scholarly world, Rand's thought has been the subject of serious treatment in more and more journals, encyclopedias, texts and books."³

In his article, "The Illustrated Rand," renowned Randian scholar, Chris Matthew Sciabarra has compiled a long list of thirty one authors who have been either influenced by Rand, portray Rand-like heroes in their work or who make outright references to her in it.⁴

Although a study of each and every one of the authors on Sciabarra's list is impractical and beyond the scope of this work, approximately half of the writers on his list will be either studied or referenced in this chapter and connected to the work of Rand.

I will begin with Erika Holzer and Kay Nolte Smith, the two most influenced modern day novelist successors of Ayn Rand. “. . . she [Rand] proudly showed off her novelist ‘children’— Kay Nolte Smith, Erika Holzer, Barbara Branden, and Edith Efron” (Walker 345). In keeping this study strictly fiction, Barbara Branden and Edith Efron, both non-fiction writers, will be omitted. In her semi biographical book, **Ayn Rand: My Fiction Writing Teacher**, Erika Holzer points out, “To my knowledge, I am the only one who had the unprecedented experience of learning to write fiction at Ayn Rand's knee, so to speak, and subsequently going on to become a published novelist” (17). While Jeff Walker and Erika Holzer both give contrasting portrayals of Rand's writing tutelage of Holzer, both show versions of “tough love”⁵.

Kay Nolte Smith and Erika Holzer both share Rand's typical style of content over form. Furthermore, both writers share similar literary traits. The earlier works of both, such as Smith's **The Watcher**, which won the Edgar Allan Poe Award for best first novel, and Holzer's **Double Crossing**, include more consciousness in the narrative than Rand's typical style. Their later works, in the Randian tradition, have less consciousness, more heavy dialogue and action descriptions. For this reason, the early works of both writers are better than their later works. Both look less like Rand in their early work, and more like her in their later works. Despite this fact, traces of Rand can still be seen in these early works as well. Holzer gives passionate and Randian words of inspiration in consciousness:

I will never leave for America unless I first find a way for you to follow. You said that once, Stephan. You found a way, didn't you? Did you arrange your own death to help me? You steal a limousine and smash into a bridge. And here I am, repairing what you smashed for me. Helping to erase every physical trace of your last violent encounter with life in this wretched, wonderful place. This photograph, where your hand hangs over the edge of the bridge—you tried to destroy the lighter. . . your final, protective act. Thank you, my friend, my fellow exile. My brother (**Double Crossing** 366-67).

Where Rand gives the same in heavily winded dialogues:

‘...Every form of happiness is private. Our greatest moments are personal, self-motivated, not to be touched. The things we withdraw from promiscuous sharing. But now we are taught to throw everything within us into public light and common pawing. To seek joy in meeting halls. We haven’t even got a word for the quality I mean—for the self-sufficiency of man’s spirit. It’s difficult to call it selfishness or egotism, the words have been perverted, they’ve come to mean Peter Keating. Gail, I think the only cardinal evil on earth is that of placing your prime concern within other men. I’ve always demanded a certain quality in the people I liked. . . Now I know what it is. A self-sufficient ego. Nothing else matters’ (**The Fountainhead** 608-9).

Unlike Rand’s typical style, Kay Nolte Smith’s passion in **The Watcher**, which sounds like Rand’s heroic and majestic language, which often includes the words ‘values’ and ‘goals’ also comes in consciousness instead of dialogue:

He could not answer. He could only think of the words she had just said. She was a creature who truly cared for nothing, except for a single gross pleasure that would kill her before her time. But that did not matter to her, either. She was dead to every value, even her own life. She had actually achieved, he realized, the goal to which he had aspired for so long. She had succeeded in removing herself from the act of living. In becoming only a watcher (**The Watcher** 289).

Despite this fact, the above passage shows slight traces of the type of character moralization which Smith associates with Rand’s work. “Kay Nolte Smith points out that Rand gives each character ‘a moral label the first time you meet him,’ not allowing readers the pleasure of coming to know the characters and making their own observations about them” (Walker 323). A similar type of Randian ideology, which usually deals with values, motives and moral identity, within prose can be seen in Holzer’s fiction as well:

. . . Out to destroy the worthwhile—the positive—in an obsessive need to disprove a negative? What if this man, who has no discernible values, derives his sense of identity, not from anything he is or wants, but from what he does to other people’s values?

(**Eye for an Eye** 307).

Smith's later works, **Catching Fire** and **Country of the Heart**, like **The Fountainhead**, show many action descriptions instead of those of feelings and consciousness:

His anger took command and sent his body hurtling along the sidewalk as free of pain and dizziness as a bullet, to thud against the gang leader's. Then pain and nausea took control again, turning the world into a kaleidoscope—a blue arc of sky, a brown slash of garbage piled at the curb, a blur of white metal that seemed to be a parked truck, and finally black (**Catching Fire** 9).

Later, they made love. It was good, had always been good: two facets that locked securely. He fell asleep soon, for he had to catch an early shuttle to Washington, but she was restless and went to the window (**Country of the Heart** 27).

Sentiments for Rand's literary style can be seen in both Holzer's biographical book and her second novel, **Eye for an Eye**.

In the tradition of Rand, Holzer says, "I would create characters people could root for. I would write a novel that featured men and women capable of heroic struggles" (Holzer 102-03). Holzer does this in **Eye for an Eye** as she tries to share the hero's passions with the reader and make us sympathize with her struggles:

By what right do they spill our blood?
By whose authority do they plunder our lives?
Who told them they could wipe us out of existence—
And go unpunished?
Will we stand by while they rob our homes?
Will we turn the other cheek while they kill our children?
Wring our hands while they wield knives and baseball bats?
While they casually take a life?

I was on my feet with the rest, hands gripping the balcony rail, pirates and preachers forgotten. Tony coughed, breaking the spell, so that I became part observer, part member of the audience, able to appreciate—able to experience—the crescendo: these people gripped by his words, his will, into an iron fist. In the moment when I perceived his essence as an avenging angel, I felt suspicion recede like some

nocturnal creature fleeing from the sun (**Eye for an Eye** 130).

In the typical Randian style, these passions are shared by Holzer through descriptions of actions and words. As she was taught by Rand, “Write about what you feel, Erika. It may or may not be courtroom drama. That’s beside the point. Write from two perspectives—one positive, the other negative. Choose something you’re impassioned about, and something that makes your blood boil” (Holzer 31).

Holzer took this advice and tried to apply it in her writing. “The moment I was exposed to Ayn Rand’s novels, I felt in some inchoate way that I was on a path I would follow the rest of my life. The moment I developed literary aspirations, I knew that Ayn’s ‘style’—her whole approach to plot-oriented fiction—was the specific direction I wanted to take” (Holzer 112-113). About Rand’s influence, she said, “I think people who get pulled into ideas through fiction get pulled in by their emotions. . . she [Rand] hooked me because I cared about the characters and the plot and I entered that world” (Walker 323).

These emotions could be touched in the works of both Smith and Holzer with majestic language that described larger-than-life heroes and situations. “Readers of fiction—then and now—harbor a fundamental need, an aesthetic yearning if you will, for the larger-than-life in their life” (Holzer 128). “Stephan Brodsky, an imposing figure in his Soviet air force uniform, strode up to them, a disapproving scowl on his face, a What’s-going-on-here! message in his eyes” (**Double Crossing** 28). “The Martin Granger Institute, Lauren thought; was he now in the heaven—or hell—in which he had not believed, smiling at his reward? Or would he consider it too showy?. . . In the beginning, he’s made her feel she was a worthy partner for the rising Harvard scholar—‘a coupling of Beauty and the Beast,’ as he used to say. Then, all too soon, he’d become the sharp, brooding man who would tell her to look as spectacular as possible when they went to a ceremonial affair and, when they were alone, would say, ‘I don’t know how people can take me seriously when you parade yourself as one of the seven physical wonders of the world’” (**The Watcher** 15-16).

Both writers also deal with the Randian theme of heroes breaking free against socially dictated oppression. Just like Rand’s **We the Living**, Smith’s **Country of the Heart** and Holzer’s **Double Crossings** both portray protagonists of repressive Socialist states who desire greater freedom to express their arts and sciences in prosperous Capitalistic societies:

Your papa must go where his works are understood

and loved and he will be free to write what he wishes, where they will not admire his music one year and keep it from being played the next. Your papa cannot live and work where they give him prizes but refuse to give him work unless he tips his cap to them like a serf, where the son of some school friend has more power over his life than—(**Country of the Heart** 54).

. . . It was a matter of inches. He groaned, slid forward, touched metal. . . Brodsky's blond head was inching forward again. One blood-stained hand strained for the cigarette lighter, pushed—and tensed, as the lighter disappeared over the side into a black void. Then the hand, a few inches from freedom, lay still (**Double Crossing** 29-30).

Of her first novel, in **Ayn Rand: My Fiction Writing Teacher**, Erika Holzer says:

My Iron Curtain 'thriller,' for example, is not a thriller at all. Since it uses espionage only as a backdrop for a novel with a serious theme—man's right to be free—**Double Crossing** is more appropriately classified as romantic realism in the tradition of Ayn Rand's novels. While I become sufficiently acquainted with the thriller genre so that I was in a position to use certain aspects of it when I needed to, my central focus throughout was on the most effective way to dramatize my ideas, not to follow any particular guidelines attached to the espionage genre" (148).

The narrative skill displayed in portraying these larger-than-life heroes in exciting situations of the thriller genre makes the difference in Holzer's novel. Since romantic realism is not really a literary genre in itself, Rand's successors usually fall into genres such as detective fiction, science fiction, popular fiction and literature.

Another striking similarity to Rand's is the setting descriptions of Holzer and Smith. All three writers work to integrate passionate language into vivid setting descriptions:

She saw it again: his fingertips pressed to the stone, his long fingers continuing the straight lines of the tendons that spread in a fan from his wrist to his knuckles. . . She thought of that, sitting before the glass shelf of her dressing table. She looked at the crystal objects spread before her; they were like sculptures in ice—they proclaimed her own cold,

luxurious fragility; and she thought of his strained body, of his clothes drenched in dust and sweat, of his hands (**The Fountainhead** 207).

She closed her eyes and saw the stage—the sky that was a spread of darkness, the tongues of fire that would begin to lick upward and spread the red-and-yellow glow of their appetite along the horizon. Gradually their light would climb the pillar of Erik’s body to find his face, striking the sharp lines of his nose and mouth, finally meeting the intensity of his eyes. . . She had been made of more elements than tears—of earth and air, as well, and fire (**Catching Fire** 263-64).

Long, hot streaks of red and orange and yellow tore across the cobblestone square and across the bridge—and keeping obediently to the right-hand side, connected with the objects of their fiery mission. The earsplitting clatter of the guns blotted our two other sounds: Aleksei screamed Luka’s name. Brenner screamed as he fell, bleeding, to the pavement (**Double Crossings** 377).

This same type of vivid setting description can also be seen in the detective fiction of Mickey Spillane and Ian Fleming, two writers who are both praised by Rand and show literary evidence of her influence. “If a student of Objectivism loved Mickey Spillane’s **The Girl Hunters** (1963), that was an expression of good literary taste, [according to Rand and her followers] Spillane’s proper metaphysics and style transcending the limitations of his genre” (Walker 125). “The only contemporary novels she [Rand] admires—other than her own—are detective stories, and for years the one writer she regarded as an island of Romanticism in a sea of aesthetic boredom and moral depravity was Mickey Spillane” (Harrison 68).

Evidence that stylistic form and content similarities to Rand exist in the work of Spillane and Fleming. Post 1943 novels of each writer, Fleming’s **You Only Live Twice** and Spillane’s **I, The Jury**, show Rand’s type of setting descriptions:

At six o’clock in the evening, the deep bell tolled briefly from the castle and dusk came like the slow drawing of a violet blind over the day. Crickets began to zing in a loud chorus, and geckos chuckled in the shrubbery. The pink dragonflies disappeared and large

horned toads appeared in quantities from their mud holes on the edge of the lake and, so far as Bond could see through his spyhole, seemed to be catching gnats attracted by the shining pools of their eyes (**You Only Live Twice** 194).

The anteroom was ultramodern, but well appointed. Chairs that looked angular were really very comfortable. Whoever decorated the interior had a patient's mental comfort well in mind. The walls were an indescribable shade of olive, cleverly matched with a dull-finished set of drapes. The windows admitted no light, instead, the soft glow came from hidden bulbs installed directly into the wall. On the floor an ankle-thick carpet muffled any sound of footsteps. . . With a full day's growth of beard and the wrinkled ruin of a suit I had on, I was lower than the janitor in her estimation (**I, The Jury** 30).

According to Rand, "Detective, adventure, science-fiction novels and Westerns belong, for the most part, to the category of popular fiction. . . their emphasis is on action, but their heroes and villains are abstract projections, and a loosely generalized view of moral values, of a struggle between good and evil, motivates the action. [As contemporary examples of the best in this class: Mickey Spillane [and] Ian Fleming]" (**The Romantic Manifesto** 110).

In her non-fiction work, **The Art of Fiction**, Ayn Rand studies a select passage from Mickey Spillane's **One Lonely Night**:

Nobody ever walked across the bridge, not on a night like this. The rain was misty enough to be almost fog-like, a cold gray curtain that separated me from the pale ovals of white that were faces locked behind the steamed-up windows of the cars that hissed by. . . Some place over there I had left my car and started walking, burying my head in the collar of my raincoat, with the night pulled in around me like a blanket. I walked and I smoked and I flipped the spent butts ahead of me and watched them arch to the pavement and fizzle out with one last wink. . .**6**

Of this passage, Rand comments, "This is Romantic writing: the author selects the essentials [and does so very well]. . . What is most typical of the setting the author wants to establish? The

faces in the cars—. . . Where a lesser writer would have said merely ‘the faces,’ Spillane describes the way they would actually be seen; it is exactly what those faces would look like under the circumstances: ‘pale ovals of white’. . . And ‘the cars hissed by’ conveys what cars sound like on wet pavement. I have always wanted to throw this particular description in the faces of the critics who attack Spillane, because it reveals real literary talent. . . ‘burying my head in the collar of my raincoat, with the night pulled in around me like a blanket’ is again a colorful description. Spillane names the essentials and gives the reader a feel of what it is like to walk with a raised collar on a foggy night. The next sentence is the best: ‘I walked and I smoked and I flipped the spent butts ahead of me and watched them arch to the pavement and fizzle out with one last wink’. . . Spillane could have said that the butts ‘fell in an arched line’ or merely ‘fell’; instead, he selects one verb that describes exactly how they fell. And the ‘last wink’ is his best touch: that one last spark sets the mood of the whole scene” (**The Art of Fiction** 132-33).

Not only does Spillane share Rand’s type of setting descriptions, but the romance novel type of action descriptions between the heroic characters looks similar as well:

When they lay in bed together it was—as it had to be, as the nature of the act demanded—an act of violence. . . It was tense as electricity, the force fed on resistance, rushing through wires of metal stretched tight; it was tense as water made into power by the restraining violence of a dam. The touch of his skin against hers was not a caress, but a wave of pain, it became pain by being wanted too much. . . it was the unendurable, the agony, an act of passion—the word born to mean suffering—it was the moment made of hatred, tension, pain—the moment that broke its own elements, inverted them, triumphed, swept into a denial of all suffering, into its antithesis into ecstasy (**The Fountainhead** 283).

She let her arms drop simply at her sides, her hands asking to be held, and her lips wanting to silence mine with a kiss. It was coming, but I dared not stop now. I couldn’t let her speak or I would never be able to keep my promise. . . She was standing in front of me now. I felt a hot glow go over me as I saw what she was about to do. . . Soft, yet so strong. She was so pretty. Young and delicious and exciting (**I, The Jury** 168-70).

“I like the early novels of Mickey Spillane, for his . . . moralistic style” (**The Romantic**

Manifesto 43). Traces of this “moralistic style” can be seen in fiction of both Spillane and Fleming. In both works, these moral examinations are entertaining and slightly comical. In **You Only Live Twice**, the villain, Blofeld gives moral reasoning as to why James Bond is just as bad as he is, or perhaps worse, “You are a common thug, a blunt instrument wielded by dolts in high places. Having done what you are told to do, out of some mistaken idea of duty or patriotism, you satisfy your brutish instincts with alcohol, nicotine, and sex while waiting to be dispatched on the next misbegotten foray. . . you were successful in destroying two projects of my genius. You and your government would categorize these projects as crimes against humanity. . . But try to summon such wits as you possess, Mister Bond, and see them in a realistic light and in the higher realm of my own thinking” (214-15).

In **I, The Jury**, Mike Hammer reveals practically the entire motivations of the femme fatale villain in a single paragraph when he says, “Oh, you made money enough, but not enough. You are a woman who wanted wealth and power. Not to use it extravagantly, but just to have it. How many times have you gone into the frailty of men and seen their weaknesses? It made you afraid. You no longer had the social instinct of a woman—that of being dependent upon a man. You were afraid, so you found a way to increase your bank account and charge it to business. A way which you’d never be caught, but a dirty way. The dirtiest way there is—almost” (167).

Rand goes on to say, “Observe the extraordinary popularity of Mickey Spillane and Ian Fleming. . . This is not to say that the novels of Spillane and Fleming project a faultlessly rational sense of life; both are touched by the cynicism and despair of today’s ‘malevolent universe’; but, in strikingly different ways, both offer the cardinal element of Romantic fiction: Mike Hammer and James Bond are heroes” (**The Romantic Manifesto** 134).

Just like Roark, these heroes must win at all costs, “Bond took his usual place across the desk. . . He noticed that there was no file. . . in front of the chair. . . the In and Out baskets were both empty. Suddenly he felt really bad about everything—about letting M. down, letting the Service down, letting himself down. . . We have nothing for you, they seemed to say. You’re no use to us any more. Sorry It’s been nice knowing you, but there it is” (**You Only Live Twice** 25). Mike Hammer says, “ ‘Don’t worry, I don’t underrate the cops. But cops can’t break a guy’s arm to make him talk, and they can’t shove his teeth in with the muzzle of a .45 to remind him that you aren’t fooling. I do my own let work, and there are a lot of guys who will tell me what I want to know because they know what I’ll do to them if they don’t’” (**I, The Jury** 11).

The same hard boiled and Hollywoodesque comical language of Spillane, “ ‘How c-could you?’ [shoot the beautiful femme fatale villain] she gasped./I only had a moment before talking to a corpse, but I got it in./ ‘It was easy,’ I said” (**I, The Jury** 174), can be seen in Rand. When Gail Wynand dates Dominique for the first time and realizes that she’s much greater than his run-of-the-mill mistress, he says, “‘I expected a beautiful slut who was a friend of Ellsworth Toohey’/They laughed together” (**The Fountainhead** 446). Rand actually makes an interesting point relating comedy to the portrayal of heroes. “In Fleming’s novels, James Bond is constantly making witty, humorous remarks, which are part of his charm. . . Remember that humor is not an unconditional virtue and depends on its object. One may laugh *with* a hero, but never *at* him—just as a satire may laugh at some object, but never at itself. A composition that laughs at itself is a fraud on the audience” (**The Romantic Manifesto** 138).

The third person point of view in Rand’s novels creates a more serious tone and all but eliminates the hard boiled nature of her heroes. The same type of gritty-but-comical one liners can be seen in Gore Vidal’s **Myra Breckinridge**, another novel possibly influenced by Rand. In the novel, when Buck Loner is defending the purpose of his acting school to the protagonist, “‘Now they are good kids. . . and they hitchhike to sunny California in order that they might be stars, like me. . . they study at the Academy where we do our darnedest to bring out the creative potential of each and every one. . .’ she replies, ‘Can the brochure, daddy,’ I said, surprising myself by the Fifties jargon that so amused Myron but rather repelled me. ‘You’re in business to make money, and you do’” (51-52).

Gore Vidal claims to never have read Rand’s fiction. “Ayn Rand is a rhetorician who writes novels I have never been able to read,” and argues against her philosophy of selfishness and egotism, “For to justify and extol human greed and egotism is to my mind not only immoral, but evil. . . Miss Rand now tells us that what we have thought was right is really wrong. [Rand’s] lesson should have read: One for one and none for all”.⁷ However, he has read at least some of her non-fiction, “She [Rand] has just published a book, **For The New Intellectual**. . . it is a collection of penseses and arias from her novels and it must be read to be believed”.⁸ While I am not questioning Vidal’s credibility here, and it is important to note that his comments above were made about seven years before **Myra Breckinridge** was published, it is very hard to believe that he had not read any of Rand’s fiction before writing his 1968 masterpiece.

Vidal and Rand also take on some artistic and biographical similarities. Both have been

screenwriters and lived in Hollywood during their lives.⁹ Furthermore, in their novels, **The Fountainhead** and **Myra Breckinridge**, evidence of a Hollywood cultural influence can be detected. “Rand describes herself as a Romantic Realist. Romantic? Yes—if one’s ideas of romance derive from gothic novels and forties movies [‘Nothing but your body, that mouth of yours, and the way your eyes would look at me if . . .’]” (Harrison 71). Barbara Grizzuti Harrison goes on to show evidence of Rand’s Hollywood influence in her fiction and attributes her apprenticeship under director Cecil B. DeMille.¹⁰ “[In Rand’s novels]. . . The heroes make Superman-dramatic unannounced visits to the always immaculate penthouse apartments of their waiting perfumed heroines. They come bearing crude bracelets made of some new revolutionary steel they’ve invented” (Harrison 73).

Melissa Jane Hardie gives further evidence to this idea when she asserts:

Ayn Rand borrowed from Hollywood discourses of extravagance and high seriousness to produce herself as a camp figure. . . For the immigrant Rand, acculturation as an American subject was a Hollywood narrative, not simply scripted by her own enjoyment and study of Hollywood products, but effected by joining the economy of Hollywood in various roles from early in her new life, including work in the studio of Cecil B. DeMille. In her text, as Hunt notes, she relies upon a cinematic register for the panoramic and exaggerated representation of feeling: ‘DeMille’s most memorable imagery—roiling mobs, hulking muzhiks, spectacular train wrecks, and art deco orgies in a zeppelin moored over Manhattan—can all be traced in Rand’s fiction’ (375).¹¹

Of Gore Vidal’s Hollywood cultural influence in the 1968 novel, Dennis Altman comments, “Vidal claimed he named Myra after a drag queen, but the name “Myra may be an anagram of “Mary,” a common word for an effeminate homosexual. She was inspired by the huge statue of a buxom woman who stood, revolving slowly, on Sunset Boulevard outside the hotel, the Chateau Marmont, where Vidal spend much of his scriptwriting days in the 1950s. . . The novel [**Myra Breckinridge**] is both a tribute to the Hollywood movies of the 1930s and 1940s and, as John Mitzel argues, a move by Gore to liberate himself from his own generation and move with the new mores of the late 1960s” (131).¹²

Gore Vidal was influenced by Ayn Rand’s fiction before the writing of **Myra Breckinridge**. Although its style doesn’t resemble Rand’s, its main characters, ideas and content

look almost exactly like those of **The Fountainhead**—just not as serious looking to the reader. **Myra Breckinridge** looks like a satirized, down to earth and more realistic version of Rand’s 1943 work. Vidal’s 1968 novel shows us a more lighthearted version of Rand’s same brutal optimism, egotistical greed and anti-heroism. The love/hate relationship between Vidal’s Myra and Rusty is the same one as that of Rand’s Dominique and Roark. Like Roark, Rusty is a naïve narcissist who is turned brutish by his relationship with the antiheroic, almost ‘femme fatale’ type of woman.

According to Susan Baker and Curtis S. Gibson, “Rusty also begins as a macho archetype: the gentle hunk. After being raped by Myra, however, he becomes a brutal lover, one whose masculinity is reaffirmed in the act of beating up women. . . Dr. Montag assures Myron that the rape merely brought Rusty’s true nature to the surface” (158). “After class, Rusty came to my office and sat on the straight chair beside the desk, listing to one side, legs wide apart. He was not in the least nervous. In fact, he was downright defiant, even contemptuous of me, so secure did he think himself in his masculine superiority (**Myra Breckinridge** 69). . . Like so many male narcissists, he is, paradoxically, modest: he enjoys revealing himself but only on his own terms” (74).¹³ Howard Roark does the same thing in gradually revealing his greatness to his peers and coordinates on the surface, but showing his true narcissism within himself to others, “He [Roark] always looked straight at people and his damnable eyes never missed a thing, it was only that he made people feel as if they did not exist” (**The Fountainhead** 17).

Just like Dominique, Myra is the antiheroic and egotistical bitch who manipulates the downfall of others. “No man will ever possess Myra Breckinridge, though she will possess men, in her own good time and in ways convenient to her tyrannous lust” (**Myra Breckinridge** 17). Just like Myra, although not using the specific words, Dominique admits that she’s a bitch, “I don’t mind. I know what I am. Go ahead and say it. I’m just a bitch” (**The Fountainhead** 279). Myra is so viciously villainous against men that she must not only subordinate men to her will and beg them for a challenge, but must also humiliate and degrade them. “For Myra, all relationships are battles for power, and the rape, for which she admits some regret, is necessary to destroy male supremacy” (Altman 132). The same holds true for all relationships of the major characters of **The Fountainhead**—they are all power struggles. In Myra, Vidal shows Rand’s same type of man worship, in the place of God, and the achievement of greatness through brutal means, “Having raped his [Rusty’s] manhood, I shall now seduce his girl. Beyond that, ambition

stops and godhood begins” (**Myra Breckinridge** 209).

Both characters in the two novels do the same basic antiheroic acts of destroying themselves and others. Like Myra and Rusty, Roark and Dominique are both oppressors and victims. Roark is oppressed by society and rapes Dominique, she in turn, as a result of her rape, works to destroy Roark, Gail and Peter. While raping Rusty, Myra says, “Now, in the person of Rusty, I was able, as Woman Triumphant, to destroy the adored destroyer [Rusty]” (**Myra Breckinridge** 195). Myra’s point of view is everything in this work in that it makes the rape incidents of Vidal’s work look less grim and violent than those of Rand’s. As Myra’s humiliated victim, Rusty later rapes Letitia. Just like Rand’s Roark and Dominique, Rusty, Myra and Letitia all experience humiliation and pain before finding self fulfillment.

Letitia finds self fulfillment after her greatest sexual experience with Rusty [in which she is also paralyzed by the brutality of the rape]. Rusty achieves the ultimate goal of becoming a movie star [even though he turns homosexual as an indirect result of Myra’s rape] just like Roark finally becomes New York’s greatest architect. Myra nearly commits suicide when she discovers that she’s a transsexual before experiencing the typical Randian happy ending of self-fulfillment for the hero, “. . . I nearly lost my mind and tried to kill myself when I learned that my breasts had been removed, once Mary-Ann realized that I was really Myron Breckinridge, her attitude changed towards me completely. . . we were married in Vegas, and so were able at last to settle down and live a happy and normal life. . . happiness, like the proverbial bluebird, is to be found in your own backyard if you just know where to look” (**Myra Breckinridge** 276-77).¹⁴

Just like Rand’s literary successor, Erika Holzer, stated that, “I have this irrepressible sense of optimism about life in general and people in particular. . . Nor am I ashamed to admit that I’m a sucker for happy endings” (31-32). These same types of endings can be seen in Fannie Hurst’s **Anywoman** and Edna Ferber’s **Giant**, two more novels that show signs of Rand’s influence, “He was trapped, and he was hers, and he was desirable, and in that crazing way, the turn of his head or the touch of his hand, could give rebirth to happiness. . . Dandling the wheelchair, Rose looked softly into the dozing face of her husband/‘If I had my life to live over again, darling—I would do it exactly this way” (**Anywoman** 309). “. . . ‘And then I thought about our Jordan and our Luz and I said to myself, well, after a hundred years it looks as if the Benedict family is going to be a real success at last’/ As he [Bick] turned, half startled half resentful, to stare at her, the man saw for just that moment a curious transformation in the face of

this middle-aged woman. The lines that the years had wrought were wiped away by a magic hand, and there shone the look of purity, of hope and of eager expectancy that the face of the young girl had worn when she had come, twenty-five years ago, a bride to Texas” (**Giant** 447).

Although Rand lumps Edna Ferber and Fannie Hurst into the same literary category and criticizes their work, similarities to her own work can be seen in both their novels. She labels them as, “Most of the ‘slick magazine’ fiction popular before World War II belongs to this class, with its endless variations on the Cinderella theme, the motherhood theme, the costume-drama theme, or the common-man-with-a-heart-of-gold theme. [For example, Edna Ferber [and] Fannie Hurst] This type of fiction has no plots, only more or less cohesive stories, and no discernible characterizations: the characters are false journalistically, and meaningless metaphysically” (**The Romantic Manifesto** 111).

While this may hold true for their respective works before World War II, both Ferber and Hurst showed striking similarities to Rand’s work after the war. Like **The Fountainhead**, Ferber’s **Giant** was just the opposite to the common-man-with-a-heart-of-gold theme. Ferber’s character, Bick, was the exceptional ruler, somewhat like Gail Wynand, who ruled his kingdom with an iron hand and stony heart.

Rand’s hero, Howard Roark loves and befriends this same type of man. However, he says to Gail Wynand, “Gail, if this boat were sinking, I’d give my life to save you. Not because it’s any kind of duty. Only because I like you, for reasons and standards of my own. I could die for you. But I couldn’t and wouldn’t live for you” (**The Fountainhead** 609). In terms of ideology and characterization, the influence of Rand is not hard to see in Ferber’s novel. When the heir to Bick’s cattle empire, Jordy wants to be a doctor instead of run the ranch, he takes the words right out of Howard Roark’s mouth—“I’d die for Papa if it was a quick choice between his life and mine. But I won’t live for him” (**Giant** 381).

Unlike **Giant** and the Randian fiction tradition, **Anywoman** mentions God worship more than man worship and the heroes do appear to be portrayed with more pure good than the typical Bick Benedict or Howard Roark. “She [Rose-the novel’s heroine] matched serenity. The serenity of the valley. She was serenity. Young and fresh, there was the faint sparkle of dew to the skin. Country-girl complexion, not dried by heavy overlays of make-up. A girl warm and round and quiet of body—and good. Quiet of heart and soul. And good. A girl to lie with, to live with, to plan with and build with” (**Anywoman** 64).

However, Rand's same optimism and unconquerable individual spirit striving for greatness can be seen in Hurst's work, " 'Unless the grand passion bowls you over, one good man is about as good as another. But I say again, don't live half a life. . . Be true to yourself, Rose. Be tolerant. Despise the hates and prejudices and suspicions and pitiful snobberies you see in this God's country of ours. Fix your eyes high as our hills, Rose' / 'I want to'" (**Anywoman** 76). Where Hurst's characters frequently worship God and his creations, ". . . but I pray to God I'll never be dependent on my children (**Anywoman** 12). . . "I like to live right in God's lap (60), Ferber's characters worship men and their creations, "Reata [Ranch] without end, amen!" (**Giant** 379). . . "They came. . . to pay tribute to a Texas institution known as the Benedicts of Reata Ranch" (234).

Another Capitalist as hero novelist in Rand's heyday, who portrayed man worship in his work, was Cameron Hawley. "'Sure, honey, that's old [Avery] Bullard himself up there right now. They say he never goes home. Some nights he works right through. You know what? The other day I saw him getting our of his car. I swear to God I was so close to him I coulda reached out and touched him!'" (**Executive Suite** 31). Of Cameron Hawley, Ronald Merrill asserts, "Though the motives of Hawley's character are hardly those of an Objectivist, the theme of the entrepreneurial businessman as an unappreciated hero who gives society far more than can ever be repaid clearly prefigures Rand's use of the same theme.¹⁵ There is no external evidence to support it, but she may well have been influenced by Hawley's heroes" (68).

Based on the evidence in his two novels, **Executive Suite** and **Cash McCall**, just the opposite to Merrill's argument looks true—Cameron Hawley was influenced by Ayn Rand. Both **Executive Suite** (1952) and **Cash McCall** (1955), are post 1943 novels, published after **The Fountainhead**. While Merrill's argument may be true in the fact that perhaps **Atlas Shrugged** (1957) was influenced by **Cash McCall** (1955), evidence of Rand's influence can clearly be seen in both of Hawley's works. Just like Rand's heroes, Hawley's go from less greed to more. **The Fountainhead** goes from Howard Roark, who claims that power lust is bad,¹⁶ to Hank Rearden who says, "Inasmuch as the formula of Rearden Metal costs much less to produce than you boys can imagine, I expect to skin the public to the tune of a profit of twenty-five percent in the next few years," (**Atlas Shrugged** 224) and John Galt who says he will stop the motor of the world.¹⁷

Hawley's hero, Avery, ". . . was never much concerned about money for its own sake. . . I don't think he was too much concerned about personal power, either—just power for power's sake. I know that's the easy way to explain the drive that any great man has—the lust for power—but I don't think that was true of Avery Bullard. The thing that kept him going was his terrific pride in himself—the driving urge to do things that no other man on earth could do" (**Executive Suite** 332). Hawley goes from this Roark-like type of hero to the more arrogantly greedy "Cash" McCall who says, ". . . I had a selfish motive" (**Cash McCall** 273). . . "If this were the first time it might be different. . . it wasn't. . . McCall had done it again and again, millions upon millions. Everyone knew that. . . every decent right-minded man in Philadelphia knew it was time someone clipped that vulture's wings!" (**Cash McCall** 408).

Executive Suite shows Rand's same beautifully majestic setting descriptions "As she turned she flicked her eyes toward the window through which she could see the sky-thrusting shaft of the Tower, dazzlingly white against the heat-faded blue of the sky. . . In the evening, after the sun had set for the rest of the city, they would sometimes see the upper reaches of the Tower still bathed in an unworldly glow of flame-colored light. On days when clouds came scudding in through the Alleghany passes and filled the whole river valley with gray mist, the top of the Tower would be lost in the sky. It was then that they looked upward most often. . ." (18-19), and her same moral examination of man's soul, whether he's a hero or not, "that same blind zealot's drive that had made Avery Bullard forget everything else in life. . . as if he had been afflicted with some aberration that had made him believe his soul would be measured on a balance sheet where there was no credit for love" (312).

Furthermore, Avery's friend, Jesse Grimm, looks exactly like Rand's Peter Keating. He's a parasite that takes the unearned and portrays a faux image of greatness. "Jesse Grimm had done just that. He knew that he had succeeded. Architects and engineers from all over the country had come to visit and admire and pirate ideas. He carefully accepted their extravagant praise, never allowing it to produce the slightest break in his sheltering shield of modesty, yet storing the words away as a miser hoards a precious treasure" (**Executive Suite** 112).¹⁸

Despite the fact that his novels deal with immortals, the same types of character portrayals and romantically optimistic language can be seen in the work of C.S. Lewis. "In Britain, novelist, essayist, and Christian apologist C.S. Lewis is perhaps a similarly cultish figure with comparable sales [to Rand's]" (Walker 327). Just like Rand's heaven for her heroes is

on top of man's tallest creation, the skyscraper, it is similar for Lewis' characters, "I am going, you see, to the Mountain. . . And all the stories of my gold and amber house, up there against the sky, where we thought we should never really go? . . . The sweetest thing in all my life has been the longing—to reach the Mountain, to find the place where all the beauty came from" (**Till We Have Faces** 66).

Lewis' immortals are also striving to conquer kingdoms and see beauty and greatness—the same larger-than-life goals of the Randian Hero, "We have all had our dream of some other land, some other world, some other way of giving the prizes which would bring us in as the conquerors; leave the smooth, rounded limbs, and the little pink and white faces, and the hair like burnished gold, far behind; their day ended, and ours come" (**Till We Have Faces** 247).

The character traits of the novel's heroine, Orual, look identical to those of Dominique of **The Fountainhead**. Like Dominique and Roark, Orual maintains a love/hate relationship with the character Psyche [who could also represent a part of herself that she loves and hates simultaneously], "It would be folly to get up and go out and call again: Psyche, Psyche, my only love" (197). . . "However I might have devoured Bardia, I had at least loved Psyche truly" (249). . . "Oh Psyche, oh goddess. . . I never wished you well, never had one selfless thought of you. I was a craver"(267).

Not only is Orual a virgin like Dominique, "Being a virgin, I had kept my shape" (204), she also lacks self confidence in her own greatness. Even though Orual kills a King, "I am a great queen. I have killed a man. . . The King's dead. He'll never pull my hair again" (197), she's still unsure of her greatness, "I locked Orual up or laid her asleep as best I could somewhere deep down inside me; she lay curled there" (198). This tragic heroine also sacrifices herself for the greatness of another, ". . . I had cared for Psyche and taught her and tried to save her and wounded myself for her sake" (250). There's also a great trial near the novel's end like that of **The Fountainhead**.¹⁹

In a similar ideological speech that "replaces traditional religion with one of our own," like Roark's courtroom speech in Rand's 1943 novel, appears in Nancy Kress' science fiction work, **Beggars in Spain**:

A man's spirituality, which is only his dignity as a man, rests on his own efforts. Dignity and worth are not automatically conferred by aristocratic

birth. . . A great heir may be a thief, a wastrel, cruel, an exploiter, a person who leaves the world much poorer than he found it. . . No, the only dignity, the only spirituality, rests on what a man can achieve with his own efforts. To rob a man of the chance to achieve, and to trade what he achieves with others, is to rob him of his spiritual dignity as a man. . . Conscription, theft, fraud, violence, welfare, lack of legislative representation—all rob a man of his chance to choose, to achieve on his own, to trade the results of his achievement with others. . . Only freedom—the freedom to achieve, the freedom to trade freely the results of achievement—creates the environment proper to the dignity and spirituality of man (**Beggars in Spain** 24).

In making the transition from the science fiction genre to more down to earth literature, Jean Rhys demonstrates a more realistic version of Rand's same disguised tragic heroes in the rebirth of her career as a Modernist British writer with her novel **Wide Sargasso Sea**. Rhys shows the same type of surface beauty and greatness that hides true hate, isolation and tragedy. Just like Dominique, as Gail's wife, pretends to love him, [marriage is at least a pretension of love] she really makes him suffer because she hates both him and the newspaper he's created. In one scene she makes him sit through a play that she knows will hurt him to watch because it's so bad.²⁰

Although Rhys portrays it more artistically than Rand, her heroine gives us the same good looking disguise through which we can see, if we look beneath the surface, the true hate, madness and isolation, "All the mad conflicting emotions had gone and left me wearied and empty. Sane/ I was tired of these people. I disliked their laughter and their tears, their flattery and envy, conceit and deceit. And I hated the place. . . I hated its indifference and the cruelty which was part of its loveliness. Above all I hated her" (**Wide Sargasso Sea** 172). "In [**Wide Sargasso Sea**] her [Rhys'] deepest themes come together perfectly: that the beauty of the world hides cruelty, that dream reveals reality, that there is no love" (Angier 98).

The key difference between the two heroines is that they are not alienated for the same reasons. Rand's heroes are narcissists who are alienated because of their greatness. They are really too great for the world—and they hate the world for not being great enough for them. Gail Wynand says, "But I can think of something worse still [than a mediocre play making him sick]. . . Letting oneself be martyred by the kind of people [common masses] we saw frolicking

tonight” (**The Fountainhead** 494).

Rhys’ Antoinette is alienated, rejected and hated, because of madness instead of greatness. Nevertheless, Rhys’ portrayal of hateful heroes is more true to life in its pessimism, ambivalence and thinner guise. “In **Wide Sargasso Sea**, Rhys persuasively sets her heroine’s experience in a time and place where we believe life could have been like that for us, anyone. Antoinette is paranoid—but we believe in her isolation, and the malevolence and menace that she feels around her. She is mad, but we sympathize with her” (Angier 99).

Although we probably should feel sorry for Rand’s heroes, she doesn’t intend for us to do this. Despite the portrayal of Antoinette as a tragically hateful and mad heroine, traces of the same Randian optimistic type of language can be seen near the novel’s end. Even if Antoinette is breaking free of her bondage in a dream—the thought of it is presented so beautifully as if it were real. “As soon as I turned the key I saw it hanging, the colour of fire and sunset. The colour of flamboyant flowers. ‘If you are buried under a flamboyant tree,’ I said, ‘your soul is lifted up when it flowers’” (**Wide Sargasso Sea** 185).

Like Dominique ascending to the top of New York’s highest skyscraper at the novel’s end, Antoinette moves up the flight of stairs to the symbolic attic, “I know now that the flight of steps leads to this room where I lie watching the woman asleep with her head on her arms. . . In my dream. . . I got up. . . It was easier this time than ever before and I walked as though I were flying” (**Wide Sargasso Sea** 187). Once she reaches her goal, like any Randian hero, she is free—even if it means freedom from a mad life and hope for happiness in death. “I was outside holding my candle. Now at last I know why I was brought here and what I have to do. There must have been a draught for the flame flickered and I thought it was out. But I shielded it with my hand and it burned up again to light me along the dark passage” (**Wide Sargasso Sea** 190).

The same narcissistic hatred of self and others that we see in the love triangle between Dominique, Gail and Roark can be seen in William Styron’s **Sophie’s Choice**. Nathan is just like Roark, a great man who is an alienated and brutish anti-hero. “Nathan and Sophie are beach nuts. . . They come back here and hump and fight. Boy, do they fight! . . . That Nathan, he makes good money, but he’s a weird one, all right. . .” (**Sophie’s Choice** 42). Just like Dominique leaves Gail for Roark, Sophie leaves, Stingo, the hero who loves her, for the great, but no good brute who loves to hate her and vice versa.

Although Nathan says to her, “I need you like any goddamned insufferable disease I can name. . . I need you like death” (47). . . after a love affair with Stingo, Sophie tragically chooses hate over love. She leaves Stingo’s love and shows her hate for both herself and others when she writes, “I am so fond of you—you must not think bei this I am being cruel. But when I woke I was feeling so terrible and in Despair about Nathan. . . So I must be with Nathan again for whatever that mean. . . Your a great Lover Stingo. I feel so bad, I must go now. . . I love Nathan but now feel this Hate of Life and God. FUCK God and all his Hande Werk. And Life too. And even what remain of Love” (**Sophie’s Choice** 499-500).

This novel show us the same types of alienated and hateful characters as Rand’s, but it is also like Rand’s works in that the characters are tragic and they all make conscious choices and have goals and purposes—the heroes as well as villains. Furthermore, it gives us Rhys’ same type of ending in a different way—a terrible dream followed by a hopefully optimistic reality. the setting descriptions also look similar to Rand’s. “And I slept. I had abominable dreams. . . myself being split in twain by monstrous mechanisms, drowned in a whirling vortex of mud. . . When I awoke it was early morning. I lay looking straight up at the blue-green sky with its translucent shawl of mist; like a tiny orb of crystal, solitary and serene, Venus shone through the haze above the quiet ocean. . . in my mind I inscribed the words: ‘Neath cold sand I dreamed of death/ but woke at dawn to see/ in glory, the bright, the morning star./ This was not judgment day—only morning. Morning: excellent and fair” (**Sophie’s Choice** 515).

These same optimistic hopes, purposes and goals of the Randian hero can also be seen in the works of Simone de Beauvoir. “And I ran, thinking, ‘The blue of the sky will never fade, and there will be more springtimes for me than almond flowers. My happiness will last forever!’” (**All Men Are Mortal** 93). Simone de Beauvoir shows us the same types of feminisms as Rand. The courageous and bold heroines look similar in works of both—majestic, God-like and egotistical. “‘No woman in the world can compare with me. But how can I prove it? . . . I will prove it,’ she fervently said to herself” (**All Men Are Mortal** 5).

Of the two writers, Camille Paglia says, “I find both Simone de Beauvoir and Ayn Rand deficient in humor. . . So I think I have a kind of childlike quality and playfulness that are missing from the dour adulthood of both Simone de Beauvoir and Ayn Rand” (78). This is true for both writers in that Dominique of **The Fountainhead** is so serious about greatness that she leaves the richest and second greatest man in New York [Gail Wynand] for the greatest man who

is not rich [Roark]. Regina, the heroine of **All Men Are Mortal** shows almost an obsession with falling in love with an immortal man. “She [Regina] loved him because he was immortal. And he loved her in the hope that he would once again be able to share the feelings of a mortal. ‘We’ll never make a happy couple,’ she thought” (**All Men Are Mortal** 51).

They both portray women always as high as men—but somehow never truly above or free of them. In **The Fountainhead**, when Dominique ultimately sides with Roark, she agrees to share either greatness or shame, right by his side. She says to Roark, “‘So he [Gail] thinks you’re an ‘unprincipled, antisocial type of man’? Now let him see the Banner smearing me also. . . But, Howard, now we stand together—against all of them. You’ll be a convict and I’ll be an adulteress” (671). “Even Simone de Beauvoir, one of the Founding Mothers of contemporary feminism, concurs that ‘society has always been male; political power has always been in the hands of men’”.²¹

Men either causing joy or pain for women—whichever they choose to make it—can be seen in works of both writers. Neither writer shows women finding self fulfillment without men. “‘In a way I am very feminine,’ said Marcelle to Desroches one day, ‘and yet I can only get on with men’” (**When Things of the Spirit Come First** 20). Although Rand’s queens never rise to the top without their kings, their sharing of greatness is no less great or independently woman than de Beauvoir’s solo acts of the feminist heroine’s victories.

In de Beauvoir’s **When Things of the Spirit Come First**, self-realization and a strengthened spirit comes not with a man’s arrival, but at his departure. “‘My life is finished. . . All I have left is myself’ . . . She closed her eyes: it seemed to her that she was coming back to her real self, as if from a long banishment. . . This road. . . had brought her back to solitude; and never again would she be tempted to escape from herself. . . She was not to look beyond herself for the meaning of her life; she was set free from love, from hope, and from that stifling presence that had taken up all her strength and her time for more than a year. Everything was fine” (**When Things of the Spirit Come First** 45). Furthermore, as an Existentialist writer, traces of Rand’s ideology, language, joy in suffering, loathing of others and even the same rough and love/hate type of sexual descriptions ²² can be seen in de Beauvoir’s work as well:

‘I do not regret the weary years that I spent alone, without love: my joy would not be so splendid if I had not waited for it in tears’ . . . It appeared to her that even happiness itself was too small a matter for

great souls. . . ‘The sacrament of marriage is not a glorification of the body. . . It is the acceptance of our animal nature. But at the same time it insists that this aspect must remain under the control of our will and reason: we must not allow it an independent existence. Yielding to merely physical drives is the denial of our human dignity’ (**When Things of the Spirit Come First** 23-25).

‘Why am I like that? When people are living, when I see them in love and happy, I feel as if someone were twisting a knife in me. . . I proved that their love was nothing but a lie; I proved to Florence that I exist. Let them hate me, let them scorn me—I won’ (**All Men Are Mortal** 6, 10)!

Two other writers who portray this same feminist type of “spirit of woman striving for self-fulfillment and happiness” are mentioned by Rand’s literary disciple—Erika Holzer. In a “how to” section of her work, **Ayn Rand: My Fiction Writing Teacher**, Holzer states that a talented young novelist she knew of, “. . . did an impressive job of igniting her career by earning respect and high praise from such lionized luminaries as Toni Morrison and Joyce Carol Oates” (15). It is quite interesting that Holzer, a Rand successor, would mention these two writers. Both Toni Morrison and Joyce Carol Oates show more realistically pessimistic evidences of Rand’s same tragic heroes, ‘against all odds’ types of struggles and cruel brutality of human nature.

Joyce Carol Oates gives us the same tragic heroine as Dominique. Just like Rand’s heroines, Oates’ anti-heroic protagonists take on heroic “against the odds” types of journeys. In their hopeless struggles to find happiness and self-fulfillment, Oates’ works show the same brutal tragedies with a slight inkling of optimism. “Oates’ tragedies deal with ordinary people who are struggling to make sense of their lives and who work at defining themselves. It is they who endure to ‘ceaseless struggle with the fabric of the universe’. . . Oates knows—as we all do—that there are no final solutions; the important thing is to pursue the right questions and continue the searching. . . The tragic vision which informs Oates’ works reflects her perceptions of the twentieth century—and it yields the hope of a hope” (Grant 119-120).

In Oates’ **Do With Me What You Will**, as Elena develops into a tragic hero through an experimental upbringing as an unloved child model caught between two hateful and warring parents, she faces the same alienation from society as the typical Randian hero. Like Roark and Dominique, Oates’ heroes hate themselves and take it out on others. They are all both oppressors

and victims of the imperfect world. Elena's father kidnaps her and then writes to her mother, ". . . I believe I am in a dangerous phase of my existence, like a phase of malaria, a fever I caught from you and almost died from. . . I want to make up to our daughter for the blight of you, what you did to our marriage, how you made the love between us rot so that it stank and any child could smell it. I want to make up to her for the ugliness of the world through my love. . . You taught me a lesson about people: get close to them and they will destroy you" (**Do With Me What You Will** 24-25).

The lack of love she receives from her mother, Ardis, is truly no better than being kidnapped by her father. "Ardis bragged to the photographers and their assistants and the other models that Elena had been born with a natural gift, that she could sit under those hot lights for half an hour, not seeing anything, not moving her face, not even sniffing, hardly breathing; she was a little doll" (**Do With Me What You Will** 53). Ardis says to her, ". . . you'd better change your tune. . . There won't always be a mother to pay for your food and take care of you. . . I think she pretends to be very stupid just to get out of work. Elena, honey. . . could you really be that stupid, to stare into the lights for an hour and not say anything"(55)?

This hate makes her alienated and between two extremes of happiness and sadness. She's happy in isolation and too good for the world she's living in—like Rand's typical hero. "Everything was still, inside the motion of the wind and water. It was strangely silent, inside, and unhuman, very consoling. . . no one could touch her, no one was even watching her" (525). . . In amazement she thought of how she had nearly died and had wanted to die. She had really wanted to die. Her existence had nearly ebbed to nothing. She could not understand this, now. Now she wanted to live" (**Do With Me What You Will** 545). "In the whole fictional world Oates has created, there is not one convincingly fulfilled or happy woman" (Grant 29). Rand's Dominique is not truly fulfilled or happy either, Rand just makes her appear this way. Like Morrison's Sula, Dominique has no original identity. She's a mimic who takes on the identities of her lovers. Her identity moves from the 'mediocrity of Peter Keating, to Gail and Roark. She takes on the goals, dreams and personalities of her men, she has no individuality of her own.

Just like **The Fountainhead**, **Do With Me What You Will** shows the dark side of human nature—hatred, with violence and brutality. "There is violence in [**Do With Me What You Will**—kidnapping, murder, brutality—but it is relegated to a lower plane, it is secondary to Elena's deep, personal struggle to achieve a sense of her own identity and to fulfill herself"

(Grant 59). Just like Elena's father kidnaps her to get revenge against the mother in this novel of Oates, Erika Holzer's **Eye for an Eye** shows the same violence and brutality of a criminal society and a burning passion for revenge out of hatred. The protagonist, Karen, says to the villain, "People like you contaminate everything you touch. You're worthless, Kagan. You lack even the nobility of the animals you pretend to love. People like you. . . aren't even human. . . Tell him about Lee, Kagan. . . or else I take aim at the heart you haven't got. At this distance, even a lousy shot like me can't miss" (**Eye For an Eye** 308-09).

Because of the hate that she is raised with, she makes a similar choice as Rand's Dominique and Styron's Sophie to leave the man who will worship her [Marvin] for the brute that she will worship [Morrissey]. She's more happy in hate than in love. "Elena yearning to step away, away from him, and her lover yearning to close the door, to escape. . . She could see over his shoulder the comfortable shabbiness of his life. . . She felt. . . an excitement. . . that her life would begin. Yes, he would come down to her. . . because she had felt, in herself, that terrible need of his, in the very instant of his denial, his voicing of that ugly word No" (**Do With Me What You Will** 557-59).

Just like the reunion of Roark and Dominique in **The Fountainhead**—two people who love to hate each other, Oates also celebrates the happy future life that Elena and Morrissey will have hating one another. Like **The Fountainhead**, it's the same optimistic ending for a novel showing the passionate love for hate. "When he [Morrissey] appeared, exactly as she had imagined he would—dark-haired, in a rush, a man in his mid-thirties—she was not prepared for their sudden, surprised smiles. They smiled as if seeing each other for the first time, a look between them of pure kinship, of triumph: and in that instant they forgot everything else" (**Do With Me What You Will** 561).

Toni Morrison shows us the same anti-heroism and enduring hate to find love as Rand. Like Rand's fiction, her novels **Sula** and **Beloved** show us heroines who nearly cut off the head to cure the headache. Just like Dominique must endure rape in order to achieve greatness at Roark's side, Sethe must endure traumatic memories of institutionalized rape to "never forget" the horrors of slavery or the murder of Beloved. By the vampire-like ghost Beloved, Sethe is choked and drained of lifeforce, "You made her [Sethe] choke/ I kissed her neck. I didn't choke it. The circle of iron choked it" (**Beloved** 101). . . "They grew tired, and even Beloved, who was getting bigger, seemed nevertheless as exhausted as they were. . . Listless and sleepy with

hunger, Denver saw the flesh between her mother's [Sethe's] forefinger and thumb fade" (**Beloved** 242).

Although **Beloved's** purpose was important, to remember the dehumanizing pain of all **Beloveds** on the Middle Passage, the pain endured by Sethe and **Beloved's** ghost is perhaps no less than if Sethe allowed her daughter to live through slavery, "Beloved wasn't interested. She said when she cried there was no one. That dead men lay on top of her. That she had nothing to eat. Ghosts without skin stuck their fingers in her and said beloved in the dark and bitch in the light" (**Beloved** 241).

In **Sula**, the townspeople of Medallion must endure the backstabbing and ostracism of Sula in order to strengthen themselves by having an enemy to stand united against and fight. Nel must suffer betrayal at the hands of her friend, Sula, before finding true self-realization. "Ooo no, not Sula. . . again she thought of Sula as though they were still friends and talked things over. That was too much. To lose Jude [her husband whom Sula sleeps with] and not have Sula to talk to about it because it was Sula that he had left her for" (**Sula** 95). At the novel's end, Nel discovers, in her self-realization, that she was truly missing Sula and not Jude, "We was girls together. . . O Lord, Sula. . . girl, girl, girlgirlgirl" (**Sula** 149).

In **Atlas Shrugged**, the world must endure virtual anarchy in order to be cleansed of the parasitical looters and saved by its great "world movers." It must go through a "Great Depression" of people starving and dying from lack of good quality people in order to experience "extreme prosperity". It's a cure for Socialism—the looters' regime of heavy governmental control—with Fascism—Laissez Faire or extreme Capitalism in which the inhabitants of "Galt's Gulch"—perhaps a group of 15-20 Robber Barons—control the money and power of an entire society with little or no laws to govern them.

Jeff Allen, a man of great ability who is turned into a tramp by the depression caused from the strike of the elite "world movers," has to face near starvation and death before being offered a job on Dagny's railroad. "I've been bumming around the country for six months. . . mostly day work it was. Mostly on farms. . . they [the farmers] don't like to see a man starving, but they're only one jump ahead of starvation themselves. . . they don't have any work, they haven't any food. . . I don't think I'd mind it much now, the dying. . . Only I think it's a sin to sit down and let your life go, without making a try for it (**Atlas Shrugged** 614-615).²³

Irwin Shaw's novels show Randian heroes "letting their lives go" as either wild and

young fools with idealistic dreams of greatness or past their prime old sages who mostly reminisce on the happy climaxes of their lives which they will never reach again. Shaw's works of fiction deal with the Randian themes of achieving greatness and/or life fulfillment.

Nevertheless, **Evening in Byzantium**, unlike **The Fountainhead** or **Atlas Shrugged**, show the hero after he has already reached his highest point of greatness. Shaw shows Rand's heroes, they're just washed up and usually juxtaposed with younger versions of themselves. When Craig, the protagonist, reads a letter from his idealistic daughter, who shows hints of Dominique's same self loathing and elopes with a washed up writer who is an enemy of his, evidence of this can be seen. It sounds as if the daughter is also writing about her dad's life:

‘Dear Daddy. . . I’m a coward. . . so I’m taking the coward’s way out. . . Well, perhaps when you’re twenty years old, five days are a long time to figure out how to waste your life. . . I know the arguments, I know the arguments. He’s too old for me, he’s a drunk, he’s poor, he’s out of fashion, he’s not the handsomest man in the world, he’s been married three times. . . He needs me. He needs to be esteemed . . . He thinks I’m something extra-special, and he says he fell in love with me that first day on the beach . . . He hasn’t touched a drink in two days’. . . Some day, Craig thought, I am going to make up a list for her. One thousand easy ways to be a victim (**Evening in Byzantium** 310-12).

In Rand's work, we only see the downfall of the hero before, never after, achieving greatness. We only see the downfall of the villains after achieving greatness. Furthermore, Rand seems to imply that her heroes will always reach for the sky—the sky's the limit. Even from the rich and bored Gail Wynand, we never see true fleeting greatness. Unlike Gail, Craig is truly great no more, his fame and fortune have both run out. Fleeting for Rand is being the second greatest hero in the novel—this is unrealistic. Only Wynand's popularity, spirituality and self-fulfillment decline—never his wealth. A realistic hero like Shaw's Craig would probably be glad to trade Wynand spirituality and self-fulfillment, and maybe even popularity, for wealth.²⁴

While Shaw shows more real versions of the Randian hero, Terry Goodkind shows more fantasy versions. In Terry Goodkind's fantasy novel, **Faith of the Fallen**, Rand's language and ideology are quite easy to see along with her type of majestic glamorization of man's greatness. “Nicci had been a slave to everyone of need. . . Her life was hers by right. She belonged to no one. . . She had no right to another's life, as they had no right to hers” (734-35). . . The statue of

the man and woman seized Kahlan's imagination with their nobility of spirit. She felt tears run down her cheeks, and then she was weeping openly. . . at the majesty, the dignity, the beauty, of what stood before her. . . As she moved past, Kahlan saw then that the curve of the sundial had words on the back, 'Your life is yours alone. Rise up and live it' (739-40).

Goodkind's novel shows stark examples of Randian philosophy, "Every person's life is theirs by right. An individual's life can and must belong only to himself, not to any society or community, or he is then but a slave. . . Surrendering reason to faith in these men sanctions their use of force to enslave you—to murder you. You have the power to decide how you will live your life" (750). This work of fantasy also gives us her same happy ending, "Kahlan learned contentedly against his shoulder as they watched men, filled with pride, smiling while they worked on the statue standing before those columns./In Altur'Rang, there was a new spirit./In the former heart of the Order beat freedom" (**Faith of the Fallen** 785).

In contrast to Goodkind's work, similarities to the Russian American author within the dense prose of James P. Hogan's novel, **Endgame Enigma**, are not as easy to see. Despite the fact that Hogan's language doesn't resemble Rand's very much, he gives us the same fast paced action descriptions: "The steward disappeared. Earnshaw waited for a few seconds, and then carried the ladder out into the corridor. He positioned it in the center of the floor underneath the translucent panel covering the light, climbed up, and had just begun undoing the fastenings when Paula emerged from the ladies room. She was wearing a maintenance engineer's uniform, too, now. Her face had shed its makeup, and she had acquired dark hair" (**Endgame Enigma** 24).

Rand's same long winded "telling what happened" type of dialogues are a constant in this work as well:

'Nasty kids they've got—especially him, that one. That day there was paint all over our window and down the wall, they tried to say it was the two little Bryokov boys from round the corner—and they're no angels. . . A real mess he made of it. . . You've never seen such an ugly color. Kind of purple, like the stuff that tart across the street plasters all round her eyes when she goes out, wobbling along on those heels with her skirt up the top of her legs—you can tell she's up to no good. . . They're the kind who make the world what it is—never a good word to say to anyone. I can't understand them at all' (**Endgame Enigma** 395).

While this passage also shows traces of Rand's trademark moral labeling of characters, another describes a building with the same type of personification as that of **The Fountainhead**.

"McCain peered out with him and found himself staring out of the sheer face of a monstrous precipice of metal. . .one of these diagonals partly crossed the section that McCain had tried to cut first, which was why he had been unable to move it" (**Endgame Enigma** 363). "From its center, the skeleton of the Wynand Building rose, completed, to the sky. The top part of the frame still hung naked, an intercrossed cage of steel. Glass and masonry had followed its rise, covering the rest of the long streak slashed through space" (**The Fountainhead** 693-94).

Just like Hogan, Helen Knode's crime novel, **The Ticket Out** also closely resembles Rand's style of fiction. Knode shows her same colorful scene descriptions: "Her hair was dark where the water had soaked up to her ears. Her eyes were almost shut; a green half-moon showed under one lid, white showed under the other. Her skin had a healthy flush, an effect produced by condensation and the sun on pink porcelain. The bathwater was pink, too, from the porcelain, and diffused blood" (**The Ticket Out** 15). Even though her work is told in a first person point of view, Knode also shows the same type of fast paced action-filled narrative, "The pool house felt fine in the daylight. In fact, the only spooky part about walking in there was how unspooky it felt" (46). . . I rolled over and flinched: the lamplight hurt my eyes. I needed to go to the bathroom. . . I limped to the bathroom and went. Feeling sticky and gross, I sponged off with a wet washcloth and rinsed my hair" (**The Ticket Out** 310).

Unlike **The Ticket Out**, L. Neil Smith's **Henry Martyn** misses very little in the way of Randian influence. His work of science fiction shows similar ideology, "The human personality is constant. It never changes over the eons. . . The human personality understands only wallowing self-gratification and the brute force of authority necessary to temper it. . ." (**Henry Martyn** 23). This is similar to Rand's 'A is A' quote of Aristotle and her antiheroic ways of fighting fire with fire.

The setting descriptions and play-by-play action narrative are quite convincing as well, "Beneath a sky the color of wet iron, underlit by fitful lightnings, a cold wind swept the moss-covered, somehow defeated—looking contours of the Burial Plain of Somon, carrying with it moisture which was not quite rain" (**Henry Martyn** 388). "It was a small room (404). . . His adversary slashed and ducked. . . Henry Martyn thrusting the same instant. Bowmore fell back, losing ground. . . Henry Martyn lunged. . . perhaps foolishly to grapple with the larger man

again” (401). Let’s not forget the happy ending either, “Each [vessel] pulsed with inner light. . . bearing the first real progress for mankind in a thousand years. . . ‘In either case,’ declared Loreanna. . . ‘I shall be with the man I love, forever’” (**Henry Martyn** 437).

Victor Koman’s **Solomon’s Knife** reflects Rand’s style of action filled narrative, “She hurt inside. . . She was free. Free but hollowed. Free of obligation, but burdened with a sudden doubt” (35) and setting description, “ She realized that she was chanting with them in a mystical rite. White-robed surgeons, arms dipped to the elbows in crimson, chanted with her and the dead-before-life. Scarlet flames appeared on the blue ice” (41-42). Furthermore, Koman’s novel shows traces of Randian ideology, moralization of the characters and heroic language, “What I have done is neither criminal nor immoral. . . I gave that tissue to someone who saw in it the same quality I did and wished to nurture it. Within her body, it grew into the baby named Renata. She is a distinct, individual human being, not chattel over which we can squabble about ownership. She is a human being in her own right” (**Solomon’s Knife** 228). . . “I had no duty to keep Renata alive. Neither did they. We all made our choices freely” (**Solomon’s Knife** 246).

Although fantasy fiction writer, Karen Michalson does not emulate Rand’s style like Koman, the values of her characters look quite similar. Like Roark, her hero, Llewelyn, shows a love for the sight of beauty, “I suffered from deathly headaches because I loved beauty too much. Flowers were beautiful and so I loved flowers. . .” (**Enemy Glory** 14), and dreams of greatness, “‘Prove you’re decent and moral and all that. Prove you care. . . And leave me to whatever dulled beauty I can cull from my poor dreaming of dreams” (**Enemy Glory** 364)! Llewelyn is well on his way to becoming a great Randian hero, “We were the chosen apprentices, far beyond our classmates in ability, so we could afford to laugh at the process. . . Being the only commoner who made the cut, I felt especially proud” (**Enemy Glory** 39), as he considers Rand’s true nature of literary characterization—antiheroism. “Extreme goodness fetches extreme evil and extreme evil rebounds with goodness and so it goes back and forth. . .” (**Enemy Glory** 359).

Shelley Reuben’s well written novel, **Tabula Rasa**, also shows Rand’s same character values. Although like Michalson, her style looks nothing like Rand’s, it’s not hard to see the same idealism, “‘When I heard you say, ‘My kingdom for a nightingale,’ I fell in love with you. So I changed my name. I did it right then at the dance hall. Just like that. So that you’d dance with me. But I changed it legally later on, so you really are Mrs. Mortimer Nightingale’”(**Tabula Rasa** 10), and inspiration to greatness of a typical Rand protagonist. “And he slapped Billy

Nightingale affectionately on the back, not knowing that he had so impressed the teenager that Billy would spend the rest of his childhood waiting, planning, scheming, and saving so that one day he could go to the Empire State and do what he would have to do to become a New York City fire investigator./Like Deputy Chief Fire Marshal Delmore O'Shaughnessy./ The man who had become his hero" (**Tabula Rasa** 25).

Reuben's work is also full of optimism:

It was a glamour job. . . And after five raises, four promotions, and three marriage proposals from individuals with flaccid muscles and large portfolios, Annie was driven to exclaim in a manner reminiscent of her mother many years before, 'My kingdom for a cowboy' (**Tabula Rasa** 28-29)!. . . She smiled at everybody and nobody. Happy to be alive. Happy to be happy (**Tabula Rasa** 30). . . Sebastian and Annie Bly were married and living on Willow Keep Road in Fawn Creek; Billy was already a New York City fireman; and all three were happier than one would think that anyone had a right to be (**Tabula Rasa** 36) . . . State trooper Sebastian Bly was twenty-eight years old. He loved his job, and wanted to keep doing it for as long as he could. As far as he was concerned, he was starring in the movie version of his own life, and even the bad times were good (**Tabula Rasa** 37).

It shows a Randian hero in the making, in the character, Merry. Her mother says to her, "You're going to be one hell of a great ballerina someday, sweetheart. But I want you to do something for me first. . . I want you to promise me that you won't let talent and ambition interfere with having a fabulous time. . . All right. My dream is that you'll be able to put on those magical red slippers, wear them with all of the love and passion that you're capable of, and dance your little heart out. But also that you'll know when it's time to take them off" (**Tabula Rasa** 243-44). The ending is happy and shows evidence of Rand's typical 'glory of man'. "And that is how they left the cemetery, their arms around each other, walking slowly, thinking extraordinary thoughts, perhaps, extraordinary people./ Speculating" (**Tabula Rasa** 290).²⁵

While Reuben is *one of* the best writers on Sciabarra's list in terms of literary form and content, I would rate Ira Levin as perhaps *the* greatest writer on Sciabarra's list of influence [see note 4 above]. In crossing literary genres, Ira Levin's early novels, **A Kiss Before Dying** and **Rosemary's Baby** both showed Randian influence in contrastingly artistic ways. Despite the fact

that Levin changes from Rand's customary "content over form" style in **A Kiss Before Dying** to the anti-Randian and artistically appreciated "form over content" style in **Rosemary's Baby**, neither of these works totally stray from traces of her influence.

Although **A Kiss Before Dying** is complex in content, it maintains a better balance than Rand's fiction between suspenseful entertainment and beautiful art. Considered by many literary scholars as the finest mystery suspense thriller ever written, Stephen King refers to Levin as, "the Swiss watchmaker of the suspense novel; in terms of plot, he makes what the rest of us do look like those five-dollar watches you can buy in discount drugstores. . . Levin's books are constructed as neatly as an elegant house of cards, pull one plot twist, and everything comes tumbling down".²⁶

Even Rand, who praised almost no writers outside of Victor Hugo, Mickey Spillane, Ian Fleming and Fyodor Dostoevsky, had favorable words for Levin's 1953 suspense masterpiece. Nevertheless, she disliked Levin's movement from suspense thriller to gothic—regardless of the fact that traces of her influence can be seen in both of Levin's early works:

Ira Levin, who started with an excellent first novel [**A Kiss Before Dying**], now comes out with **Rosemary's Baby**, which goes beyond the physical trappings of the Middle Ages, straight to that era's spirit, and presents [seriously] a story about witchcraft in a modern setting; and, since the original version of the Virgin Birth, involving God, would probably be regarded as 'camp' by today's intellectual establishment, this story revolves around the obscenity of a Virgin Birth authored by the Devil (**The Romantic Manifesto** 121).

Rand's critical comments here focus more on the subject matter and religious allegory of **Rosemary's Baby** than its actual merits as a work of literature. These comments appear to stem from Rand's atheist convictions more than from fair literary judgment. Rand's fiction looks more campy than Levin's.²⁷

Douglas Fowler (1988) is one critic who doesn't believe that **Rosemary's Baby** is campy when he states, "Exercising an admirable [and highly professional] tact, Levin ends his novel just before the cozy absurdity of an AntiMadonna cradling her tiny AntiChrist vitiates the wonderfully chilling buildup to this moment of AntiTruth (40). Fowler (1988) goes on to state

that Levin's 1967 work revived gothic from the genteel middle ground of bestseller tastes for the first time since before the Civil War (49). Therefore, both works hold great literary importance outside of Rand's influence.

Why does Rand like **A Kiss Before Dying** better than **Rosemary's Baby**? Both works share interesting similarities and differences to her fiction. Douglas Fowler's (1988) assessment of key characters in both of Levin's early works look exactly like typical Randian [anti]heroes, whether good or bad, ". . . Ruthless ambition is the common denominator linking Bud Corliss with Guy Woodhouse, for at the heart of darkness in both works lies coldly selfish male egotism" (36).²⁸

We can see Rand's passionate language, "He clattered down flight after flight of black metal steps. . . his right hand burning over the banisters. His heart galloped and the image of whirling walls dizzied him" (**A Kiss Before Dying** 77), and colorful setting descriptions, "Dorothy holding it first to his lips and then to hers, where the pink glow of each puff would momentarily touch the feathery blonde hair. . . She turned the burning end of the cigarette towards them and moved it around and around, back and forth, painting circles and lines of vivid orange in the darkness" (11).

Furthermore, although **A Kiss Before Dying** is much better written than Rand's fiction and includes more feeling descriptions and consciousness of the characters, traces of her brand of verb filled action narratives can still be seen in it:

He turned. Her hand was extended towards him, holding a folded piece of blue-lined paper. She was watching him. . . He closed his eyes for a moment. . . He tried to make himself return the smile, but he couldn't. . . Then he sat with his fingers locked firmly together, watching the lecturer (**A Kiss Before Dying** 26).

Levin gives a description of a building like that in **The Fountainhead**, "On the right, the KRBI tower reared up like a smaller Eiffel, its girded pattern black against the sky. . . The entire roof was dotted with chimneys and ventilator pipes that stuck up like piers from a tarry sea" (**A Kiss Before Dying** 72-73). Even the naïve and heart of gold victim, Dorothy, has dreams of beauty and greatness in the Randian mold—they simply look different from Bud's, "She envisioned a warm and happy life in the trailer camp, still warmer and happier when the baby came. She was impatient with the motion picture, which distracted her from a reality more beautiful than any

movie could ever be” (**A Kiss Before Dying** 37).

Nevertheless, perhaps Rand’s greatest reason for admiring the 1953 work is the complex and intricate plot, which is much more basic in **Rosemary’s Baby**:

It still wasn’t too late. People wrote suicide notes and then stalled around before actually doing it. He looked at his watch; 9:20. The earliest Ellen could get the note would be. . . three o’clock. Five hours and forty minutes. No step by step planning now. It would have to be quick, positive. . . In five hours and forty minutes she must be dead (**A Kiss Before Dying** 59)

It was alive./It was in Minnie and Roman’s apartment/
But it was still alive (**Rosemary’s Baby** 227).

The tension leading up to the baby’s birth is suspenseful plot enough for this novel—it’s suspense in a more gothic and creepy way. Rosemary’s Devil Worshipping cronies say to her:

‘Come with us quietly, Rosemary. Don’t argue or make a scene, because if you say anything more about witches or witchcraft we’re going to be forced to take you to a mental hospital. The facilities there for delivering the baby will be less than the best. You don’t want that, do you? So put your shoes on’ (**Rosemary’s Baby** 211).

Even though, unlike **A Kiss Before Dying**, the way the 1967 gothic novel is told is more important than what is told:

‘Oh God!’ she said and screamed to the ceiling:
‘Oh God! Oh God! Oh God! Oh God! Oh God!’
‘God is DEAD!’ Roman thundered. ‘God is dead and Satan lives! The year is One, the first year of our Lord! The year is One, God is done! The year is One, Adrian’s begun!’
‘Hail Satan!’ they cried. ‘Hail Adrian!’ ‘Hail Adrian!’
‘Hail Satan’ (**Rosemary’s Baby** 237)!

Rand’s same extreme hero worship and optimistically climactic ending can be seen in this work as well:

‘Hail Rosemary,’ Helen Wees said.
The others took it up. ‘Hail Rosemary.’ ‘Hail Rosemary.’ Minnie and Stavropoulos and Dr. Sapirstein. ‘Hail Rosemary.’ Guy said it too.

‘Hail Rosemary.’ Laura-Louise moved her
lips but made no sound (**Rosemary’s Baby** 244).²⁹

Rand’s trademark literary style, content and characterization branched out into bits and pieces of several multi-genre works and authors instead of remaining intact within one group. The wide reaching genres of Rand’s fictional influence studied in this chapter are evidence to her representational balance. As novels of important cross-genre influence, Rand’s works are important for the balance they represent between entertainment and artistic literature, capitalism and pulpy larger than life heroes, good and evil, mystery and suspenseful plot, camp, feminism and man worship, rebellion, politics and philosophy. Because of this type of balance and genre-crossing, **The Fountainhead** and **Atlas Shrugged** are probably two of the most loved and hated works of American Literature. Love or hate Rand’s fiction, in terms of influence and representational balance, no matter how good or bad one may think it is, her works leave almost no genres or aspects of the American Imagination untouched.

CHAPTER 6

The American Dream of Success, Wealth and Excess: The Randian Hero in Twentieth Century British and American Literature

The successful, wealthy and excessive capitalist as hero remains a troublesome aspect of the American literary establishment. The capitalist of literature is typically a villain and anti-heroic at his best. Twentieth Century literature continually tries to morally separate the successful capitalist from his desire for excess. While the idea that “excess causes downfall” in British and American Literature is not a bad idea in itself, it is contrary to the American cultural imagination of excessive and/or wealthy lifestyles either lived or desired at all socioeconomic levels.

Rand is one of the very few authors who shows anti-heroic, perhaps even villainous, capitalist heroes of excessive lifestyles who ultimately prosper both professionally and personally. In most literature, heroes tend to either prosper as non-excessive capitalist heroes or meet their downfall as excessive and tragic heroes. While both Rand’s heroes and those of literature are usually of the same type—tragic heroes, Rand’s heroes tend to move in the opposite direction. Whereas the typical literary hero moves from ideal to tragic, the Randian hero moves from tragic to ideal.

In literature, the moral labels often put on these capitalists make their portrayals even more problematic. Rand’s novels are valuable in that they show us the American dream of wealth, success and excess without downfall, and that through wealthy tycoons, “the sky can be the limit for us” too. We can have our own American “excess” story without the guilt of being the evil, immoral and selfish capitalist anti-heroes of the typical literary establishment. Literary optimism such as this, which is often inseparable from pro-capitalism of the right wing, is not as appreciated as the socialist, left wing and pessimistic fiction of the academy.

Jack Cashill (1985) asserts, “Many celebrated novelists have written favorably about the capitalist. . . They [academics] might read **The Octopus**, Frank Norris’ indictment of monopolists, but hardly ever its broker-as-hero sequel, **The Pit**. F. Scott Fitzgerald’s Monroe Stahr of **The Last Tycoon**, and Theodore Dreiser’s Cowperwood and Henry James’ Christopher Newman of **The American** are just a few capitalist heroes who are twisted or ignored by the literary establishment. These fellows are strong, upright, courageous, and successful on their own merits. However, they are continually weeded out of the curriculum by academics” (157-64).¹

Of pessimistic heroines in academic literature, professor Mimi Reisel Gladstein [who has put **Atlas Shrugged** on her syllabus] confesses, “The . . . mood created by the reading material in women’s studies courses in American literature is rage or despair. . . Not that one owes one’s students a happy ending, but after several semesters of depression, a touch of positivism is in order” (48).

The importance of this type of optimism in Rand’s heroes is that, in her portrayal of them, she forces us to truly choose a moral side between selfish ‘capitalistic’ indulgence and selfless ‘socialistic’ sacrifice —this is bothersome to the hypocritical American consciousness—but true. The typical American [in lit and real life] tends to remain torn between service to self and community [or capitalism and Christianity] and enjoys the balance that this creates both on and beneath the surface. Roger Rosenblatt conveys these ideas when he states, “The simple life [non-excessive]. . . is a basic American myth, but it was a lot closer to being realized before the age of genetic finagling, test-tube babies and nuclear arms. . . the constant conflict between capitalism and Christianity, for example, could be resolved, at least in words, by the figure of the rugged individual who gives to charity of his free will, not by paying his taxes” (116).

Rand’s heroes, as excessive modern day versions of these rugged individualists of the past, compel us to choose either the heroic individualism of pleasing ourselves [capitalism] or what she calls the evil altruism of pleasing our society and/or fellow man [Christianity]. The Randian hero is important as the ultimate literary ideal, although we will never reach it, which we can all use as a measuring stick by which we can make our own definition of the American dream for ourselves to either strive for or avoid. Because heroic failures learn more than successes, in creating an ideal that will make both literary and real life heroes “failed” versions of Rand’s, whether we spend our lives loving or hating her, we will eternally learn which type of hero we want to be in relation to hers. Stephen Cox (1993) asserts, “**The Fountainhead** is a work of American literature; of that we can be sure. . . The book is saturated with American experience, with the life of the American city, with the lives of American people pursuing archetypically American occupations—businessman, journalist, builder of skyscrapers” (7).

Progress turned to excess is the American way that’s often vilified in our literature. It seldom makes a hero out of the capitalist, but when it does, he or she almost always is either not excessive or fails to win the desired goal. According to John Cashill (1982), “The hero must not only participate in the principal action, but also, his ‘fulfillment as an individual must be

accomplished in terms of the principal action.'² To be a capitalist hero in the fullest sense, a character must achieve his heroism in the course of his work as a capitalist" (10). In Frank Norris' **The Pit**, Henry James' **The American** and Sinclair Lewis' **Dodsworth**, neither of the protagonists are made heroes as a result of capitalist successes. The 'capitalists' are separated from the 'heroes.' Norris' Jadwin and James' Newman both fail to win their capitalist prizes at the end. Even when Lewis' Dodsworth does win his prize, he's not sure if it makes him happy.

Sam Dodsworth of Sinclair Lewis' novel, at the end, is happy, he's not excessive: "They were dining at the Ritz in Paris, Edith and Sam, feeling superior to its pretentiousness, because that evening they had determined to return to America, when his divorce should be complete, and to experiment with caravans. . . He was, indeed, so confidently happy that he completely forgot Fran [his ex-wife] and he did not again yearn over her, for almost two days" (**Dodsworth** 376-77). Not only will this filthy rich automaker give up the glitzy and glamorous lifestyle of Europe, that his ex-wife is used to, in order to live a simple and common American existence—the ending implies that, even though he's won his desired goal, he thinks, perhaps the luster of this goal will be continually fleeting. And perhaps Sam will never be totally content with or without the excessive lifestyle.

Curtis Jadwin of Norris' novel cares more about the victory than enjoying the excessive spoils associated with it. "But his entire personal fortune now swung in the balance. It was the last fight, the supreme attempt—the final consummate assault, and the thrill of a victory more brilliant, more conclusive, more decisive than any he had ever known, vibrated in Jadwin's breast. . ." (**The Pit** 271). It is only after he's financially wiped out that the hero denounces the excessive capitalist lifestyle, "I remember nothing—only that I have been to blame for everything. . . I fancy we both have been living according to a wrong notion of things. . . [his wife replies] What do 'things,' servants, money, and all amount to now?" (**The Pit** 304).

Just like Norris makes Jadwin a greater hero without his capitalist mantle, so does Lewis do the same to Dodsworth. Just before leaving his tycoon lifestyle in America to vacation with his wife in Europe, Sam says, "I've learned that life is real and life is earnest and the presidency of a corporation is its goal. What would I be doing with anything so degenerate as enjoying myself? . . . Only now. . . did he feel that he was actually delivered from duty, actually going—going to strange-colored, exciting places, to do unknown and heroic things" (**Dodsworth** 32-33).

Note here how Sinclair Lewis liberates his protagonist from being a capitalist. He is now

still a 'hero' but must be 'freed' or be delivered from capitalist 'duty' that was the most enjoyable and meaningful aspect of his life up until this point. John Cashill argues the same thing about Christopher Newman of **The American** when he says, "Still, in that James did not intend to make any explicit and ideological statements about the capitalist or his system, Newman is, for most, more an 'American' hero than a 'capitalist' one" (226). In agreement with this point, Count Valentin admires Newman not for capitalist money or greatness, but the American freedom that he had to make the money—more of a cultural and class issue than a capitalist one.

He says to Newman, "Ah, but your poverty was your capital!. . . you looked round you and saw a world full of things you had only to step up and take hold of. . . I couldn't make money, because I was a Bellegarde. I couldn't go into politics because I was a Bellegarde. . ." (**The American** 135). We sympathize with the hero instead of striving to emulate his greatness and wealth in the capitalist tradition.

Furthermore, when James doesn't give him the victory he deserves at the end, we see that the novel itself is less about the Bellegarde's Old World Money vs. Newman's New World Money than it is a struggle between good and evil. Both Newman and his wife to be, Claire, are good people wronged by Claire's family. "[Claire] was just a fair peach . . . She had one little sad spot. [Newman] pushed her into the sunshine and it almost disappeared . . . [Claire's family] pulled her back into the shade, and in a moment it began to spread" (**The American** 439). . . He [Newman] was a good fellow wronged" (**The American** 528).

Rand never morally separates the capitalist from the hero—neither does Theodore Dreiser. Cowperwood is truly Gail and Roark combined into one character—the good and anti-heroic capitalist hero. In the tradition of Rand, Henry Nash Smith claims that "Twentieth century American novels about business have identified a number of moral dilemmas inherent in a capitalist system, but they have not produced a character described as a capitalist hero. Frank Cowperwood is conceived on a heroic scale, but he cannot enact the role of a hero because he defies the moral standards of his society and is indifferent to its welfare" (111).

Mark Twain's Hank Morgan is a capitalist hero, but unlike Roark, Cowperwood and Fitzgerald's Monroe Stahr, he is not an uncommonly great man—he's practical and ungentlemanly. Uncommonly great capitalist heroes [rich and greedy gentlemen—like Gail] are those more unappreciated in literature. In terms of capitalism, Morgan is just as opportunistic and greedy as Gail Wynand. According to Henry Nash Smith, "Morgan is practical and devoid

of poetry and sentiment. He is crude in his tastes and he takes a commercial view of everything, greedily seeking opportunities to make money and constantly using figures of speech derived from business transactions—contracts, discounts, bookkeeping, selling short, etc. . . . Whether deliberately or not, Mark Twain shields his hero against the charge of gaining wealth through speculation. Despite Hank Morgan’s indifference to culture and refinement, he is free of the graver taint of immorality that literary convention associated with business enterprise” (87-88).

In the same tradition of Rand and Dreiser, Twain doesn’t put a moral or religious stigma onto capitalism. Twain, Rand and Dreiser all do the commendable thing in separating traditional morality and/or religion from their capitalist heroes. Twain separates church from the state and individual like the American imagination pretends to, but really doesn’t. “Everybody could be any kind of a Christian he wanted to; there was perfect freedom in that matter. But I confined public religious teaching to the churches and the Sunday-schools, permitting nothing of it in my other educational buildings. . . . I was afraid of a united Church; it makes a mighty power. . . . and then when it by and by gets into selfish hands, as it is always bound to do, it means death to human liberty and paralysis to human thought” (**A Connecticut Yankee** 77).

However, even Rand vilifies her uncommon gentleman capitalist hero Gail, to a certain extent. As a capitalist, Roark moves from common man to great gentleman—just like Wynand. Rand ends her novel before Roark has the chance to become the rich and eccentric gentleman like Gail. Gail is greater than Roark and morally no more or less Promethean. Henry Nash Smith asserts:

The method of fable brings out in bold relief the central myth of nineteenth century American capitalism—Prometheus, enemy of reactionary and tyrannical gods of tradition, bringer of intellectual light and material well-being to the downtrodden masses. . . . Prometheus could not be expected to pattern his own code of morals upon the mores and traditional beliefs of the mortals he strove to benefit. . . . From the standpoint of the common man, Prometheus must seem incomprehensible and probably shocking—a transcendent figure beyond good and evil as they were defined in the sphere of everyday life on earth (90).

The capitalist heroes, Gail, Roark and Cowperwood are human versions of Prometheus.³

Because greatness and productive work is the only moral requirement of the Randian hero, her capitalist heroes and anti-heroes always enjoy the fruits of their labor—no matter how good or bad they look in her novels. Gail Wynand, “. . . hired a sensitive poet to cover baseball games. . . He got a socialist to defend factory owners and a conservative to champion labor. . . He gave a great symphony conductor a munificent yearly income, for no work at all, on the sole condition that he never conduct an orchestra again”(The Fountainhead 415).

Henry Nash Smith argues that Rand’s works depict more of the tragedy of the heroes than the actions of their capitalist protagonism. He says, “It is implied that Galt and his chosen band will build a new society on the ruins of the old, but they have not even begun this task when, after more than a thousand pages, the novel ends. The substance of the narrative is not the actions but the sufferings of the Titans” (110). Although there is some truth to this point in that Rand does make the heroes and anti-heroes look like moral victims, she also shows us capitalist heroes who are happiest when they are in the process of work and pride themselves on their strength.⁴ However, Rand’s heroes are happiest when they are in the process of work—a process that we do see [even though we see it in small bits and pieces].⁵

Unlike the good and likable [not pitied] Newman who fails to get the girl in **The American**, Rand’s heroes are all presented as tragic cases who we should pity. However, Rand’s work counters the traditional heroes who cannot “have their cake and eat it too,” by giving her capitalists the victories they want, not necessarily the ones they deserve. “In Henry Nash Smith’s view, Cowperwood [of Theodore Dreiser’s trilogy] is ‘by far the most impressive portrait of a big businessman in American fiction,’ No later writer would bring to the subject Dreiser’s commitment or intensity. Yet, Dreiser simply took over ‘the familiar catalogue of the businessman’s vices and presented them as virtues.’”⁶

Rand does this same thing as well. Roark is a Cowperwood and Gail in the making. Just like Dreiser’s, Rand’s capitalist heroes can do no wrong on the way to the top and once they get there. It’s alright for Roark to use his brutishness and dishonesty to gain the power of being New York’s best architect. She makes these vices look like humanistic virtues. Roark pretends to help others while he’s really helping himself.

Howard Roark and Gail Wynand are more deserving of victory than Dominique—at least they’ve done some form of work for it. Dominique is truly an idle villain who has lived off her father’s wealth and status all her life. She’s opportunistic, lacks passion and develops no

individualism or life of her own outside what she does alongside her men. Nevertheless, this true evil villain is portrayed as a woman who turns capitalist heroine all of a sudden on the spur of the moment by Rand. She drops Gail when she knows that Roark is about to reach the top. Although Dominique doesn't deserve this victory, Rand gives it to her as the capitalist heroine who can have both an excessive bourgeois lifestyle and contentment within herself.

She says to Roark, "Yes. Now Gail is blasted over to the side where he belongs. . . Now let him see *the Banner* smearing me also. . . Don't say anything about self-sacrifice or I'll break and. . . I didn't do it for you. . . But, Howard, now we stand together—against all of them. You'll be a convict and I'll be an adulteress. . . Now I'm not afraid to have this past night smeared all over their newspapers. My darling, do you see why I'm happy and why I'm free?" (**The Fountainhead** 671). This phony and dramatic scene is truly Rand's last ditch effort to make this opportunistic idler look heroic—it's too abrupt and insincere.

Nevertheless, bourgeois capitalist heroes like Dominique and proletariat socialist heroes, like Jack London's *Burning Daylight*, are more alike than different in that both are seeking the same victories. They both strive for inner contentment and business success. "Rugged individualism" is like a 'common man' protagonist version of the excessive capitalism of Rand's and Dreiser's 'uncommonly great men.' The transition of these 'content' capitalist heroes from the nineteenth century to the twentieth is also very important. The twentieth century capitalist tycoon, especially if he's self made, is really the evolved pioneer or rugged individualist of Manifest Destiny from farm to nineteenth century factory. Mark Twain's Hank Morgan is a more 'common man' version of Roark who doesn't move from proletariat to bourgeois.

In American literature, where has Mark Twain's rugged and individualistic capitalist hero gone? Nowhere--Rand, along with the likes of Dreiser, just strips him of the likeable 'common man' aspect of his character. Unlike Roark, Hank Morgan is uncommonly great because of his time—not any extraordinary ability of his own. Hank says, "I became head superintendent; had a couple of thousand men under me (**A Connecticut Yankee** 5). . .Whereas, what would I amount to in the twentieth century? I should be foreman of a factory, that is about all; and could drag a seine down-street any day and catch a hundred better men than myself" (**A Connecticut Yankee** 61).

Rand also shows us 'common man' heroes like Morgan, they are just secondary heroes who stay mainly in the background and we don't see much of them.⁷ Mark Twain's Hank

Morgan is the lovable ‘everyman’ with a nineteenth century capitalist twist. Of this trend in the American imagination that Twain innovated, John Chamberlain states:

American critical realism developed as a part of westward expansion; it was a response to frontier conditions that demand a hearty and commonsensical way of looking at things. . . . Mark Twain pushed the tradition of frontier realism and laughter to a peak. But Mark Twain enjoyed business even though he satirized it. And the main object of his satire was the damned—but still beloved—human race (146).

Jeff Walker states that **A Connecticut Yankee** is a precursor of **Atlas Shrugged**.⁸ Twain’s influence on Rand can be seen not only in the similarities of the heroes, but also in the literary backgrounds of the two writers.

According to James L. Johnson, “Twain had long been interested in the French Revolution, and had for years despised the revolutionary mobs of the Reign of Terror. He even amended the revolutionary motto: ‘Liberty [to rob. . . burn and butcher]—Equality [in bestiality]—Fraternity [of Devils].⁹ Yet by the time he came to write **A Connecticut Yankee** his views on the French Revolution had modified: ‘Next to the 4th of July and its results, it was the noblest and holiest thing and the most precious that ever happened in this earth. And its gracious work is not done yet’” (145-46).¹⁰ Just like Twain, Rand was inspired by the French Revolution as well.¹¹

Furthermore, Hank Morgan is more similar to Howard Roark than different. Both heroes mask egotism and brutishness beneath a heroic and well-intentioned surface. Andrew Jay Hoffman proclaims:

Hank is honest with us, and, although egotistical in the extreme, Hank needs this egotism in the face of his eventual failure (83). . . . We have seen that Hank fails in his heroic endeavors because of his ego (118). . . . Hank Morgan believes his technological wonders combined with democracy and education must create a utopia. Readers do not share Hank’s belief, because the novel itself undermines it with Hank’s violence and egotism. But readers do accept that the world Hank desires greatly improves on the world he occupies and that most of the changes he makes will lead to that better world (125-26).

Kent Kreuter goes on to say that, “And Twain also admitted that Hank Morgan, in addition to

having a good heart and high intent, had as well a ‘rude animal side,’ a ‘circus side’ (279).¹² Unlike Twain’s hero, egotism and brutishness ultimately leads to Roark’s success instead of downfall. Like Morgan, Roark separates religion from politics and life and individually works towards a better ‘utopian world.’ Democracy is the only heralded system of Hank’s that Roark doesn’t also embrace. Rand loved capitalism, not democracy.¹³

In terms of the literary hero, ‘capitalist’ is simply a less heroically appreciated way to say ‘individualist.’ Stephen Cox (1993) asserts, “The most American thing about **The Fountainhead** is its focus on the most American of all problems, the problem of individualism. What most admirers admire most in Rand is her intransigent advocacy of individualism; what most enemies detest most about her is the same quality. But it is one thing to preach individualism; it is another to identify its problems; it is still another to render those problems in their precise American context and idiom” (9).

John Chamberlain mentions John Steinbeck as a writer whose “strikers-as-hero” characters suggested that the existence of a business system that was as virulently anti-people as Rasputin or Ivan the Terrible” (146). Nevertheless, Steinbeck portrays a rugged individualist hero in his short story **The Leader of the People**. Grandfather, the pioneer leader of a Manifest Destiny wagon train of the past is a hero more for leading the group in their common ‘individualistic’ types of goals than for his own glory. He says, “It wasn’t the Indians that were important, nor adventures, nor even getting out here, it was a whole bunch of people made into one big crawling beast. And I was the head. . . Every man wanted something for himself, but the big beast that was all of them wanted only westering. I was the leader, but if I hadn’t been there, someone else would have been the head” (**The Leader of the People** 1755). Thus, in terms of heroism, Steinbeck puts a socialist spin on a capitalistic type of idea.

Grandfather was a rugged individualist—a progressive—the closest thing to a capitalist during that time. After he helped to conquer the world of the American West—Steinbeck’s capitalist hero’s life was anti-climactic. Grandfather goes on to say, “Every place is taken. But that’s not the worst—no not the worst. Westering has died out of the people. Westering isn’t a hunger anymore” (**The Leader of the People** 1755). According to Henry Nash Smith, “The novelist’s symbolic use of the West reflects the commonly held belief that the driving force in the development of American industrial capitalism had been the energy and natural resources brought into play by expansion across the continent” (79).

The American individualist culturally died out west after Manifest Destiny. It subtly stuck his head out again during the Civil War of the south as Margaret Mitchell's Rhett Butler. The industrial revolution made the 'individual' hero Rhett, Mark Twain's 'capitalist' hero Hank Morgan. Grandfather of Steinbeck's short story is no different from Nat Taggart, Rand's capitalist trailblazer, of the same era.

He built the Taggart Railroad Empire out of the same heroic inner desire as that of the "westerling" pioneers. "Nathaniel Taggart had been a penniless adventurer who had come from somewhere in New England and built a railroad across a continent, in the days of the first steel rails. . . He was a man who had never accepted the creed that others had the right to stop him. He set his goal and moved toward it" (**Atlas Shrugged** 63). Westering was no different from Nat Taggart's goal. ". . . I was the leader. The westering was as big as God" (**The Leader of the People** 1755). According to John Cashill, "Rand believes, too, that if man can destroy the world, he can save it as well. Rand's solution is the strong man. She looks to the American past for her ideals and archetypes, to the 'age when Nat Taggart moved across the country' (**Atlas Shrugged** 232), an age when men were 'eager for the sight of achievement'" (253).

A lack of new worlds to conquer gradually destroys the progressive hero and his world. When Jody, the boy who idolizes Grandfather's heroism, aspires to also be a leader of the people, he is told by the old hero, "There's no place to go. There's the ocean to stop you. There's a line of old men along the shore hating the ocean because it stopped them" (**The Leader of the People** 1755). Life that was once great and extraordinary becomes common and mediocre. When Roger Rosenblatt comments on this idea of rugged American individualism, he says, ". . . Once the revolution is done, every rugged individual must be whittled down to a mere citizen for the revolutionized society to function. . . The American Dream, the American Novel, the rugged American Self. Perhaps the Pilgrim Nation has run out of places to wander to, and thus clings to a term that implies a perpetual future" (116).

Heroic souls within great men whose competition fails to keep it exciting—douses the flame of desire within them--too much safety ruins both the capitalist hero and his world. The main reason why Gail destroys passion in people is because he's bored—he's already conquered his own world and he wants to conquer the worlds of others. Roark conquers his own world at the end of **The Fountainhead** and will steadily become more like Gail and work to conquer the world of others now that the great struggle against impossible odds is won.

In his own study of the capitalist hero in fiction, John Cashill says, “. . .The novels to be studied are not as much about the achievement of success, as they are about finding purpose once success is achieved” (41). **The Fountainhead** is about the hero, Roark, struggling to find success, just like Jack London’s Ernest Everhard of **The Iron Heel**. **Atlas Shrugged** is about the robber baron heroes, mainly Dagny Taggart and Hank Rearden, finding purpose once success is achieved, just like London’s hero of **Burning Daylight**.

In terms of the capitalistic self made man, much fiction tends to give the hero the improbable “rags to riches” socioeconomic leap. “A crucial element of the [Horatio] Alger myth is the class leap, the ascension from poor farm boy or street waif to business tycoon.¹⁴ Christopher Newman’s story, James tells the reader, ‘was, with intensity, a tale of the Western world’ (**The American** 25). . . ‘After the war Newman found himself, as before ‘without a penny,’ (**The American** 27). Under these circumstances he makes his entrance into San Francisco and soon thereafter makes his fortune. An Iowa farm is the birthplace of Elam Harnish, **Burning Daylight**, who soon thereafter moves to Eastern Oregon to get his first ‘hard knocks’ (**Burning Daylight** 6). ‘Curtis Jadwin was a man about thirty-five, who had begun life without a sou in his pockets. . . His people were farmers, nothing more nor less than hardy, honest fellows, who plowed and sowed for a living’” (**The Pit** 59).¹⁵

Rand doesn’t always give improbable and mythical jumps into greatness for all her protagonists. Her fiction maintains an interesting balance between uncommon heroes of both inherited and self-made wealth. She continually juxtaposes great heroes who obtain wealth in opposite ways. In **The Fountainhead**, the heroine of inherited wealth, Dominique, is in love with the great self made man—Roark. In **Atlas Shrugged**, Dagny Taggart, of inherited wealth, maintains love affairs with heroes of each type—the self made man Hank Rearden and the inherited wealth of Francisco D’Anconia. It’s a realistic view portraying great men and women coming from all walks of life.

Unlike many typical capitalist heroes, the Randian capitalist hero exists in different varieties of socioeconomic status. Whether they’ve made the socioeconomic jump from proletariat or not, Rand’s heroes, primary at least, ultimately end up in the Superman ability level of the bourgeois. However, she does show that men and women of great ability exist within the proletariat class as well. Unlike Jack London’s, her heroes are anything but socialist.

According to Judith Wilt, “Strenuously rationalist, her narratives deny ‘class’ in their presentation of Aristotelian man, of American individual man, carefully picking out here a Minnesota farmer, there a New York construction worker, who see the world in Randian terms, as an aristocracy of wealth creators allied with the working deserving poor against the idle middle classes of bureaucrats, managers, and manipulators of mass culture. At the same time, the narratives consistently display a naïve and contemptuous Victorian class equation of virtue with success: ‘I can run a good railroad. I can’t run it across a continent of sharecroppers who’re not good enough to grow turnips successfully’”(193).**16**

Why is the capitalist hero so unappreciated within the literary establishment? Is the capitalist disdained for his or her greed, eccentricities, aristocratic arrogance, greatness, or a combination of all these? Regardless of how it’s portrayed, progressive and productive individualism, within the literature or real life, is always a positive thing. F.Scott Fitzgerald’s Monroe Stahr is greedy, eccentric, arrogant and great. He is a likeable hero in Hollywood—a setting where men and women with non-capitalistic traits such as benevolence, humility, modesty and mediocrity will perish. Schwartz, another character of the Hollywood set, says to Cecilia, “I once had an affair with the wife of a producer. A very short affair. When it was over she said to me in no uncertain terms, ‘Don’t you ever tell about this or I’ll have you thrown out of Hollywood. My husband’s a much more important man than you!’” (**The Last Tycoon** 17).

Cecilia, the narrator, merely portrays lesser versions of Stahr’s same capitalistic traits—both characters are likeable protagonists. She contemplates her love for these traits in Stahr, “In the corridor of the plane I ran into Monroe Stahr and fell all over him, or wanted to. There was a man any girl would go for, with or without encouragement. I was emphatically without it, but he liked me and sat down opposite till the plane took off (**The Last Tycoon** 22). . . . When I wasn’t dozing I was thinking that I wanted to marry Stahr, that I wanted to make him love me. Oh, the conceit! What on earth did I have to offer? But I didn’t think like that then. I had the pride of young women, which draws its strength from such sublime thoughts as ‘I’m as good as she is.’ For my purposes I was just as beautiful as the great beauties who must have inevitably thrown themselves at his head” (**The Last Tycoon** 25).

Stahr, the capitalist hero, is greedy for success, “You couldn’t persuade a man like Stahr to stop and lie down and look at the sky for six months. He would much rather die. . . . Fatigue was a drug as well as a poison, and Stahr apparently derived some rare almost physical pleasure

from working lightheaded with weariness” (**The Last Tycoon** 128). Although he is conceited and arrogant, he dislikes mediocrity, lack of confidence and passion for success in people more than the people themselves. “He [Stahr] ate nothing but a few spoonfuls of soup and he said all the awful things about everybody being so lazy so-and-so’s and none of it mattered to him because he had lots of money” (**The Last Tycoon** 146). . .

When speaking about average Hollywood artists, Stahr says, “It takes more than brains. You writers and artists poop out and get all mixed up, and somebody has to come in and straighten you out. . . You seem to take things so personally, hating people and worshipping them—always thinking people are so important—especially yourselves. You just ask to be kicked around. I like people and I like them to like me, but I wear my heart where God put it—on the inside” (**The Last Tycoon** 25).

Cecilia is as much a protagonist as Stahr because she learns that people without capitalistic traits will not survive long in Hollywood. If for no other reason, Stahr should be appreciated as a hero for weeding out those who lack the ability, brains and drive for success needed in the vicious world of Hollywood. Even though, culturally speaking, Hollywood is not the same as the rest of America, lesser versions of the same capitalistic traits are needed to succeed. The vilified capitalistic terms, greed, arrogance and greatness are simply more extreme versions of the positive “common man” type terms, self-confidence, drive and ability. The moral labels put on these productive individualists is problematic and distorts the true image of the wealth, success and excess of the capitalist hero.

Arthur Mizener asserts, “Stahr is a tycoon, a great Prince, because he’s not just a tycoon in **Time** magazine’s sense but the image of genuine authority in a democratic society. The particular form authority has taken in him is necessarily the form required for authority by the comparatively old-fashioned capitalism in which he grew up. That was the condition, and he may well be the last tycoon of that kind there will be. But the essential qualities of the great Prince which he possesses will be needed by any society if it’s to be any good” (166).

Robert Fulford (1995) defends capitalism, and some of its real life literary heroes:

The 18th century would have found our hostility [towards capitalism] incomprehensible. Samuel Johnson said, ‘There are few ways in which a man can be more innocently employed than in getting money.’ Jonathan Swift, that angry moralist, speculated on the market and made a small pile. But

about 150 years ago, something changed. Articulate people, from aristocrats to novelists, began to believe that a business society was an evil society. In 1912 Bernard Shaw described this transformation. The first half of the 19th century considered itself the greatest of all centuries, he said, but the second half discovered that it was the wickedest. He saw this as the triumph of the socialist movement's ability to convince everybody, even conservatives, 'that the condition of the civilized world is deplorable.' Compared to what? Well, compared to how things should be, ideally.

John Chamberlain ponders the literary disdain for the capitalist hero when he asserts:

Even when Mark Twain was writing [**A Connecticut Yankee**], two alien traditions that are implacably hostile to 'trade' and the 'bourgeois' were establishing themselves in the U.S. The first tradition was bound up with the aristocrat's point of view and in the works of Henry James that have got away from James' own view of the American businessman as the great 'innocent.' The second tradition, which ultimately reached noisy fruition in the books of the 'proletarian' 1930's, was that of literary socialism. Strangely, the second anti-bourgeois tradition has attracted many converts from the first. It is with literary socialism and its various dependent 'totalitarian' liberalisms that the note of belittling comes to be applied to the businessman. Balzac, who had a great influence on Karl Marx, may have caricatured the businessman, but his caricatures had great and sweeping vitality. The latter-day novelists who have picked up Marx would have done better if they had emulated their master and gone themselves to Balzac. As things stand, their own caricatures of the businessman do not derive from living examples but from a dry and doctrinaire attitude (147-48).

Michael Collins refers to Rand's Robin Hood of the rich, Ragnar Danneskjold, in his defense of the capitalist hero.¹⁷ He states, "Capitalism has a better nervous system than socialism does. It can therefore get out of the way of danger or take advantage of opportunity more readily. Freedom—to move out of the way, or to grasp a chance—is therefore critical"(345).

Atypical authors portraying the capitalist hero, like Ayn Rand, show us idealistic views of these icons. Rand wants us to continue to strive for capitalistic heroisms that we will never

realistically reach. According to John Cashill, “Rand looks to the American past for the pure laissez-faire capitalism she espouses. The embodiment of this past is John Galt, the archetypal industrial strong man born American Adam. He does not see the potential for heroism in contemporary capitalism, neither sees any obstacle to heroism in the structure of rational capitalism or in the mythos of America. What disturbs capitalist authors like Rand is that the real capitalist experience can never measure up to their ideal” (256).

Frank Norris and Jack London both portray Rand’s heroic ideal. Norris and London were two rebellious, non-traditional and “conservative-looking” writers of California whose characters and literary backgrounds took on similarities to Ayn Rand’s. Both Rand and London were radical writers who moved from left to right in their politics throughout the course of their careers. Unlike London, Rand simply began her career more on the right than London. According to Philip S. Foner, [just like Rand], London, “. . . Was interested not only in exposing cruelties and oppressions in the economic system, but in remaking it and building a new and better social order (6). . . but remained the most radical writer in American literature” (8).

Martin Eden represented a turning point in the politics of London’s fiction where he failed to clearly and openly attack individualism like he does in **The Iron Heel**. Philip S. Foner claims, “Many critics, including socialist reviewers, attacked the novel [**Martin Eden**] as an apology for individualism and as proof that London had abandoned his belief in socialism. . . the critics can hardly be blamed for missing London’s message in **Martin Eden**; indeed, it is likely that the average reader today still comes away from the book without the slightest conception that it was meant to be an attack on individualism (103-04). . . With the waning of his socialist activity and his drift away from the working class and working class ideals in his last years, Jack London lost the inspiration and the ability to write valid literature. But in spite of all this, he remains one of America’s most significant writers because he concerned himself with the vital problems of his age” (130). Again, Rand was also concerned with the vital problems of her age.

Just like Rand’s Hank Rearden, London’s *Burning Daylight* is a gambler, or capitalist risk taker, who loves competing and winning the game more than enjoying its spoils:

The high betting had begun before the draw, and still
the high betting went on, with the draw not in sight. . .
but Elam Harnish [alias *Burning Daylight*], coming next,
had tossed in five hundred dollars, with the remark to
MacDonald that he was letting him in easy (***Burning Daylight*** 14)
. . . [a spectator asks] What’s the size of the killing/ One

hundred and twenty-seven thousand. . . Name your snake-juice—the winner pays! Daylight called out loudly. . .” (**Burning Daylight** 20-21). . . The sport, to him, was in waylaying the successful robbers and taking their spoils from them. There was fun and excitement in that, and sometimes they put up the very devil of a fight. . . In the swift rush of the game he found less and less time To spend on being merely good-natured” (**Burning Daylight** 162-63).

[When asked to take a chance and become a bondholder of the John Galt Line] He [Rearden] reached for his fountain pen, wrote at the bottom of the list ‘Henry Rearden, Rearden Steel, Pennsylvania--\$1,000,000. . . [Then he says] ‘I don’t ask people to take greater chances on my ventures than I take myself. If it’s a gamble, I’ll match anybody’s gambling’ (**Atlas Shrugged** 194).

Henry Nash Smith interjects, “He [London] draws upon a simplified blend of Marx and Nietzsche in order to depict his protagonist as a superman who makes cynical use of a socialist insight into capitalism for his own advantage” (98).

John Cashill adds, “Like [Frank] Norris, London doesn’t question the structure of rational capitalism, nor the hero’s place within that structure. The one stage at which Daylight achieves heroism as a capitalist is as an entrepreneur in the Klondike. He’s a hero because he uses his energy and wealth to benefit both himself and his community. But to understand London’s views on American capitalism, one must first understand what they are not—the Marxism advocated by his superman surrogate, Ernest Everhard, in **The Iron Heel**, written only three years prior to **Burning Daylight**. . . If anything, London celebrates the entrepreneurial phase of Daylight’s progress. He definitely doesn’t criticize ‘the fundamental American methods’¹⁸ he scorns in **The Iron Heel**” (182-83).

Just like London, not only does Frank Norris’ heroes look similar to Rand’s but his literary background takes on some striking similarities to the Russian Radical as well. Both writers were influenced by Aristotelian models of novel construction. Don Graham points out, Norris claimed that the construction of a novel should be predicated on the classic, Aristotelian model:

The axiom, ‘The whole is greater than the part,’ is as true for a novel as it is for a proposition of geometry. He [the writer] could be shown that the divisions of the drama—i.e. 1, the start, 2,

the rise, 3, the height, 4, the close—are equally essential to the novel and conducive to the readers’ interest—which is always the same as artistic finish (125).¹⁹

Rand says something very similar to this in her discussion of what she believes to be the basic principles of literature. “A novel is a long, fictional story about human beings and the events of their lives. The four essential attributes of a novel are: Theme—Plot—Characterization—Style. These are attributes not separable parts. They can be isolated conceptually for purposes of study, but one must always remember that they are interrelated and that a novel is their sum. [If it is a good novel, it is an indivisible sum]” (**The Romantic Manifesto** 80).

Although he was a literary student of Emile Zola, the father of literary naturalism, **The Pit** was Norris’ most romantic, and Rand-like novel. Jennifer Boyd concludes, “**The Pit**, more than any other of Norris’ works, demonstrates his claim that ‘Naturalism is a form of romanticism, not an inner circle of realism’.²⁰ Norris believed that realism does not probe psychological depths but rather ‘notes only the surface of things’²¹. To romance, however, Norris believed, ‘belongs the wide world for range, and the unplumbed depths of the human heart, and the mystery of sex, and the problems of life, and the black, unsearched penetralia of the soul of man.’²² **The Pit**. . . reflects Norris’ belief that naturalism ‘abstracts the best from realism and romanticism—detailed accuracy and philosophical depth’”(111-112).²³

The Pit also showed the same types of influences that touched Rand’s fiction. Norris viewed Zola as a ‘romantic,’ rather than a realist. Norris observed correctly that Zola dealt in ‘variations from the type of normal life,’ that he evinced no interest in ‘teacup tragedies’ but focused instead on the ‘huge dramas, the same enormous scenic effects, the same love of the extraordinary, the vast, the monstrous, and the tragic,’ as Hugo.²⁴ Also a student of Hugo who included great drama, the extraordinary and tragic in her novels, Rand says, “As far as literary schools are concerned, I would call myself a Romantic Realist” (**The Romantic Manifesto** 167).

Unlike Norris, Rand considered naturalism and romanticism to be opposing schools of literary thought.²⁵ She embraced romanticism and totally avoided and vilified naturalism. Norris embraced naturalism as romanticism late in his career and praised romanticism in ways that would have made Rand, a fellow student of Victor Hugo, proud. Norris says, “Naturalism, as understood by Zola, is but a form of romanticism after all. . . Terrible things must happen to the characters of the naturalistic tale. . . That Zola’s work is not purely romantic as was Hugo’s, lies

chiefly in the choice of Milieu **26**. . . We must not refer Tolstoy to the same standard as Victor Hugo—the one a realist, the other a romanticist. . . Tolstoy would have confined himself to probabilities only. Hugo is confined by nothing save the limitations of his own imagination. . . The realist would have been accurate. . . The romanticist aims at the broad truth of the thing”.**27**

Humanism was another trait of Victor Hugo which Norris used in his work. According to Lawrence E. Hussman, “Norris was called ‘the Humanist who used Naturalistic methods.’**28** But this ‘contradiction’ does not differentiate Norris’ work from that of other, presumably authenticated determinists, such as Stephen Crane and Theodore Dreiser. Indeed, preference for the virtues of love and charity can usually be found lurking just below the surface of most works by materialist authors. . . determinist writers, as well as others faced with the necessity to choose, find it unpalatable to existentially embrace self-centeredness as a standard of excellence. Among American novelists, perhaps Ayn Rand’s privileging of ‘amoral’ freedom over the claims of others comes closest to breaking the mold” (5).

Although selfish, egotistical and capitalistic, some of Rand’s heroes are also humanistic like London’s and Norris.’ For her heroes, readers must look deeper beneath the surface to see it. The movement of Ernest Everhard’s humanistic socialism in **The Iron Heel** to the humanistic individualism of the hero in **Burning Daylight** is much like the humanistic individualism of Norris’ Curtis Jadwin and Rand’s Howard Roark.**29** Rand’s heroes are either all individualistic or a combination of individualism and humanism.

She juxtaposes these two types of heroes. Even though he’s selfish and egotistical, Roark is humanistic because he helps his friend Peter Keating, by doing his work for him. Gail Wynand is not humanistic at all. In **Atlas Shrugged**, John Galt and Francisco D’Anconia don’t give a damn about saving humanity while Dagny Taggart and Hank Rearden do. Dagny and Rearden are more humanistic capitalists because they are the last to join the strike and care more about the welfare of society than Galt.**30**

The Pit takes on similarities to Rand’s novels not only in character portrayals, but it’s also a novel of the American Imagination. Lawrence Hussman states, “Norris, in writing **The Pit**, decided to use Chicago. . . not only as a potentially destructive urban vortex, but also as a symbol of the energy and vitality of America” (179). Furthermore, also in the Randian tradition, “ . . . **The Pit** stands out as ‘one of the few novels in the Naturalistic tradition that features a happy ending’.**31** At the conclusion of the story, when Jadwin and Laura set out for their new

life in the West, neither is much the worse for the wear. **The Pit** simply does not compel the amplitude of feeling that great literature does” (Hussman 181).

Of the capitalist nature of London’s and Norris’ heroes, Henry Nash Smith concludes, “London’s proclamation that the business tycoon is a superman, beyond good and evil, has no more substance than Norris’ depiction of Curtis Jadwin as a Napoleon, a giant of will power and intellect. In both cases the superman has to abandon his role before he becomes an acceptable husband and receives the fictional good-conduct medal of a wife’s devotion. London. . . like Norris, is guilty of a kind of dilettantism. Both are playing with concepts and themes from which in the end they retreat in order to take refuge in the citadel of monogamous marriage and domestic felicity” (99).

It is interesting to note that Rand’s heroes always remain capitalist and we see them either before marriage or pondering divorce. Dominique marries three different characters and maintains a traditional ‘good wife’ role, but she’s not really a capitalist heroine. Roark doesn’t marry Dominique until after his capitalistic success, Dagny and Galt are never married and Rearden’s marriage is on the decline. Gail loses the ‘good-conduct medal of a wife’s devotion’ during his great capitalist push to defend Roark and influence public opinion about his paper. Even in Rand’s work, we see the idea that capitalist heroes and marriage don’t mix. Dreiser may be the only writer who attempts to blend these two aspects of characterization.

Dreiser’s Cowperwood is even more capitalist than Rand’s heroes because he tries to enjoy both his wife and mistress at the same time. Rand’s heroes excessively have more than one lover just because they can. Although Dominique and Hank Rearden have multiple lovers, neither tries to equally enjoy both—they dislike the spouse and like the lover. Nevertheless, the mere idea that Rand’s heroes can have both without downfall is an excessive and greedy capitalist ideal.

The optimistic heroism of the Randian hero in his struggles for greatness shows us that excess does not cause downfall. Furthermore, we do not have to give up our wealth to find happiness like London’s hero, *Burning Daylight*, does. Through the successful Randian hero, she shows how we can maintain both a wealthy and happy lifestyle of any excess we desire. Typical twentieth century literature counters this idea to show that we must enjoy wealth and prosperity at reasonable levels. Rand shows us that not only can we “have our cake and eat it too” in terms

of excessive prosperity, but she also encourages us that “the sky is the limit” to our own version of the capitalist American Dream.

When describing the typical literary capitalist hero, John Cashill claims, “. . . that it [the work of the capitalist hero] should result in a larger community good; the he [the capitalist hero] should adhere to the strategy suggested by Christian business ethics since corruption follows neglect; that he should avoid the excesses of materialism and leisure” (70-71). Ultimately, the Monroe Stahrs, John Galts and Sam Dodsworths will indirectly contribute to a larger community good because it will have better movies, engines and cars created by these great tycoons. Outside of Rand, and perhaps Dreiser, Edna Ferber’s **Giant** shows perhaps the most excessive prosperity of capitalist heroes with the least amount of downfall.

Bick lives a life of wealth and excess, but it’s also practical and sensible. Though he lusts for power in creating the greatest cattle empire in Texas, he’s a likeable ‘heart of gold’ hero who loves his wife, Leslie, and never loses focus on important values. “Three days of their honeymoon were spent in New York. . . They went to the theatre, ate well, drove in the Park, and shopped a little but there was none of the lavish moneyed carelessness that one would expect from the possessor of millions of acres of land and hundreds of thousands of cattle” (**Giant** 105).

“Negatively expressed, [Rand’s] benevolent vision views man’s metaphysical nature as not condemned to tragic, joyless futility in a meaningless ‘life’ but rather as capable of and promising a life ‘without pain or fear or guilt.’”(Cody 31). Tragic heroes of excess like Emma Bovary, Humbert Humbert and Jay Gatsby are Randian heroes, like Roark, who will endure any pain in order to reach their joys. They are extreme “all or nothing” types who will never be content with practical compromises of their fantasy dreams. Lives filled with pain, fear and guilt are typical of the hero of the literary establishment. Edith of Babbitt’s **Dodsworth** tries to help rid the hero of this typically ‘American’ trait. “Edith’s only effort to correct his provincial ways was in a gentle urging, ‘Let yourself enjoy life, Sam! You’re typically American in being burdened with a sense of guilt, no matter what you do or you don’t do’”(**Dodsworth** 362).

Although F. Scott Fitzgerald’s Jay Gatsby is not truly a Randian hero by my definitions, he is exactly like Gail Wynand. Both men are high society gentlemen who live excessive lifestyles. Gatsby uses the dirty means of bootlegging and point shaving to earn his wealth. Nevertheless, Rand makes Gail’s means of earning wealth look just as dirty as Gatsby’s—even though it’s through legal and productive work.

When Gail buys Dominique an expensive necklace, she says, “ ‘That life story of the Bronx housewife who murdered her husband’s young mistress is pretty sordid, Gail. But I think there’s something dirtier—the curiosity of the people who like to read about it. . . Actually, it was that housewife. . . who made this necklace possible. It’s a beautiful necklace. I shall be proud to wear it.’/Gail replies, ‘I like to think that I took the worst refuse of the human spirit—the mind of that housewife and the minds of the people who like to read about her—and I made of it this necklace on your shoulders’”(The Fountainhead 490).

Therefore, Gatsby is suitable enough to be considered a Randian hero like Gail. “What distinguishes the capitalist and what makes him so much the quintessential American is that he has made himself what he is through his own work. . . Christopher Newman has derived his confidence, what Valentin calls his ‘air,’ not so much from his money, as from his ‘proud consciousness of honest toil, of having produced something yourself that somebody has been willing to pay you for’.³² James is careful to distinguish the possession of wealth from the earning of it; as Newman says, ‘I cared for money-making, but I never cared so very terribly for the money’” (Cashill 212).³³

The excessive heroes Gail, Gatsby and Emma Bovary don’t care so much about money, but more about what they think money can buy them. For Gail, it’s Dominique as a coveted mistress and powerful public support for Roark’s struggles. For Gatsby it’s a renewed love affair with Daisy that would be ‘just like old times.’ For Emma it’s a chance to live that wonderful and fantasy lifestyle that would be excessively joyful. Gail is the only heroic figure in Rand’s canon that fails to win his desires like the typical literary protagonist. This makes Gail realistic—a man who uses wealth in neither a terribly good nor evil way—but a practical one.³⁴

“Materialism and leisure” for the tragic hero takes many different forms, but in terms of individual happiness, it looks very similar. Edward Ashburnham of Ford Madox Ford’s **The Good Soldier** and Humbert Humbert of Vladimir Nabokov’s **Lolita** are both European heroes who indulge in American excesses of love, lust and obsession. While these traits are not necessarily bad, these literary heroes cannot have what they want without downfall. A tragic hero must be obsessed with something impractical or that which he or she cannot have. Edward is no different from Rand’s heroes—he’s a combination of good and evil. His obsession with women younger than his wife leads him on extramarital flings, both impulsive and planned [by his wife].

However, his American friend, John Dowell [the novel’s narrator] views him as good. “. .

. It was generally a disagreeable ordeal for newcomers but Edward Ashburnham bore it like an Englishman and a gentleman (**The Good Soldier** 27). . . I seem to perceive myself following the lines of Edward Ashburnham. I suppose that I should really like to be a polygamist; with Nancy, and with Leonora and with Maisie Maidan and possibly even with Florence. I am no doubt like every other man; only, probably because of my American origin” (**The Good Soldier** 257). He perpetuates the American belief that the excessive hero should be granted all desires. “Not one of us has got what he really wanted. Leonora wanted Edward, and she has got Rodney Bayham. . . Florence wanted Branshaw, and it is I who have bought it from Leonora. . . Edward wanted Nancy Rufford and I have got her. . . Why can’t people have what they want? The things were all there to content everybody; yet everybody has the wrong thing” (**The Good Soldier** 257-58).

Unlike John Dowell, Edward’s wife, Leonora, believes that his materialistic obsession, or desire to have everything he wants, takes a terribly destructive toll on the man. “She [Leonora] considered it to be her duty to warn the girl of the sort of monster that Edward was. She told the girl of La Dolciquita, of Mrs. Basil, of Maisie Maidan, of Florence. She spoke of the agonies that she had endured during her life with the man, who was violent, overbearing, vain, drunken, arrogant and monstrously a prey to his sexual necessities” (**The Good Soldier** 262).

Norman Leer interjects, “Dowell’s view of Edward. . . perceives a vestige of nobility in this hero, which sets him apart from a world which has even less. [Edward’s] inner turmoil suggests a potential for moral response, which might have been realized had either he or his world been able to discern a workable moral base (70). . . and Leonora, instead of directly meeting the problem of her bad marital relationship, takes over her husband’s estate, and without quite realizing it kills his last small vestige of self-respect. [Edward’s] frenzied series of affairs can be attributed in large part to Leonora’s cold and businesslike act (76). . . [Edward’s] vestiges of aristocratic dignity become admirable simply because his society has dropped so far below them, and is unable to show any clear alternatives to take their place” (81).

The same type of obsession happens to Gatsby. His desire to relive the past causes him to confront Daisy in front of Tom. When he pressures her to confirm his idea that she loves him best and wants to elope with him, she says, “‘Oh, you want too much!’ she cried to Gatsby. ‘I love you now—isn’t that enough? I can’t help what’s past.’ She began to sob helplessly. ‘I did love him [Tom] once—but I loved you too’” (**The Great Gatsby** 133). John Henry Raleigh proclaims, “No one knew better than Gatsby that nothing could finally match the splendors of his

own imagination, and the novel would suggest finally that not only had the American dream been corrupted but it was, in part anyway, necessarily corrupted, for it asked too much” (101).

According to Marius Bewley, “The theme of **The Great Gatsby** is the withering of the American dream. . . [it is] an exploration of the American dream as it exists in a corrupt period. . . Fitzgerald perfectly understood the inadequacy of Gatsby’s romantic view of wealth. . . He presents it in Gatsby as a romantic baptism of desire for a reality that stubbornly remains out of sight. . . Gatsby is a ‘mythic’ character. . . Not only is he an embodiment of that conflict between illusion and reality at the heart of American life; he is an heroic personification of the American romantic hero, the true heir of the American dream” (125-28). R.W.B. Lewis interprets, “In **The Great Gatsby**, the Adamic anecdote retains a singular purity of outline: the young hero follows the traditional career from bright expectancy to the destruction which, in American literature, has been its perennial reward. . . each of them [Adamic heroes] struggles tirelessly, sometimes unwittingly and often absurdly, to realize the full potentialities of the classic figure each represents: the Emersonian figure, ‘the simple genuine self against the whole world’” (197-98).

Emma Bovary is also like Gatsby and Edward, she must have all or nothing. She’s the typical tragic heroine in that her life is either too exciting or too boring. She can never find true happiness that is a good balance between both. Emma is a heroine just like Rand’s. The major difference is the capitalism of Rand’s heroes. They can afford their excessive lives and Emma can’t. She’s just like Dominique--an idle and tragic heroine who is nothing beyond the title of being someone’s wife. The family hires a nanny and Emma is neither a housewife nor mother who maintains a focus on this domestic form of capitalistic, or productive, work. The eternal desire to be intoxicated by idealistic love affairs consumes her life. The lack of productive work in her life, helps to perpetuate this lack of social and mental balance in Emma. “Why was life so unsatisfying?. . . Each smile hid a yawn of boredom, each joy a curse. . . and the sweetest kisses only left on one’s lips a hopeless longing for a higher ecstasy” (**Madame Bovary** 245).

Emma either does extreme productive work, or none at all. After she is brokenhearted when Rodolphe, her extramarital lover, breaks a promise to elope, “She plunged into excessive charity. She sewed clothes for the poor; she sent firewood to women in childbed; and one day when Charles came home he found three tramps eating soup at the kitchen table. . . Charles’ mother found nothing to condemn in Emma’s conduct, except, perhaps, her mania for knitting undershirts for orphans instead of mending her own dish towels” (**Madame Bovary** 186).

Nabokov's Humbert Humbert creates a better balance between 'all or nothing' than Emma or Edward because he knows what will make him happy:

Rope-skipping, hopscotch. That old woman in black who sat down next to me on my bench, on my rack of joy [a nymphet was groping under me for a lost marble], and asked if I had stomachache, the insolent hag. Ah, leave me alone in my pubescent park, in my mossy garden. Let them play around me forever. Never grow up (**Lolita** 22).

While he can always enjoy the fantasy essence of nymphets in the park, Humbert Humbert also maintains a practical application of this dream. He never imagines it so fantastically that he can't enjoy it. "For there is no other bliss on earth comparable to that of fondling a nymphet. . . . Despite our tiffs, despite her nastiness, despite all the fuss and faces she made, and the vulgarity, and the danger, and the horrible hopelessness of it all, I still dwelled deep in my elected paradise—a paradise whose skies were the color of hell-flames—but still a paradise" (**Lolita** 152).

In these, the most optimistic lines in the entire work, we see how joyful excess can be when used within a reasonable balance of emotion. The less disguised the optimism, the more capitalistic the novel. While **Lolita** isn't a capitalist novel, strains of optimism exist in it that go beyond typical literature. Humbert Humbert says, "While my body knew what it craved for, my mind rejected my body's every plea. One moment I was ashamed and frightened, another recklessly optimistic" (**Lolita** 20). This optimism disguised with pessimism portrays Humbert Humbert as the greatest rebel hero in all of literature, not because he doesn't try to live excessively or idealistically. He appreciates the joys of the past, resigns himself that 'it's over' and moves on in a realistic way.

When Lo refuses to elope with him after she's pregnant with her boyfriend's child—Humbert Humbert doesn't harbor bitterness. He doesn't confront the man like Gatsby or kill himself like Edward. Humbert Humbert cries and says farewell to the love of his life in a noble and heroic way. He appreciates and remembers their wonderful past, "For some reason, I kept seeing—it trembled and silkily glowed on my damp retina—a radiant child of twelve, sitting on a threshold, 'pinging' pebbles at an empty can" (**Lolita** 255). Furthermore, he finds bittersweet closure by falling romantically into a deep purgation, "I was driving through the drizzle of the

dying day, with the windshield wipers in full action but unable to cope with my tears” (**Lolita** 256).

Humbert Humbert suffers the pain of losing his joy in a way that is not as extreme as the suicides of Emma Bovary or Edward and not as emotionless and dramatic as Gail losing Dominique. While crying is out of the question for the Randian hero, even very few literary heroes, especially men, cry to show their emotions. Like a true hero—he murders Quilty, not because of the perverted and socially taboo acts that he had her perform—but because Quilty took advantage of Lolita’s love and gave none back in return. There was reason to Humbert Humbert’s madness—more reason than Roark’s rape of Dominique. Edward’s love for women younger than his wife is a more excessive and traditional form of Humbert Humbert’s love for nymphets. But unlike Humbert Humbert, Edward cannot be content with one mistress at a time.

Sherman McCoy of Tom Wolfe’s **The Bonfire of the Vanities**, is punished for the same type of excessive lifestyle. He is tried in court and defamed by the media for his excessive lifestyle and lack of morals as much as for breaking the law. When taken to trial, protesters call him, “‘Capitalist killer’ . . . Mr. McCoy, 39, was dressed in an open-necked sport shirt, khaki pants, and hiking shoes. This was in sharp contrast to the \$2,000 custom-tailored English suits he was famous for as the legendary \$1,000,000-a-year ‘king of the bond market’ for Pierce & Pierce. . . Mr. McCoy’s marriage was rocked by the revelation that Maria Ruskin Chirazzi, heiress of the Ruskin air-charter fortune, was in the automobile with Mr. McCoy at the time Mr. Lamb was struck. The couple, it developed, had been conducting an affair in a secret apartment later dubbed the ‘rent controlled love nest’” (**Bonfire of the Vanities** 686-89).

Brian Abel Ragen asserts, “[McCoy’s] good fortune and success had given him an extreme sense of entitlement. He treats all his advantages as only his due and expects even more. . . he expects a gorgeous young mistress as well as a wife of forty (144). . . [Just like Gatsby’s car accident] in each case the man is not driving. The man who has done the same thing out of vanity or infatuation on a still larger scale, has let the woman take the driver’s seat, and that leads to disaster (148). . . A related theme is vanity itself. . . Since McCoy must lie to his wife, he can’t go to the police or even cooperate with them when they come to him. What would have been just a frightening incident had he been alone in the car becomes his downfall because his mistress is with him” (150).

Ironically, wealth and excess don't hurt the man who helps destroy McCoy. "Mr. Fallow, winner of a Pulitzer Prize for his coverage of the McCoy case, couldn't be reached for comment. He's reportedly on a sailboat in the Aegean Sea with his new bride, Lady Evelyn, daughter of Sir Gerald Steiner, publisher and financier" (**Bonfire of the Vanities** 690). Both desires are just like those of Rand's rebels--they go beyond the socially accepted norms of morality. "Taboos strangulated me. . . Marriage and cohabitation before the age of puberty are still not uncommon in certain East Indian provinces. Lepcha old men of eighty copulate with girls of eight, and nobody minds" (**Lolita** 20-21).

For Rand's heroes, they only suffer from pessimisms that they allow to happen to themselves. Unlike that of Humbert Humbert, the pain for Rand's heroes, whether wealthy or not, is more professional and financial than personal. They're rich and progressive enough to take care of both themselves and the parasitical masses. Rand's heroes can have anything they want in any eccentric form they please and feel contentment that they earned every bit of it. High society wives, trophy mistresses and flaunting random displays of wealth are all theirs for the taking. Greed and excess never hurts them and they wind up the winner of every money and power contest.

Hank Rearden says to Dagny:

'I've always wanted to enjoy my wealth. . . Only I couldn't. I couldn't find any purpose for it. I've found it now. It's I who've produced that wealth and it's I who am going to let it buy for me every kind of pleasure I want. . . including the preposterous feat of turning you into a luxury object. . . when I was working in the ore mines in Minnesota, I thought that I wanted to reach an evening like this. . . when I was tired, because I had worked two shifts, and wanted nothing on earth except to lie down and fall asleep right there, on the mine ledge—I thought that some day I would sit in a place like this, where one drink of wine would cost more than my day's wages, and I would have earned the price of every minute of it. . . and I would sit there for no purpose but my own amusement. . . I gave up expecting it years ago. But I feel it tonight' (**Atlas Shrugged** 351-52).

This type of literary trait, of excess not causing downfall, is more associated with popular literature. Rand's work isn't just 'popular literature'--it sits on the cusp of many different genres. Her capitalist heroes are morally only a step away from the opportunistic anti-heroes of

popular literature. Both of these types of heroes flirt with the borderline of good and evil.

In Irwin Shaw's **Nightwork**, the opportunism of Doug Grimes, the hero, doesn't make his life any worse, "We had driven slowly, stopping often to sight-see and indulge in great meals outside Lyon and in Avallon. . . We had dined gloriously. Over dinner I had told her everything. Where my money had come from, how I had met up with Fabian, what our arrangement was. . . She [Evelyn-his girlfriend] had listened quietly. . . 'Finders keepers, I always say,' she said. . . 'Don't worry, dear. I am not opposed to larceny in a good cause'" (**Nightwork** 282). Furthermore, even though Doug's life of wealth, success and excess, like Rand's heroes, is acquired on the bending of a few moral rules, doesn't cause him one ounce of regret, he says, "If stealing a hundred thousand dollars from a dead old man could put the expression that I saw now on Henry's face, felony became a virtue and I would steal ten times over from ten dead men" (**Nightwork** 304).

The literary trend towards 'sky is the limit' excessively optimistic lifestyles for the hero without downfall moves typical protagonists toward anti-heroic status. Anti-heroes of popular and academic literature ultimately tend to get what's coming to them. Their fates are simply the ones they choose without moral labels. Good or bad fates only happen to heroes—not anti-heroes. We feel sorry for Christopher Newman not getting the girl because he's not anti-heroic—it's a bad fate for him and Claire. Furthermore, anti-heroes can be either protagonists or antagonists. They are real-looking characters like Gail Wynand. Anti-heroes are also usually created by some traumatic life event that gives them the moral toughness and immunity to be opportunistic and blurry on their stand around the border between good and evil.

As the most anti-heroic character of Rand's canon, Gail Wynand is no different from any other literary anti-heroes. They are rebels against their old selves and beliefs resulting from their life trauma. In Joseph Heller's **Catch-22**, the trauma doesn't come for Youssarian when he learns about Catch-22. "There was only one catch and that was Catch-22. . . Orr was crazy and could be grounded. All he had to do was ask; and as soon as he did, he would no longer be crazy and would have to fly more missions. Orr would be crazy to fly more missions and sane if he didn't, but if he was sane had had to fly them. If he flew them he was crazy and didn't have to; but if he didn't want to he was sane and had to" (**Catch-22** 46).

The trauma really comes for him when Catch-22 is directly applied to his life and he must choose between being an aggressor and a victim. Constance Denniston says, "In the upside-down

world of **Catch-22**, the characters fall into two categories, the aggressors and the victims. The aggressors are Yankee types who express their American know-how and individuality in a will to power” (70). The fun of rebellion is to be able to choose a side or not, on one’s own terms. After the Army offers him the deal, Youssarian can no longer be either victim or aggressor on his own terms.

They say to him, “We’re going to glorify you and send you home a hero, recalled by the Pentagon for morale and public relations purposes. You’ll live like a millionaire. . . A whole new world of luxury awaits you once you become our pal. Isn’t it lovely? (**Catch-22** 417). . . If you don’t go through with the deal, they’re going to institute court-martial proceedings. . . you’ll go to prison for a long time, your whole life will be ruined” (**Catch-22** 432-33). Although his old naïve and victimized self initially accepts the deal, Youssarian develops his identity as a true anti-hero in joining neither side and rebelling in his own way by escaping to Sweden. According to Stephen W. Potts, “. . . It’s not the expectation of success that motivates Youssarian. . . but the mere fact of rebellion, of refusing to deal with the system, or let the system deal with him, on his own terms. . . But Youssarian is fighting for the sake of fighting, not for the sake of success, and he is taking pleasure and strength from the fact of fighting back” (113).

Even the capitalist aggressor of the novel, Milo, gets to dishonorably get his fellow Americans killed for a profit in his own way. Doing it his own way is most important. He says, “If I can persuade the Germans to pay me a thousand dollars for every plane they shoot down, why shouldn’t I take it? . . . And the Germans are not our enemies. . . Sure, we’re at war with them. . . Maybe they did start the war and maybe they are killing millions of people, but they pay their bills a lot more promptly than some allies of ours I could name” (**Catch-22** 250-51).

Gail Wynand is a combination of Youssarian and Milo—a capitalist who wants to rebel against integrity and passion in his own way. His trauma comes when his hero, a man of great integrity, gets framed unjustly for it. “. . . When Pat Mulligan, police captain of his precinct, was framed, Wynand could not take it; because Pat Mulligan was the only honest man he had ever met in his life. . . He would tell [the great editor] about Mulligan and together they would beat the machine . . . [Gail says to the editor]. . . ‘Do you remember this?’ . . . [the editor replies] ‘How do you expect me to remember every piece of swill I write?’/ ‘Thanks’ Wynand said. The gratitude was genuine—a payment for a lesson he would never need again. Wynand walked back to the Gazette, feeling no anger toward the editor or the political machine. He felt only a furious

contempt for himself, for Pat Mulligan, for all integrity” (**The Fountainhead** 407-08).

The same type of experience happens to Miles Fabian. He is the anti-heroic, opportunistic character who helps, Doug, the not-so-goody-goody protagonist of **Nightwork**, get rich. His wife tells of his life trauma, “He was a pilot. . . he had almost every medal a grateful government could hand out. . . In the winter of nineteen forty-four. . . he and his best friend were shot down over the Pas de Calais. Miles was taken by the Germans. . . That’s where the scar came from. When the hospital he was in was finally overrun, he weighed a hundred pounds. . . That’s when he decided, he told me, that he had done his last deed for humanity” (**Nightwork** 314).

Charles Ryder of Evelyn Waugh’s **Brideshead Revisited** and Stevens of Kazuo Ishiguro’s **Remains of the Day** are two British literary anti-heroes who experience the same types of trauma. They have more cultural religion and tradition to hide themselves behind than their American counterparts. Although they find themselves and grow as individuals as a result of their implied traumas, it’s not done as instantly and matter-of-factly as Gail Wynand or Miles Fabian. Furthermore, because they have more moderated European sensibilities, as opposed to the less traditional, crazy and wild American world of excess, these two anti-heroes are not as likeable as Youssarian, Milo or Gail Wynand.

Ryder is snobbish. According to Stephen Spender, “Despite his rationalism [a characteristic of Rand’s heroes], [Ryder] is a bigot of a rather insignificant kind. He is a painter, but considers modern art ‘great bosh.’ He is a snob, not only in his relations at Brideshead, but in most things. . . He is incapable of remaining more than faintly interested in Sebastian after his friend has become a drunkard” (69-70). However, as an anti-hero, Ryder’s morality sits between the extreme snobbishness of his father and cousin, Jasper and the more down-to-earth Sebastian. Jasper advises him, “Don’t treat dons like schoolmasters; treat them as you would the vicar at home. . . You’ll find you spend half your second year shaking off the undesirable friends you made in the first” (**Brideshead Revisited** 26).

Sebastian hates going home because of the strict traditional rules he’s made to follow there. He says, “I’m afraid I wasn’t very nice this afternoon. Brideshead often has that effect on me” (**Brideshead Revisited** 39). Although Ryder rebels against cultural and religious tradition by divorcing Celia to marry Julia, he finally becomes a victim of the same snobbery that has characterized him. Julia refuses to marry him because of her religion.³⁵

Just like Ryder, Stevens of Kazuo Ishiguro’s **Remains of the Day**, experiences the same

type of heartbreak from the one prospective love of his life. When she says, “For instance, I get to thinking about a life I may have had with you, Mr. Stevens. . . One can’t be forever dwelling on what might have been. One should realize one has as good as most, perhaps better and be grateful/ [Stevens replies to himself] I do not think I responded immediately, for it took me a moment or two to fully digest these words of Miss Kenton. Moreover, as you might appreciate, their implications were such as to provoke a certain degree of sorrow within me. Indeed—why should I not admit it? –at that moment, my heart was breaking” (**Remains of the Day** 239).

In their moments of heartbreak, Stevens and Ryder heroically step out from behind their guises to find themselves and the purpose and meaning in their lives. Neither the stuffy Stevens nor the snobbish Ryder are likeable—heroes should be liked. However, as a result of their courage, both experience important life revelations in which we neither feel great sympathy nor happiness for them. Unfortunately, unlike Gail Wynand and Miles Fabian, Stevens and Ryder find themselves in the latter part of their lives. The trauma is best at earlier ages because the anti-hero spends less of his life in denial, confusion and inner conflict and has more time to experience the results of it. Two major problems creating these anti-heroes’ dispositions are Catholicism and professionalism to hide behind, and, especially for Stevens, not experiencing much of the world beyond the kingdoms of Oxford, Brideshead and Darlington Hall. **36**

Although they both failed to find the true happiness they wanted, these anti-heroes have tried to do what they think is important and are free to create their own happy consolations. Brian W. Shaffer comments, “Stevens consistently calls his former co-worker ‘Mrs. Benn’ to her face but ‘Miss Kenton’ to himself; and he literally smiles at her even though his heart is breaking. This duplicity enables the forlorn Stevens to convince himself that, despite a clearly failed excursion and life, ‘there is plenty of daylight left’ –that the ‘the evening’ may well be ‘the best part of the day’” (86). Barry Lewis concludes that, “The ending of Stevens’ story can be interpreted both pessimistically and optimistically. Stevens’ reevaluation of himself and his life leaves him in a rather bleak situation, alone on a bench at a pier in Weymouth. Yet at least he is now willing to acknowledge the human warmth he has avoided for so long” (100).

While both Stevens and Ryder find neutral middle grounds in their lives, if read the right way, readers can find entertainment in their stories. Academics aside, if **The Fountainhead** is nothing else—it’s entertaining literature. Rand’s mix of serious literature and fun entertainment is crazy. Robert Fulford (1996) argues, “**The Fountainhead** is heavy-handed trash, but a bizarre

and obviously effective form of trash.” When we mix dreamy melodrama with trash, we get a soap opera. American readers love trash and melodrama—that’s why Rand’s novels sell so well. A melodramatic love story with deceit, opportunism and shock value—those are the best-selling ingredients of **The Fountainhead**. Melissa Jane Hardie says, “. . . the analysis of popular culture must elaborate its own practice by locating the agency of popular audiences. . . ‘Clearly, our understanding of modern culture becomes distorted when critics ignore the books people want to read in favor of those they ought to read.’” (369). **37**

Gore Vidal’s **Myra Breckinridge** is another entertaining novel for popular readers, that’s no less shocking in its sexual brutality than **The Fountainhead**. Unlike Vidal’s, Rand’s shocking trash simply came about a quarter century before its time. **Myra Breckinridge** was published in 1968, a time in which America’s cultural climate was more prepared for it than Rand’s 1943 novel. “[In the novel] A woman who is, in fact, a homosexual man revenges her/himself on a heterosexual man with the aim of symbolically reversing the sex/ gender order. Or, more likely, to shock, titillate, and offend in order, ultimately, to instruct” (Altman 132). Susan Baker and Curtis S. Gibson recall that, “**Myra Breckinridge** shocked many readers—some with delight, others with outrage—and seemed a radical departure from all of Vidal’s earlier novels” (148).

In addition to being soap opera trash, **The Fountainhead** also checks in as a long epic novel of American history between the wars.**38** A message to both academic and popular readers: feel a little overwhelmed by reading the seven hundred plus pages of entertaining epic novels like **The Fountainhead**, Margaret Mitchell’s **Gone With the Wind** and Herman Wouk’s **War and Remembrance**? Have no fear, scholars Helen Taylor, Barbara Grizutti Harrison and critic Christopher Lehmann-Haupt give excellent advice on reading epics and what to look for in them—love affairs, sex, war, power battles and most importantly—iconic heroes and anti-heroes that we all want to emulate. Arnold Beichman portrays one critic of Herman Wouk’s **War and Remembrance**, **New York Times** book critic Christopher Lehmann-Haupt, who gives perhaps the best advice for reading the entertaining epic in general when he says, “Don’t think about **War and Remembrance** too much and you’ll have a wonderful time”.**39**

Enjoy the melodrama, “. . . victors and vanquished, combatants and civilians, people of so many nations, men, women and children, all cut down. . . they will not have died in vain if their remembrance can lead us from the long, long time of war to the time for peace” (**War and Remembrance** 1039). Root for the likeable everyman American hero, ‘Pug’ Henry, “[the Vice

Admiral asks him]And read your Bible every morning, and Shakespeare at night?/Well, sort of. At least I still try./ You clean-living types depress me./Well I smoke and drink like anything now./Honor Bright? . . . That’s progress” (**War and Remembrance** 10). Appreciate the strong will of the faithful war wives, “Madeline’s presence luckily postponed certain tactical and moral questions; such as, whether she [Rhoda] should sleep with Palmer, after having written to Pug that she wanted to preserve their marriage” (**War and Remembrance** 80).

Enjoy this between the exciting action, “Now fear stabbed Byron’s very bowels. This time the submarine was caught. . . and he was caught in it. . . He too was praying. . . ‘God, let me live. God, let me live” (**War and Remembrance** 106). . . with historical facts close enough to the truth, “Here took place the crucial battle for Leyte Gulf. The most spectacular battle, however, was fought in the south, in the dark. . . Every gunship of Kinkaid’s Seventh Fleet lay in wait [for Kurita’s Japanese diversionary force]. . . The Battle Line blasted them into oblivion. . . Only one destroyer escaped to tell the grisly story of Surigao Strait back in Japan” (**War and Remembrance** 951).

The popular reader wants exaggerated entertaining history more than true history. Barbara Grizzuti Harrison gives the same type of critique of fun and brainless reading of **The Fountainhead**. She states, “The book. . . is fun-bad, though no less pretentious. **The Fountainhead** is a ripe and fanciful mixture of politics and sex. . . There is—provided one lobotomizes the political-feminist part of one’s brain—a certain amount of delicious, randy fun to be found in this stuff. Rand knows how to push the atavistic dream-machine buttons.” (70, 73). Helen Taylor read **Gone With the Wind** in a similar way, she recalls, “The way I read the book, then, meant that I focused on Scarlett O’Hara’s fortunes, and those of the characters with whom she interacts most, and fitted everyone and every event into the framework of Scarlett’s destiny and progress. Cheerfully skipping what I found to be boring political and social details, I concentrated hard on the central love triangle of Scarlett, Ashley and Rhett, which I found endlessly satisfying” (12).

After learning more about Southern Civil War history and culture, the boring parts of the novel became more interesting to Taylor. **40** Although Rhett Butler is more a combination of Roark’s brutishness and Gail’s anti-heroism, Dominique looks exactly like Scarlett. Even though I can find no concrete and specific evidence to prove Mitchell’s influence on **The Fountainhead**, Rand praises the work with words quite similar to those Taylor mentions about

her reading of the epic.⁴¹ She says, “Margaret Mitchell’s skill, in this novel, lies in the fact that the developments of the romantic triangle are determined by the events of the Civil War and involve, in a single plot structure, other characters who are representative of the various levels of Southern society” (**The Romantic Manifesto** 86).

Rand picks up where Margaret Mitchell leaves off. Roark’s rape is a more vividly brutal depiction of Rhett Butler’s carrying Scarlet O’Hara up to the bedroom to ravish her. Of the melodramatic rape scene of Rand’s 1943 work, Wendy McElroy claims:

Rand’s ideal of surrender is too violent and too literally bruising for me to embrace willingly. As thoroughly as I appreciate the intellectual values being stylized in the initial sex scene between Dominique and Roark, I cannot get past the fact that—in similar circumstances—I would try to maim any man who caused me that sort of physical pain. Even in the alleged pursuit of ultimate values. And yet. . . what heterosexual woman hasn’t fantasized about being swept into the strong impetuous arms of Rhett Butler and conveyed up a curving staircase to the satin sheets of ravishment? These gentler, less threatening fantasies of ‘being taken’ seem to survive intact through actual violence, perhaps because they express a natural urge within women [and some men] to relinquish control and be conquered by a mutual passion. This urge within women is deftly captured by Ayn Rand, and captured in a manner that is typical of both her life and work: the woman goes to extremes. I am left wondering whether the discomfort caused by her extreme presentations might not be a positive thing. In the final analysis, the main purpose of art might be to shake us all up a bit (169).

Gone With the Wind shakes us up in the same way as well. Helen Taylor asserts, “Scarlett’s problem with sexual feeling and expression are at times comic or simply titillating, at other erotically profoundly charged. And as in much pornography and many ‘romantic’ novels which place considerable obstacles in the way of sexual fulfillment between two predestine lovers, it is the difficulties which give pleasure and arousal, both of which are heightened by the eventual shattering of strong taboos within a culture that strongly represses female sexuality” (106).

Although Mitchell’s scene is better written and Rhett’s carrying-the damsel up the stairs looks less brutal and more heroic than Roark’s breaking into Dominique’s room, the two rape scenes are similar in terms of the melodramatic, romance-novel trashiness they portray. ⁴²

James Michener proclaims that Tolstoy's Anna Karenina and Flaubert's Emma Bovary are the nineteenth century precursors to Scarlett O'Hara—a new type of heroine: free spirited, attractive, immoral and totally ingratiating. . . In critical acceptance, Flaubert stands supreme with Tolstoy not far behind. This is partly because these two presented their portraits as tragedies, which the public has been trained to accept as a higher level of art. . . Margaret Mitchell was excessively praised at publication [of **Gone With the Wind**], numerous critics comparing her novel favorably with **War and Peace**, and was excessively deflated in the 1950s and 1960s because of her parochial viewpoint and lack of development of her characters (69-71).

And just like critics of Rand, “. . . Critics will have to grapple with the problem of why her [Mitchell's] novel has remained so readable and so important to so many people” (Michener 71). Just like Flaubert said that Emma Bovary ‘c'est moi,’ so does Helen Taylor, “Several are secretly thrilled to be compared with her and say ‘I am her and sympathize with her blindness, immaturity, and her greed and zest; Scarlett always seems to be chasing the unattainable—like me’” (96). Dominique maintains all these attributes while also following Scarlett's lead in being, “Such a strong character—spoilt, beautiful, bitchy—as we'd all like to be” (Taylor 96).

Despite the heralded icons of Scarlett/Dominique, true credit belongs to Rhett/Gail/Roark for admitting the anti-heroism in themselves and their women. Although they use extremely forceful means, they challenge the anti-heroine to freely pursue her desires and express her individual and sexual passions. Rhett says, “We are both scoundrels, Scarlett, and nothing is beyond us when we want something. We could've been happy, for I loved you and I know you, Scarlett, down to your bones, in a way that Ashley could never know you. . . And I, my darling, will continue to moon after whores. And, I dare say we'll do better than most couples” (**Gone With the Wind** 928).

Despite the fact that Rand's epic anti-heroes look more like Mitchell's than Herman Wouk's, Willie of **The Caine Mutiny** is a likeable American ‘everyman’ hero gone bad. He's neither totally on the side of individualism nor the system. As a rebel, he's an atypical character of Wouk's war fiction. He maintains an anti-heroic love/hate relationship with his girlfriend, May, and the Navy. In one scene, when he's late reporting to base because he's saying goodbye to May, she says, “All I want is a chance to make some money and live in peace. I was a fool to fall in love with you. . . For God's sake. . . Why do you keep looking at your watch?/ [Willie replies] I'm earning demerits/ [May fires back] Get out—get out of my life. . . Drop dead!” (**The**

Caine Mutiny 36). When he reports to the duty officer late, he's told, "The only relevant circumstance that I am aware of, Midshipman Keith, is that you now have twenty demerits, the highest figure in Furnald" (**The Caine Mutiny** 37). While the American everyman hero doesn't have to be perfectly good, he usually doesn't have the worst demerit record in a barracks.

Scholars can agree that Captain Francis Queeg is a villain--this is arguably true. ". . . the Caine steamed out through the Golden Gate at sunset, minus some twenty-five of her crew, who had elected court-martial for missing ship rather than another cruise with Queeg" (**The Caine Mutiny** 219). However, few scholars touch on the idea of Willie's anti-heroism. W.J. Stuckey comments, "throughout three fourths of the novel, Captain Queeg is a thoroughly incompetent man. However, toward the close of the book Wouk springs a wholly unprepared-for surprise: Queeg, he tells us, is not really the incompetent everyone thinks him; he is the victim of ambitious and cowardly subordinates" (159). Although he's no coward, Willie's no exception to this group of anti-heroic men. By having the worst demerit record in his outfit and participating in the mutiny, Willie's just as bad a screw up as Queeg—he's simply more loveable.

Willie wrongfully participates in the mutiny, "Queeg's protests gave Willie a growing sense of gladness and power. . . he seemed to be living the happiest moment of his life" (**The Caine Mutiny** 340). Queeg represents parts of both things that Willie hates—his individual self and the corrupt system he serves. As a rebel, he tries to take an ambivalent middle ground between them. "Willie moved his belongings into Queeg's room. . . It was an immensely queer sensation. . . Queeg was once for all the grand historical figure in his life. Not Hitler, not Tojo, but Queeg" ("The Caine Mutiny 481). He receives both a medal and a reprimand, symbols of his good and evil--the two together represent his anti-heroic rebellion. He's dismissed from the Navy. " 'Well,' thought Willie. . . 'a medal and a reprimand. Nice morning's haul'. . . it [the reprimand] meant the end of his naval career" (**The Caine Mutiny** 485-86).

However, his rebellion is not necessarily all bad. This aggressive 'win at all' costs attitude, that Willie develops in the mutiny, will help him win May's heart in the end. "He [Willie] was going to make May his wife" (**The Caine Mutiny** 498). Willie is a mild Randian hero—not as good as Christopher Newman, more good than Jay Gatsby, but not as evil as Rhett Butler or Miles Fabian. Gail Wynand and Dominique are the most anti-heroic types in Rand's canon—the two characters in the moral middle of her scale. Sidney Sheldon's anti-heroes, like Kate Blackwell of **Master of the Game**, are just like Rand's and even her most good heroes,

Roark and Galt, are 'tough' enough to survive. However, Sheldon gives us heroes so extremely good that they top Rand's most morally upstanding figures, Roark and Galt, in righteousness.

Furthermore, their ability to 'survive' is seriously in question because they lack that slight and necessary 'touch of evil' that Willie, Roark and Jay Gatsby all have. Irwin Shaw's skill in presenting heroes who aren't too good and anti-heroes who aren't too bad, without Rand and Sheldon's level of melodrama, make him the most realistic popular writer among this group in terms of characterization. Sheldon's character Jamie McGregor is so good and gullible that it's bad. "Jamie McGregor was one of the dreamers. . . There was [in him] an eagerness to please that was endearing. He had a light-hearted disposition and a soul filled with optimism" (**Master of the Game** 20). These qualities get him cheated out of millions of dollars and nearly killed.

He makes a verbal deal to prospect diamonds for Mr. Van der Merwe, a Dutch trader in South Africa, and share the profits equally. Then naively, Jamie, a newcomer to the region from Scotland, ". . . signed the contract the following morning. It was written in Afrikaans" (**Master of the Game** 39). After getting cheated out of his diamonds by Van der Merwe, the richest, most powerful and well connected man in this region, Jamie trusts a random bartender to listen to his story while he's drunk. The bartender tells him, "'There's an old barn at the end of the street. I'll arrange everything. Be there at ten o'clock tonight./ Thanks,' Jamie said gratefully. 'I won't forget you.'" (**Master of the Game** 56). Jamie naively shows up and is nearly murdered in the ensuing gang beating—no doubt set up by Van der Merwe.

Villainy is tough and the world is even tougher. Rand's heroes, and their concurrently emerging versions in both scholarly and popular literature show us that a touch of evil is needed to succeed in the cold and cruel world. While success is a very important goal for all heroes and anti-heroes, it is not usually the best teacher. Tragic heroes who fail in death, like Emma Bovary, Edward Ashburnham and Jay Gatsby, perhaps never die in vain; unfortunately they can no longer learn from their experiences. Literary heroes who fail and survive, like Charles Ryder, Stevens, Gail Wynand and Curtis Jadwin, learn and are enriched much more than the excessive and spoiled, although lovable, Myra Breckinridge, Scarlett and Kate Blackwell, who encounter few or no life hardships. The world needs more anti-heroism and literature is a wonderful place to begin. Hank Morgan, Willie Keith, Curtis Jadwin, Burning Daylight and Humbert Humbert are all mild Randian anti-heroes who we should strive to emulate.

CHAPTER 7

Greed is Good: The Randian Hero in Pop Culture

In moving from literature to pop culture in portrayals of the Randian hero, not much changes because productive work leaves a lot of moral leeway to characterize the anti-hero. These heroes can fall anywhere between the slightly dishonest lawyer, Kevin Lomax of **Devil's Advocate** and the murderous Cuban drug lord, Tony Montana in **Scarface**. Because morals and ethics differ among individuals in American society, a gray area exists for the capitalist hero in his productive work. While shows such as **The Sopranos** portray evil non-Randian hero characters, Gail Wynand's counterparts in pop culture show that just as much dishonesty, opportunism and greed exist in productive work as in destructive work.

Capitalist heroes of our modern culture such as the late Sam Walton and Bill Gates are steadily turning into the anti-heroic 'men we love to hate' such as Don King, President George W. Bush and the late Ken Lay. Is this because the morals and ethics of our heroes are changing, or our standards in perceiving them? Where should the moral line be drawn between capitalist heroes who are classified as good or evil and those we should love or hate? Not everyone agrees on the answer to this.

Nevertheless, moral judgments and ethical examinations of pop culture anti-heroes are not the goal of this chapter. This is not meant to be a bash-fest of President George W. Bush or the executives of Enron. Ayn Rand's anti-heroes, in real life and cultural media, such as J.R. Ewing of **Dallas**, Alexis Colby of **Dynasty**, Gordon Gekko of the movie **Wall Street**, and boxing promoter Don King, continue to re-emerge and don't ever seem to go away. This chapter will examine 'the ugly side of capitalism' through the greedy modern day versions of Gail Wynand and their morally 'gray' power plays and structures created to crush their enemies, both strong and weak.

Because we enjoy either loving or hating them, these moguls are inseparable from the hypocritical American imagination. They show us that wealth without the power and drive to be the best and win the prize is not as sweet. These tycoons are us and we all want to live the wealthy and greedy lifestyles of the Randian hero and only need more power in order to expose this inner desire to win the game. If we have enough power, like Gordon Gekko, nobody can stop us, because in his immortal words, "we make the rules."

Stephen Cox (1993) echoes this sentiment of the greedy capitalist hero never going away,

in the form of **The Fountainhead**:

The Fountainhead is a monument of American culture: monumental in size, monumental in scope, monumental in effect, monumental in the statement that it makes about America, but monumental also in the complexity and integration of its statement.

The Fountainhead is a monument that has stood in our neighborhood for fifty years, and it's still causing trouble. Some of the neighbors would like to tear it down; they claim that the zoning commission should never have allowed it to be built in the first place; they don't think that there's any room on this block for a palace, fortress, treasury, and temple. Other people are determined to ignore the monument; they're put off by its quality of self-integration, amounting to self-enclosure; they don't find this structure 'user-friendly.' Still others love the building and would like to know it better, but their curiosity is often limited to what the standard guide-books have to say. I think it's time for everyone to get up, go outside, and take a fresh look—walk around the property, inspect the materials, study the blueprints, and see, as if for the first time, how it all fits together, how it grew out of the American earth, and why it will never be torn down (23).

Even our founding literary forefathers, such as J. Hector St. John de Crevecoeur, promoted a milder form of greed—self-interest. He says, “The American ought therefore to love this country much better than that wherein either he or his forefathers were born. Here the rewards of his industry follow with equal steps the progress of his labour; his labour is founded on the basis of nature, self-interest; can it want a stronger allurements? Wives and children, who before in vain demanded of him a morsel of bread, now fat and frolicsome, gladly help their father to clear those fields whence exuberant crops are to arise to feed and to clothe them all; without any part being claimed, either by a despotic prince, a rich abbot, or a mighty lord”.¹

According to Douglas Den Uyl, “Individualism, then is a long-standing part of the American consciousness. . . **The Fountainhead** is arguably the best statement ever made of the American individualist tradition. . . Today, individualism might be expressed this way”:

I do not choose to be a common man. It is my right to be uncommon—if I can. I seek opportunity—not security. I do not wish to be a kept citizen, humbled and dulled by having the state

look after me. I want to take a calculated risk; to dream and to build, to fail and to succeed. I refuse to barter incentive for a dole. I prefer the challenges of life to the guaranteed existence; the thrill of fulfillment to the stale calm of utopia. I will never cower before any master nor bend to any threat. It is my heritage to stand erect, proud and unafraid; to think and act for myself, enjoy the benefit of my creations and to face the world boldly and say, this I have done. All this is what it means to be an American (15-16).²

The late Sam Walton, perhaps the most good and common-man capitalist hero of modern day, based his “entrepreneur’s creed” on this, Dean Alfange’s “American Creed.”³ Sam Walton was more of a capitalist hero than a Randian hero because he was not as hated as he was loved.

Even today, Walton’s creation is hated more than the man himself. After building his great retail empire and earning enough wealth to live an excessive lifestyle, he still preferred a common type of existence. Of his own recreational lifestyle after gaining his wealth, Sam Walton proclaimed, “A lot of businessmen seem to prefer golf, but I always thought it was a little too country club for me and it took up too much time and wasn’t really competitive in the same way that tennis is, you know, in a give-and-take, head-to-head way (144). . . Bud [his brother] and I got really taken with Texas quail hunting a few years back. We each got leases on ranches way down in south Texas scrub country. . . My place is about as simple as they come; Bud’s is a good bit fancier. His has a swimming pool” (147). One magazine described the commonality of one of Sam’s typical quail hunting trips:

Sam Walton’s Campo Chapote [his quail hunting ranch] is a rustic little cluster of trailer homes out in the vast middle of South Texas nowhere. This isn’t the quail hunting of rich Southern gentry, the kind with white-coated servants and engraved Belgian shotguns and matched mules in silver harness hitched to mahogany dog wagons. Sam calls that variety ‘South Georgia quail hunting,’ and he’s tried it, but it isn’t really him. In case the ambient of Campo Chapote hasn’t sunk in yet, it is, to put it simply: ‘All Things Not Trump.’ This is a camp where your host hands you your towel, points you to a bedroom in the trailer, and explains: ‘Don’t let the noise in the ceiling worry you, it’s just rats’ (Walton 148). ⁴

‘All Things Not Trump’ describes Sam Walton’s lifestyle perfectly. In describing his own excessive lifestyle, Donald Trump says, “It [purchase of one of the world’s greatest yachts] was a deal done strictly for the sake of dealing: art for art’s sake. In a way, it reminded me of when I bought Mar-a-Lago, my house in Palm Beach. I didn’t need a 118-room house in Florida, and I didn’t need this 282 foot boat, either. I just say an opportunity to acquire something at a fantastic price, and I seized the moment (152). . . The plan I envisioned was to make the **Trump Princess** a kind of floating suite for high rollers. . . This, I knew, played right into the psychology of the high roller. These are a very diverse bunch of people, but they all live life to the hilt” (156). Like the typical capitalist hero, “Donald Trump, the deal-maker and builder of Manhattan skyscrapers. . . came to Atlantic City in the middle of those early boom years. Like the rest, he was seeking worlds to conquer” (O’Donnell 23).

As a player who lives a lifestyle that many of us would like to try, Donald Trump echoes this trait about himself ‘continually wanting to conquer new worlds.’ “After a couple of years [after buying the **Trump Princess**] I started to think about an even bigger boat, and I actually had plans drawn for one. This is a classic example of how I keep trying to top myself. Owning the world’s most magnificent yacht only made me want to get something even bigger and better” (Trump 162). He follows this with an unbelievable statement. “But as much as I’ve enjoyed it until now, and as impressive as it’s been to my casino customers, I think I’m giving up the game of who’s got the best boat. The **Trump Princess**, as I write this, is up for sale. I don’t need it anymore, I don’t want it anymore, and, frankly, I can find better things to do with the money” (Trump 162). He’s never needed this boat and the ‘better things’ he will do with his millions instead will probably be no less excessive and unnecessary as this. He must create new ways to outrageously blow his dough in order to keep life fun.

In contrast to Trump, Sam Walton emerged to success from commonality, almost like the protagonist, Bud Fox in Oliver Stone’s **Wall Street**. However, unlike Walton, Bud only gets a taste of success—he reaches it, but never maintains it. In this movie, we see two forms of the Randian hero. Bud is like Roark, naïve, rebellious and aspiring to be great. According to Norman Kagan, “[Oliver] Stone cast [Charlie] Sheen as his lead because he felt there was a ‘devilish side to him. . . a strong streak of rebelliousness combined with an inner grace.’ Only twenty-two, much younger than the real crooked brokers, Sheen was aged by Stone with good suits, a haircut,

and enough food to put on weight and jowls” (113).

Bud’s mentor, Gordon Gekko, is like Gail Wynand, the successful anti-heroic capitalist who has arrived at wealth and power and crushes his opposition for sport. Just like Gail, Gekko is not the villain of the movie, or even the hero we want—but the one we need. As high society gentlemen, Gail and Gekko both show that we all must rule or be ruled. Gail and Gekko didn’t invent the vicious game of capitalist wealth and power, they just play and dominate it. Like Martha Stewart’s questionable indictment for insider trading, it’s a gray area type of offense—it’s semi-destructive and semi-productive.

Randian heroes exist on three different levels, ability, capitalism and morals. In ability, her heroes are either common men or supermen, in terms of capitalism, they are either producers of wealth or political/bureaucratic parasites and in terms of morals, they are either anti-heroes or villains. **Wall Street** examines the Randian hero mostly on the moral level. Gekko is only a slight capitalist hero and he’s not great. He’s a smaller producer of wealth than a Sam Walton or the founder of Blue Star Airlines who Carl Fox claims, “. . . built this company up from one plane in thirty years.” Gekko says, “I create nothing. I own.”

Gekko is the most interesting and tragic figure in the film. Like Gail, he lives through the trauma of his father working hard most of his life and dying broke. Just like Rand’s all or nothing types, Gekko believes that either you’re “a player or nothing.” The motto that he outlines in his speech—“greed is good,” is not only important to his character and the film, but also to American culture.

Martin S. Fridson claims, “corporate raider Gordon Gekko’s credo ‘greed is good’ has become proverbial for ethical failings in the business world. For example, no fewer than three contributors to a 1992 conference book on white-collar crime invoke the phrase.⁵ A collection of the 100 most memorable movie lines, published in 1996,⁶ includes the words that Michael Douglas intones in the film” (120). Gekko says, in a speech similar to Rand’s Francisco D’Anconia’s, promoting a love for money,⁷ “You do it right or you get eliminated. . . Greed is good. Greed is right. Greed works. Greed classifies the essence of the revolutionary spirit. Greed has marked the upward surge of mankind. . . Greed will save the U.S. A.”

Although some critics attack the morality of Stone in the movie, they tend to see the message he portrays, whether they like it or not. “The struggle for America’s soul doesn’t boil down to the dark fathers versus the white fathers. It’s in the souls of the gray fathers—the ones

who are ignorant, ambivalent, or just plain self-interested. . . **Wall Street** is thrilling left-wing trash, and it's more or less disposable.⁸ . . . Stone's *j'accuse* is confused at its very heart: is it the system itself or the abuse of the system that is wrong? Oliver Stone pretends to be a moralist, but at his best he's really a sort of Darwinist—what really interests him is the battle for survival.”⁹

Despite his use of moralization in the film, Stone not only defends hostile market takeovers as productive work, he also defends the excess of his character, Gordon Gekko—as he should. He says, “It [**Wall Street**] has an analysis of class structure that you don't see in mainstream movies very much. . . It's about greed, about people who are somewhat more selfish—super rich people, really. I think that, at best, the film is in the **Network** genre”.¹⁰

Oliver Stone goes on to defend Gordon Gekko and his form of productive work when he says, “Personally, I think most corporate raids are good. Not always, but most times. . . Management's become so weak in this country, so flaccid. These guys are into their salaries, golf trips, fishing trips; there's so much fat and waste in these companies. A lot of these corporate raiders are guys who want to make the money, but in doing so, they clean up the companies. So corporate raiding is a reformation of the system. It's a natural correction”¹¹ . . .

Gordon Gekko became a devil, a Mephistopheles for the 1980s. And yet he was a hero to so many young people of that and this hyped-up time. People still come up to me all over the world, exclaiming, ‘Great movie! I loved Gordon Gekko!’ . . . His oft-quoted ‘Greed is good’ speech is interesting, as he, at many points, represents a commonsense point of view¹². . . The best way to prevent war, to live in peace is to bring prosperity to as many people across the world as you can. And when you spread McDonald's all over the world, food becomes cheaper and more available to more people . . . The Pax Americana, to me, is the dollar sign. It works. It may not be attractive. . . But what they're doing [American businessmen] makes sense.”¹³

The Gordon Gekkos and Dagny Taggarts of the world eliminate the incompetent, unproductive and weak. They keep corporate leaders from relaxing too much and encourage the competitive spirit that is the lifeblood of capitalism. Why should a hero be hated for being so good that few others can compete with him? A real life type of Gordon Gekko icon who is portrayed with a crooked image and often hated for his success is boxing promoter, Don King. Just like Gail and Sam Walton, Don King moved from a hustling proletariat into a wealthy bourgeois gentleman. While Sam Walton didn't have the anti-heroism of Gail or Don King, all three self-made men rose to the top with hard work and utilization of the American capitalist

system to their advantage—they are equally great.

According to Mike Marqusee, “In 1966, Cleveland numbers runner and part-time club owner Don King beat a man to death with a pistol. He was charged with second-degree murder but the judge, whose links with the Mafia were revealed after his death, reduced it to manslaughter (265). . . The chief obstacle to black entrepreneurship—in sports or elsewhere—has never been a shortage of entrepreneurial skills, but of capital. King solved that problem by persuading other people to advance the cash [among them, Ferdinand Marcos, Sese Seko Mobuto and the Mafia]. This he managed largely through his uncanny ability to convince fighters to consign their fates to him. . . [for the Ali-Foreman fight] King signed both Ali and Foreman by a process of bluff and double bluff. . . King’s search for a bankroll was beginning to seem hopeless when he was contacted by Fred Weymer. . . . who was managing Mobutu’s overseas holdings and provided King with two \$4.8 million letters of credit, one for each fighter. The deal proved to be Don King’s passport to the top of the boxing business” (266).

Like a true self-made man, King used proletarian talents and turned them into bourgeois success. John Sugden says, “[King] had a sense for the great occasion which was matched only by his ability as a propagandist. . . Just as in city gyms all over the world fighters hone skills learned in the streets and harness them to ring craft, so King brought the arts of the street hustler to the business side of boxing” (45).

In the tradition of self-made Randian heroes, Roark, Galt, Rearden and Gail, King was created by and for cut-throat capitalism. John Sugden states, “Today, King is one of the most powerful figures in the murky world of boxing promotion. There is hardly a major championship boxing match which takes place anywhere without the mark of King’s influence. . . In the unconventional world of professional boxing King, with his outrageous clothes, diamond rings, ‘electric’ hairstyle and seamless rhetoric was able to make quite an impression. An environment which brought together media money, showmanship, corruption and machiavellian political infighting was made for a man like Don King” (45).

Like Gekko and Roark, King stays on the edge of prosecution. According to John Sugden, “As **Sports Illustrated**, put it, so long as [King] stays out of prison: King will continue to pull the strings in the fight game, arranging some bouts that shouldn’t be made, ignoring others that should, always acting in his self interest. He will continue to play the conflicting roles of promoter, whose profit is optimized by low cost, and manager, whose cut depends on high

purse (46).”¹⁴ Mike Marqusee adds, “King’s real relationship with the black community he claimed to represent is best revealed by the black fighters he ripped off. Larry Holmes said that King ‘looks black, lives white and thinks green.’ Tim Witherspoon observed, ‘Don’s specialty is black on black crime.’ In the twenty years following his breakthrough in Kinshasa, 100 law suits were filed against King by disgruntled fighters and managers. But the real question about King is not how he managed to swindle and manipulate heavyweight fighters, but how he managed to do the same to the government and the judiciary” (283-84).

While we may not love him for his character—he’s a true Randian and American hero—greedy and gets the job done at all costs. He’s equally loved and hated. According to Tim Smith, “King has been engaged in dispute with the New Jersey Department of Gaming Enforcement and the Casino Control Commission, who has controlled boxing licenses in New Jersey casinos for the last seven years. When King refused to answer questions about Bob Lee, former president of the International Boxing Federation, who was on trial for racketeering charges in 1999, his license application has been refused in Atlantic City. . . . Despite this fact, City Council president Craig Calloway said, “Atlantic City needs Don King. Don King doesn’t need Atlantic City. So does the state of New Jersey. No one has promoted fights in Atlantic City like Don King. He brings it to a level that no one has been able to eclipse”(84).

Don King appears as a friend of the Devil, Al Pacino, in the movie **Devil’s Advocate**. With the exception of the extremes of good and evil, Pacino, and Judith Ivey, Kevin Lomax’s Bible-bashing mother, the movie is full of Randian anti-heroes. Although satirical, it portrays a true side of American culture. Lomax’s vanity and greed are strong enough to bend the rules and are only a fine line away from that which produces the document shredding, murder and drug deals of the Devil and his other servants. Because of its satirical nature, we’re supposed to like the anti-heroes of this movie. The same holds true for the film, **Other People’s Money**. It’s a portrait of a greedy capitalist tycoon as lovable hero—a comedy, nothing to be taken seriously.

It’s problematic for American culture to portray greedy tycoons as serious heroes and to separate their capitalist nature from their moral characters. How much money, sex and power would we really turn down in the name of righteousness? The movie only shows two untruths—Lomax, played by Keanu Reeves, quitting his profession at the end because of his moral beliefs and the rich, neglected and bored wives of the Devil’s lawyers who aren’t shown having extramarital affairs to go along with their hobby of compulsive shopping. Rand’s Dominique would never stand for spousal neglect without forbidden fantasy love affairs to pass her time.

In order to be a Randian hero, one must not only continually live on the razor's edge between good and evil—but also go beyond them. Just like Kevin Lomax illegally listens in on court cases in the **Devil's Advocate**, Don King spends much of his time in the courtroom. Roark is dishonest and goes to jail for bombing a building and it's implied that Gekko will go to jail for insider trading. Once the country goes into a depression, the great and wealthy Hank Rearden, suddenly leaves his wife and family, who he's supported for years, to their own fates. The strikers of **Atlas Shrugged** allow the good and virtuous people of society perish along with the evil and parasitical. They're trying to rid the world of common men and women. Theodore Dreiser's Cowperwood is an even more extremely anti-heroic capitalist than Rand's. All these heroes are a part of an exclusive club, which excludes Sam Walton and Carl Fox [Bud's common man father in Wall Street]. The rules of this club are simple: "It doesn't matter how you play the game, but whether you win."

John Cashill portrays the 'strength over morality' characteristic of Cowperwood that exists in lesser extents within all of our modern day Randian heroes:

Guided not by morality but by strength, Cowperwood proceeds to violate virtually every principle of traditional business ethics. Bribery, blackmail, and extortion are quotidian tactics in his market strategy. [He] fixes elections, waters stocks, embezzles public money, and is imprisoned, unrepentant, for the latter offense. In his personal relations he lies when it suits his purpose, and he does so shamelessly. What distinguishes him from the other characters in the Cowperwood novels, particularly the politicians, is his relative consistency. He relies on one standard, strength, both in the marketplace and the community (157).

Cashill goes on to cite Dreiser's novel:

That thing conscience, which obsesses and rides some people to destruction, did not trouble him [Cowperwood] at all. He had no consciousness of what is currently known as sin. . . There were just two faces to the shield of life from the point of view of his peculiar mind—strength and weakness. Right and wrong? He did not know about those. They were bound up in metaphysical abstractions about which he did not care to bother. Good and evil? Those were toys of clerics, by which they

made money (**The Financier** 476). 15

We may choose to love or hate Cowperwood, Gekko, Gail and Don King for our own reasons and by our own definitions of anti-heroes. Nevertheless, what we should appreciate about these figures is that they're willing to portray the ugly dog-eat-dog aspect of capitalism that's often disguised and clouded in American culture. Furthermore, they don't hypocritically pretend to be the humanistic, unselfish, humble and non-excessive men that they're not. We can take these anti-heroes at face value. Whether we like it or not, they portray greed--a real part of the American Imagination that we should at least understand and come to terms with; if not embrace.

Jeff Walker proclaims, "The Nietzschean business tycoon played by Warren William in the movie **Skyscraper Souls** (1932) defends the value of the skyscraper he builds as 'this marvel of engineering, this spirit of an age crystallized in steel and stone' . . . Rand, working in the movie business at the time, may have seen the film and, inspired by William's spirited oratory, ennobled its sentiments and re-attached them to the character of Gail Wynand" (316).

Although the words and actions of Gail, Gekko, King and Trump may be ugly at times, above all, neither anti-hero ever strays from being a gentleman. This is an important aspect of bourgeois success and a trait usually attached to the capitalist hero. Although Roark and Gail both rise from proletariat status to bourgeois, Gail is more gentlemanly on his way to the top than Roark. Bernardo Bertolucci's film, **Last Tango in Paris** portrays an anti-heroic character much like Howard Roark—on the border between proletariat and bourgeois classes and searching for hope and meaning in his life. Despite this fact, Paul, the anti-hero of the film, played by Marlon Brando, is much more crude and unrefined than even the brutish Roark. Furthermore, he develops a relationship with a woman just like Dominique—one living a rather empty and meaningless bourgeois existence.

Where Roark is a brute, Paul is a foul-mouthed and gross man. Just as in **The Fountainhead**, where Roark and Dominique are reflective of each other—both searching for passion in their lives, the same holds true for Paul and Jeanne. Before Paul's rape of Jeanne—the meaningful act of sexual violence, Claretta Tonetti contends, "Paul and Jeanne are a 'useless passion' . . . Without real sharing, loneliness resurfaces at the end of every encounter. Solitude finds its graphic expression in a scene in which the two bodies, which had previously found a jocular and affectionate togetherness in a naked knot, are separated by the emptiness of the apartment and retreat into themselves" (128).

Both Rand's novel and Bertolucci's film portray existentialist anti-heroes who see the

dark before seeing the light. Before the rape, Dominique is content to live a 'nothing' type of existence in rebellion against convention and mediocrity. Robert Phillip Kolker says, "Her [Jeanne's] decision to marry Tom [her filmmaker fiancé] and adopt a safe bourgeois life signifies her ultimate betrayal of the passion Paul attempts finally, and too late, to offer to her" (135).

Dominique betrays her true passion in the same way by marrying Peter Keating and Gail Wynand when she really loves Roark. In both novel and film, both characters find themselves through a rape which releases repressed sexual and individual passions in both of them. Jeanne and Dominique would go on living their empty and passionless lives without Roark and Paul raping them. In the true tradition of anti-heroism, despite the extreme, brutal and shocking means used, good will come out of the evil deeds of Paul and Roark.

Robert Phillip Kolker states, "She [Jeanne] turns to Tom as an escape from the sexual pressures and humiliations visited on her by Paul, whose role as tutor becomes confused with that of oppressor" (138). In self-retreat, Paul creates a world where neither he nor Jeanne can know names or significant details of each others' lives. "When. . . Jeanne tells Paul about her father, how she adored him like a god in his shining uniform, Paul responds in typical fashion to her awe: 'What a steaming pile of horseshit. All uniforms are bullshit. Everything outside this place is bullshit'" (Kolker 142). Paul's statement is a vulgar way to say the existentialist idea that nothing really matters except the world of meaning they've created. Dominique's meaningless marriages to Peter and Gail are the same types of conventional 'bullshit.'

Roark, Dominique, Paul and Jeanne all initially venture through the darkness of sexual repression, emptiness, loneliness and lack of love. "His [Paul's] reminiscing stimulated his desire to transgress civility. He chooses to 'show them' with a sexual act that, in his case, means to defile not only a woman but also conventions. . . Later on, the same child turns his sadism against himself and has Jeanne sodomize him. . . The reality of the body and the intensity of its pleasure are all that is left for Paul. No name, no family, and no country. He is the uprooted American of the lost generation, whose solitude is self-destructive" (Tonetti 130-32).

After the darkness of their lives is culminated with the respective rapes, all four characters begin to see the light and move toward goals that will make them happy. Roark now has a lover to be successful and great for and Dominique's passion of mercy killing Roark gives her some life aim. Jeanne now has the courage and passion to stop being a subject of her fiancé's passions and to find her own. Claretta Tonetti proclaims, "Tom is obsessed with his film, and during a fight with Jeanne we see him losing his head when she tells him that his film is finished. Jeanne is also enraged. 'You are taking advantage of me, she yells. . . You force me to do things

I have never done. . .’ The pent-up frustration ends in a veritable boxing match in the subway, where the two fiances exchange blows in an unexpected explosion of fury. . .” (134-35).

Paul also leaves the solitude of the apartment and goes out to reconcile himself and come to terms with his wife’s suicide—a painful purgation that he now has the courage to do. Once this is done, he is killed in pursuit of a happy and meaningful remaining life with Jeanne. Although **Last Tango in Paris** doesn’t show capitalist tycoons or their greed, in the form of desperation, it does present the same ‘all or nothing’ and ‘win at all costs’ attitude of the typical Randian hero.

The Bush political dynasty and its unproven connections with the Enron scandal is also typical of the Randian hero—a great money and power play of America’s socioeconomic elite. Regardless of the morals involved, these power plays are all Randian because they involve productive work. Money, power and influence run in the Bush family and didn’t exactly hurt the political careers of the Bush Presidents. According to Kevin Phillips, “Both the Walkers and the Bushes were old and prosperous families even in the mid-nineteenth century. The first Bush to attend Yale was the forty-third president’s great-great-grandfather, James Smith Bush, in the 1850’s. . . The Walkers were wealthier though. Great-great-grandfather David Walker had built the largest dry goods import firm west of the Mississippi (20)

Kevin Phillips goes on to say, “. . . That three generations of Bushes have been ‘part of that’ [The Skull and Bones]16 is central to the family’s ascent. . . Prescott Bush [St. George’s 1913, Yale 1917, Skull and Bones] and George H.W. Bush [Andover 1942, Yale 1948, Skull and Bones] fit well, thereby unfolding a kind of red carpet on which they could later walk comfortably through the upper echelons of American life (27). . . By the mid-twentieth century, connections and crony capitalism had become the family economic staple, with emphasis on the rewards of finance, and instinctive policymaking fealty to the investment business. The Bushes have produced no college presidents or stonemasons, no scientists or plumbing contractors—generally speaking, their progeny have become almost exclusively financial entrepreneurs” (41).

The 1980s emerged as a greedy decade of dynasties as the Bushes carried on President Ronald Reagan’s legacy of greed, opportunism, power and wealth. “One excess was the emergence during the 1980s of a cultural ‘luxury fever’ nourished by the rising stock market and soaring circulation of publications like **Architectural Digest**, which promoted a conscious imitation of aristocracy. . . Democratic president Jimmy Carter, cultivating smallness, had reduced highway speed limits, hinted at national malaise, and worn a sweater in a national television speech urging energy conservation. President and Mrs. Reagan, in complete contrast,

wanted to rebuild U.S. might, restore the economic incentives of the Roaring Twenties, and bring back fashion, high society [California-style], and conspicuous consumption” (Phillips 53).

In the mid-1980s, California cultural historian Debora Silverman made the following case in relation to the popular mood created in the decade by the Reagan presidency which was perpetuated by the most-watched television series in the United States: **Dynasty**:

There is a mutually reinforcing connection between popular opulent fashion and the dual roles of White House Nancy Reagan on one hand and the television fantasy of **Dynasty**'s Krystle Carrington on the other. In the weekly evening show, Krystle is the devoted wife of a rich and loving 'entrepreneur' and her sartorial splendor, like Mrs. Reagan's, is presumed to be the natural physical expression of her husband's competitive success in the marketplace. **Dynasty** began programming during the week of the first Reagan inaugural in 1981, and exploited the confusion between fantasy and reality by occasionally featuring recognizable political figures, such as Henry Kissinger and Gerald Ford, as guests at some of the extraordinarily lavish parties attended by the Carrington clan. **Dynasty** has been complemented by a new popular show, **Lifestyles of the Rich and Famous**, which purports to tell true stories of the rich. **Dynasty** fashions, along with perfume, jewels, accessories, and lingerie, are now marketed as department store signature items and advertised to consumers as a way to 'share the luxury,' 'share the treasures' and 'share the magic' of the Carrington characters staggering riches by buying their imprint. 17

Dynasty was created a couple of years after **Dallas**. Strong, wise and flawed, Blake Carrington is so successful in business but can't get a handle on his family life. Greed is greed, power is power, anger is anger, fighting is fighting. **Dynasty** reflected the glitz, glamour and greed of the 1980s. Fallon continually goes at it with Krystle. Krystle is the moral compass.18

Not only do **Dallas** and **Dynasty** have almost identical characters, they both resemble Ayn Rand's anti-heroes. Jock Ewing and Blake Carrington are just like Hank Rearden—semi good men who can win in business but not in their family lives. Fallon, the anti-heroic rebel of season one of **Dynasty**, is an idle do-nothing just like Rand's Dominique. She holds the anti-heroic role on the show until her mother—Alexis Colby, arrives at the beginning of season two. Alexis Colby emerges as a capitalist version of her daughter, Fallon.

Alexis is just like J.R. Ewing and Gail Wynand—capitalist anti-heroes of excess, arrogance and greed. **Dallas** is a less flamboyant, more down to earth and Western genre version of **Dynasty**. Ray and Pam on **Dallas** are both of lower socioeconomic status than the Ewings. Their mere presence on the ranch implies common ideals to the Ewings and make them look more down to earth. According to Alessandro Silj, “What it [CBS] wanted was a sort of present-day **Giant** rewritten in modern idiom. So [David] Jacobs came back again with the idea of **Dallas**, and they liked it” (15).

Just like Dominique in **The Fountainhead**, 19 all the characters of **Dallas** and **Dynasty** revolve around the actions of the anti-heroes J.R. Ewing and Alexis Colby. “The good guys are defined solely by their opposition to him [J.R.]. . . Joan Collins’ character [Alexis Colby] sticks out not because she’s different in kind from anyone else but just because she gets more fun out of the same [wickedness]” (Carson 59). “What happened was that Larry Hagman gave the J.R. character an unpredictable dimension: he made him a ‘baddy’ sure, but a vulnerable baddy with whom the audience established a very strong love/hate relationship” (Silj 16). “Dallas is a phenomenon. . . and the character of J.R. is at the centre of its appeal. . . The glory of J.R. is that he revels in his villainy. . . He can’t wait to twist the knife further into brother Bobby, long-standing rival Cliff or even in his poor old Ma” (Buckman 62).

Sharon Mazzarella’s description of **Dynasty** sounds like that of **The Fountainhead** and Dominique. “The program relied on both camp and excess for its appeal. . . **Dynasty** did provide juicy roles for women, notably Joan Collins’ characterization of Alexis. Her character—scheming, conniving, and ruthless—was often referred to as a ‘superbitch,’ and was the quintessential ‘character you love to hate’. . . It had proved the perfect metaphor for 1980s greed and excess. In declaring **Dynasty** the best prime time soap of the decade, **TV Guide** asserted its ‘campy opulence gave it a superb, ironic quality—in other words, it was great trash.’”

Mark Finch comments, “Of all of **Dynasty**’s characters, Alexis is most closely matched by the performer’s star persona. There are two key signifiers of this image: Britishness and bitchiness. . . **Past Imperfect**, her autobiography, and **The Stud** (1978) confirm the signifiers of promiscuity and hardness that are deployed in earlier films. Finally, she is indelibly associated with **The Bitch** (1979), a film which works to problematise that equation. **Dynasty** plays upon this image: [Collins says] ‘I’m the best thing that **Dynasty** has got. It’s because of me that the show became a hit.’²⁰. . . Alexis is not far from a Wicked Witch of the West whose actions are

directed against the happy monogamous couple—she originally arrived out of nowhere [a narrative surprise] to avenge her gay son’s dead lover (episode 13)[end of season 1] (38-39).**21**

In contrast, the late Ken Lay, the prosecuted former CEO of Enron, possessed the ambition to be a roguish Randian anti-hero like Alexis, but he lacked the necessary hardness. He took a fast ride on the crony capitalist train of the Bush dynasties to a pinnacle of money and power until it raced out of his control and crashed. Kevin Phillips interjects, “What makes the Bush-Enron connection more significant is its dynastic aspect—the mutual support over two decades, two generations and two presidencies. George H.W. Bush and Ken Lay seem to have first met in 1980. After being introduced by mutual friends in the energy business, Lay contributed to Bush’s quest for presidential nomination” (155). **22** “Lay individually contributed more than \$275,000 to the Republican National Committee and \$10,000 for the Bush recount fund in Florida. Enron provided \$250,000 for the Bush coronation at the RNC in Philadelphia. . . . Enron’s grand total contributions to Bush 2000 was \$700, 000” (Ivins and Dubose 189).

Lay’s connections with the Bushes put him in charge of Enron, but he lacked the toughness required to maintain it. Born a poor Baptist preacher’s son, Lay developed a huge ambition to make his own wealth. He fought in Washington to relieve government control on businessmen. George H.W. Bush secured billions in government subsidies for Enron. Lay knew about the reckless behavior of Enron executives like Louis Borget who took Enron money and put it into personal accounts. He knew about his executives gambling away Enron’s reserves and the falsifying of records. Lay even encouraged his traders to gamble more. Andy Fastow, Chief Financial Officer, who stashed Enron’s debt into other companies, skimmed money off the top for himself and sold worthless stocks to Merrill Lynch bankers, was fired and set up as Enron’s fall guy. When Fastow was found guilty and sentenced to ten years in prison, as Enron CEO, Lay refused any responsibility for his actions and claimed no knowledge about them.

Enron executives like Jeff Skilling and Lu Pai possessed the toughness and opportunism that Ken Lay lacked as CEO—but they lacked the discipline and professionalism. Skilling was a huge risk-taker who liked extremes and created a “survival of the fittest” attitude in the company. He gambled in the market. Lu Pai, who is referred to as the “mystery man,” charged Enron expense accounts to nightly excursions to strippers’ shows. When his stripper girlfriend became pregnant, he mysteriously left Enron and his wife and fled to a private ranch in Colorado after selling his company stock for \$350 million.**23**

Lay rode to the top of the money and power mountain easily with his well connected Bush cronies—like anybody might--Randian hero or not. Molly Ivins and Lou Dubose state, “In 1997, at Lay’s request, Governor Bush went to bat for Enron, calling then-Pennsylvania governor Tom Ridge to push for the deregulation policies Lay wanted in place in Pennsylvania” (193). . . If you were paying an electric bill in California, you probably remember 2001 as the year your bill increased by 800 percent. . . Bush and Cheney used the bully pulpit of the White House to stop the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission from imposing even temporary caps on electricity rates in California” (195).

With the power structure set up for him, Lay failed to clean house when necessary. He went down with the ship instead of getting out while the getting was good—like Lu Pai. Lay’s problem is not that he knew about stealing and corruption in his company. Lay’s problem is that he didn’t fire the necessary people when the heat of the company’s corruption got too close to him. Mimi Swartz comments, “One of the internal auditors [of Enron] thought the company’s next move was obvious. . . ‘If it were my decision I’d shut it down. . . I’d fire them all.’ But Lay’s new company was facing bankruptcy, and his reputation as a CEO, so freshly minted was heading for oblivion. Lay’s decision was that the traders would not be fired. Enron would simply institute and enforce strict controls. Whether Lay did so out of his own natural benevolence or to save his company will never be known (32). . . Ken Lay was a man who did not like to say no, and his employees soon learned to exploit his weakness. His people performed, but they also extracted their pound of flesh—most often in the form of large cash rewards (35).

In **The Fountainhead**, Ellsworth Toohey breaks one of Wynand’s rules and writes about Howard Roark as a part of his plot to take over the paper. Gail’s reaction to this is hard and tough—unlike Ken Lay’s. When his right hand man--Alvah Scarret, denies responsibility, he simply asks, “Who was on the copy desk?/ It went through Allen and Falk./Fire Harding, Allen, Falk and Toohey. Buy off Harding’s contract. But not Toohey’s. Have them all out of the building in fifteen minutes” (**The Fountainhead** 642). According to Mimi Swartz, Lay hired Rich Kinder as his disciplinarian. Unlike Lay, Kinder had a passion for actually running the business, he was circumspect where Lay was inclined toward extravagance. Kinder would also look the other way when Lay gently but firmly insisted the company use his sister Sharon’s travel agency, and put his son Mark on the payroll. Lay’s were the sins of a small-timer, but Enron was big enough and rich enough that no one seemed to mind (36).

Donald Trump, a capitalist icon who does possess the type of toughness that Ken Lay lacked, says, “The opposite of toughness—weakness—makes me mad and sometimes turns my stomach. I’m not referring here to the kind of weakness that comes from being poor, sick, or disadvantaged. I’m talking about those people who can take a strong stand but just don’t” (213). Skilling seemed more of the true CEO of Enron while Lay was more of its public relations puppet. Mimi Swartz concluded, “Skilling turned out to be a very good pitchman, both inside and outside the company: Lay hated Enron floor meetings and depended on prepared text to get through them. . . . Where Lay was a plodding speaker—almost Elmer Fudd-like at times—Skilling was sharp, made eye contact, and knew how to use all the right buzzwords” (246).

Tough CEOs set up ways to cut off links existing between fraudulent employees and managers and themselves. When a corrupt employee or manager is caught with his or hand in the cookie jar, CEOs don’t passively let them resign and take no responsibility for their actions—this brings more heat on them. Lay refused to protect himself, like any good tycoon or CEO would. Denying responsibility for actions of corrupt people in your company is not protecting yourself. Self interest, a greedy and capitalist concept, is the best way to prevent corruption.

Brian Cruver comments that many people say that Lay is a kind, decent man who was sucker punched by his ‘lieutenants’. . . . Others say that he’s an evil man who is the embodiment of greed, or as the symbol of everything wrong with capitalism (342). . . . Nevertheless, Lay assembled a team of the most influential, clever, and ruthless executives in his company. He then used that power and those people to change the way the world does business. These changes fed and nurtured his Enron Empire until it grew into a monster he could no longer control” (343).

Like the typical Randian hero, Enron and its executives were above pettiness. Kevin McGann asserts, “It [**The Fountainhead**] appeals to the romantic sense of alienation and superiority, asking the reader to identify with an elite still sensitive to aesthetic ‘integrity’ and tortured by the low-brow conventional mediocrity of a small-minded society. It has the bitterness of the ‘outsider’ and offers a hero who is determined enough to overcome these obstacles” (328-29). Stephen Cox (1998) speaks on this idea when he says, “She [Rand] always hated ‘the little street,’ the world of petty ideals and petty rules, the world of ‘snickering, giggling, dirty-story-telling, good-timing, jolly, regular fellows” (57). Rand hated the goody-goody world of the petty reasonable and her uncommon anti-heroes are above anything petty. The Randian hero is capable of only great things, rebelling against conventional pettiness and morality in both work and play.

Kevin McGann goes on to say, “This country, **The Fountainhead** seems to say, does not lack True Believers but rather something or someone to believe in: a Howard Roark. . .” (329). Roark is not the only great anti-heroic rebel against conventional pettiness, morality and commonality that Rand gives us. Rand gives us a wide range of great and amoral anti-heroes like this, such as Gail and Dominique. Roark matches snickering with his great laugh at the obstacles he faces when he’s kicked out of a conventional architectural school. Dagny Taggart replaces dirty-story-telling with open proclamations of her affairs with married men. Good-timing and jolly regular fellows are replaced by serious man-Gods like Gail who fires his employees, gives and accepts corrupt deals and bargains architectural commissions for men’s wives.

Roark is no better in that he takes what he wants through brutishness. Rand just doesn’t admit it. Like Dreiser and Nietzsche, she puts strength and greatness above morality and ethics. Her anti-heroes live by their own codes of ethics and morals in getting their goals achieved. These codes are very similar to those of Gekko, Don King, Kevin Lomax and J.R. Ewing. These anti-heroes all live on the razor’s edge of evil, hide behind the guise of productive work and continually dodge legal prosecution in their greedy pursuits of the American Dream.

Sidney Lumet’s film **Network** is full of Randian heroes, despite its extremes which go beyond even those of Rand. Howard Beale, played by Peter Finch, an extreme version of Howard Roark, is murdered on the air because of his failure to produce high ratings for Diane—the extreme rebellion capitalist, played by Faye Dunaway. Where Dominique hides behind her relationships and idleness, Diane hides behind her work. Schumaker, played by William Holden, and Diane are the two most Randian anti-heroes in the movie—they are both rebels against the establishment. Schumaker maintains touches of Rand’s humanism. He wants to help Beale instead of continuing to make him a circus to draw ratings. Just like Howard Beale—and Roark, Schumaker is “Mad as hell and he’s not going to take it anymore!” But he applies his rebellious anger in a more practical way than Howard Beale and the typical Randian hero.

The film **The Betsy** shows more of the excessive lifestyle of the capitalist than **Network**. Angelo Perrino, played by Tommy Lee Jones, the lone rebel—like Roark, is a young version of Mr. Hardeman, played by Sir Lawrence Olivier. At age 86, Hardeman wants to create The Betsy—a new, small, fast, pollution free and safe car. As a true capitalist, he wants to conquer a new world beyond his great and rich automotive empire. In words similar to Rand and her

heroes, Hardeman says, “It’s a risk worth taking. Build the car before the government forces you; before the competition. The industry and the American people will be better off for it.”

Hardeman and Perrino are denied nothing in the way of money, sex and power. Perrino has sexual affairs with Hardeman III’s mistress, Bobby, who he can’t control and his daughter, Betsy, who he neglects. Bobby is rebellious and anti-heroic in the mold of Dominique. Perrino also makes a great power play with his sexual affair with Betsy, Hardeman’s grand-daughter to whom he gives nearly half the shares of his auto empire. Just like Hank Rearden, Hardeman is a successful capitalist in his business but fails to create a happy family.

The same ‘money can’t buy happiness’ moral is given to Adrian Lynne’s **Indecent Proposal**. The anti-hero, John Gage, played by Robert Redford, is a player like Gail. Gage’s proposal of one million dollars for a night with David’s wife, Diana, played by Demi Moore, looks in essence very much like Gail’s offer to Peter Keating of an architectural commission for a date with his wife, Dominique. David Murphy, played by Woody Harrelson, is too melodramatic—even by Rand’s standards. Although he’s a little like Roark—he makes a really stupid decision.

Roark would have either accepted the offer or not—like a true capitalist hero—and stuck with his decision. David goes through with the deal and later gives up his money. In a gesture to win back his wife, he gives up the entire million dollars on an art photo. David could have made Diana just as happy with a million dollars as he could have without it. He gives up his wife for nothing. Even spineless Peter Keating got an architecture commission for Dominique. **24** David giving up the money was the only unrealistic aspect of the film.

Giving up money will not last a player very long in the world of capitalist video games. In **Airline Tycoon Evolution**, not only must the player compete against three rivals for profits, but the ‘tycoon’s’ efficiency, time management and planning are also tested. As business manager for an airline—only winners or losers exist in this game—losers of each challenge are eliminated. For example, one mission rewards the first manager to get out of \$10 million debt while another rewards the first airline manager whose planes carry 1000 tons of cargo. Capitalist greed, opportunism and efficiency are the traits that win this game.

In this game, “either you do it right or you get eliminated.” Our electronics and video game stores are filled with different versions of the same types of “tycoon” games. **Railroad Tycoon, Sea World Tycoon, Restaurant Empire Tycoon** and **Zoo Tycoon** are just a few of the

plethora of these capitalist games that exist in our social culture. These games imply the idea that it's fine to be greedy and opportunistic capitalist on a fantasy video game—but real life corporate America is not as competitive or cutthroat. I beg to differ. Any real life owner, CEO or manager, whether public or private, can benefit from the positive traits necessary for success in these games.

Even a more lighthearted and entertaining tycoon game like **National Lampoon's University Tycoon** is still based on the capitalist dynamics of striving to be the best, making the most money and earning the best reputation. It's description reads, "The Dean quit and you're in charge! Can you build the ultimate university? This is your chance to set the bar for all the schools. Ultimate success is measured by the dollars you earn and your global status coolness, party rating and reputation. Are you a campus stud or a campus dud?" **25**

These games show the ugly side of capitalism, which most of our mass society seldom sees, that's necessary to build and maintain the best airlines, restaurants and universities that contribute to our prosperous way of life. Like David's initial acceptance of the proposal and Howard Beale's murder for failure to produce high ratings—capitalist greed is ugly to look at. However, it's a quick and effective way to do what must be done. Robert Fulford (1995) comments, "Anyone who has thought about it for two minutes knows that the Industrial Revolution radically improved the life of the people, producing a swift drop in infant mortality and a swift rise in population. But it wasn't nice to look at, and to this day we still tend to think of it as a kind of plague."

America is all about money and power. Whether directly or indirectly--we are all continually striving towards either of these two goals. Gail Wynand, just as John Gage of **Indecent Proposal**, believes, in the true spirit of capitalism, that everything and everyone has a price—even if it's not always money. If we ponder this idea with our true inner spirit of American excess, and not our surface hypocrisy, perhaps it is more true than we want to admit.

Unfortunately, our culture promotes communal socialism on the surface while practicing individualist capitalism in reality. Roger Rosenblatt says, "One of America's saving graces has been its ability to live comfortably with certain forms of hypocrisy; essentially we are no different today from our forebears who gave their lusty solo king-of-the-hill yells while helping people across town to fight a fire and demanding that the central government provide roads, protection, cheap land and transportation. . . Why does America prefer to wear a fiction when the

facts show the nation in a better light? Who was that masked man” (116)? Although there’s nothing wrong with charity and humanitarianism, they don’t contribute to our prosperity like greed and opportunism do. Our comfortable clothes, cars, houses and computers, that make our lives easier, were not created and given to us out of the kindness of capitalist tycoon’s hearts. Greed, competition and individualism produced most, if not all, of the fine things in American life that we enjoy and often take for granted.

CONCLUSION

Ayn Rand's fictional heroes portray ideas which are truly her own versions of various literary, philosophical and political movements throughout the world of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Despite the fact that her fiction does not represent good literary art nor her philosophy being totally new or original—there is much to be learned from her work—on both scholarly and popular levels of literature. Furthermore, Rand's art, philosophy and politics are more easily defined by what they aren't than by what they are. The extremes and impracticalities in which most of her ideas are presented make them difficult to apply to our lives and society.

The pop cultish nature of her work also makes it difficult for serious and academic scholars to take it seriously. Nevertheless, in presenting fiction that represents her own vulgarized and popularized versions of Aristotle, Victor Hugo, Fyodor Dostoevsky, and Friedrich Nietzsche, Rand stays true to the literary and philosophical schools from which she's learned. Where Rand disliked Leo Tolstoy and loved Dostoevsky, Vladimir Nabokov loved Tolstoy, disliked Dostoevsky and failed to give Maxim Gorky serious consideration among Russian novelists.

Rand's so-called Romanticism in the mold of Victor Hugo is really her own reactionary form of anti-Naturalism. Her so-called Objectivism is really a reactionary and right-wing form of Existentialism—a philosophy originated by her beloved Dostoevsky. She claims a break with the philosophy of Friedrich Nietzsche in **The Fountainhead** which is truly just a watered down American version of it. The problem of her work is not that it is her own radical and reactionary versions of nineteenth and twentieth century literary and philosophical masters—it is that Rand never admits this. Popular readers love Rand's Americanized anti-Naturalist, Existentialist, Nietzschean capitalist trash. Despite all the shortcomings of her work, scholars should at least be willing to go beneath the fantasy surface to consider the importance of the ideas portrayed by Rand's heroes which relate to American culture, literature, capitalism, individualism, etc.

Although her politics are often labeled as Libertarian, an overly impractical extreme, she shows us, through her moral middle of the road characters—the true way to express her ideas. Gail, Rearden and Dagny Taggart are the most interesting characters of Rand's canon, because like George Orwell and his heroes, they are skeptical. Rand's philosophy is very similar to that of Karl Marx in that both want to sweep away, or eliminate money and power from, the proletariat and bourgeois classes, respectively. Despite his skepticism, Orwell fought for

democratic socialism while checking power on both his side and his opponents--unlike Rand and Marx.

Rand only checks power on the left. In the tradition of Nietzsche's philosophy, her heroes go beyond traditional and socially accepted norms of good and evil. Through her anti-heroes, she portrays the true and valuable idea that our own individual standards of morality are the only ones that should matter to us. Furthermore, even the acceptance of standards of traditional morality, which are socially and religiously enforced in our culture, differ from person to person. Gail Wynand is Rand's true hero because he's the only one who admits that he's seeking money and power. All of Rand's heroes are Nietzschean—some are simply more or less than others. Dominique is Rand's true villain because she's a do nothing who never stays true to any side.

Rand's character portrayals and her heavy plots are the most important aspects of her fiction. However, while some merits of Rand's form and content exist, the difficulty of genre categorization for **The Fountainhead** and **Atlas Shrugged** is a major reason for her wide range of influence in popular literature. The fiction of all authors possibly influenced by Rand tend to fall into specific categories such as detective fiction, science fiction, crime thrillers, mysteries, etc. Rand's fiction does not totally fit into any of these genres. While it may fall into the category of capitalist literature—Henry Nash Smith's essay, "The Search for a Capitalist Hero," claims roughly that no true capitalist hero exists in literature. Therefore, a genre labeled 'capitalist literature' is problematic and generally thought of as non-existent among scholars.

We love and hate the Randian capitalist heroes because they always win, make up their own rules and are naturally born with greatness that we either envy or want to emulate. Pop culture Randian anti-heroes like Donald Trump, Don King, Gordon Gekko, J.R. Ewing and John Gage show us the greedy tycoons within ourselves that we hate to love and love to hate. No matter how much we may denounce and dislike them on the surface, Cowperwood, Gail and Angel Perrino are all fantasy creations of our own cultural imaginations. Why are we so sure that we would be any more likeable, humble, and less excessive than these anti-heroes if endless amounts of money, sex and power were put before us?

The American way is more about winning the prize than the morals and ethics used in getting it. As long as the work is legal and productive, it's good enough by both Rand's standards and those of American pop culture. We want to have, flaunt and exert the power and wealth of Ayn Rand's heroes—it's the American way. Our society throws conventional religion,

morality and ethics in to confuse and blur the most vital version of these concepts--our own.

If we mold ourselves into Randian heroes, power can be properly checked and rules can be enforced on the way to common capitalist goals for the greater good of all. Selfish interest in ‘covering ourselves’ can create greater accountability and responsibility to corruption and evil and prevent cases like the Enron scandal from occurring. Although greedy, opportunistic and immoral, Rand’s heroes are not as sincere as Dreiser’s Cowperwood. Dominique and Rearden don’t work to make relationships with both spouse and lover enjoyable and enriching. Rand’s rebellion against petty ideals, such as the traditional American family, domesticity and parenting are problematic in her portrayals of pure capitalistic heroes.

While Rand does a noble job of separating conventional morality from the capitalist hero, as she should, Dreiser makes morality almost non-existent. Because of the well disguised touches of humanism, which she probably learned from Victor Hugo, she holds back from portraying a true capitalist hero. Roark helps Peter’s architecture career. The humanism of Rearden, Roark and Dagny actually hurts their societies more than help them. If Roark had left Peter to his own fate, he would have failed at architecture, quit it and embraced his true love—painting. If Rearden and Dagny had joined the strike earlier, and stopped trying to directly save humanity, the downfall and new world order would come sooner. Therefore, for the good heroes not invited to join the strike, like Jeff Allen, there would be less suffering.

Despite these shortcomings in Rand’s work, real life versions of this hero, such as Donald Trump, can enjoy everything in life without downfall. He maintains a good blend of vicious capitalist greed and ‘good’ traits of a family man. He can crush his enemies in money making like Cowperwood. He says to John O’Donnell, a chief casino manager, “I hire the best people from my competitors, I pay them more than they were making, and I give them bonuses based on how they perform for me. That’s how I’ve built a first-class operation” (19).

He’s tough and hates compromise, like Rand and her heroes. He says, “Americans simply don’t get the respect and deference we deserve as a great power, the undisputed leader in both military and economic strength (Trump 221). . . One of our biggest problems today is that we have too few advocates [of toughness]. What we have instead are too many weaklings and compromisers” (227). While a capitalist anti-hero, like Gekko and Kevin Lomax, he also loves and spoils his wife, “Ivana was a legend among New York’s beautiful people for her fabulous jewelry and haute couture and she brought an air of glamour to Atlantic City” (O’Donnell 53).**26**

Because he tries to do the same thing, Dreiser's Cowperwood is the ultimate capitalist hero in literature. He's a Randian hero without the disguised humanism and one who attempts to mix marriage, capitalism and extramarital lovers with enjoyment. Despite the fact that this mix isn't always successful, Cowperwood's attempt to be happy in this situation is the most noble in literature. For example, he breaks up a fight between his wife and mistress in one section of **The Titan**. Rand's heroes, though not far behind Cowperwood in brutishness, greed and power lusting, are idealistic and dreamy soap opera versions of Dreiser's hero. Gordon Gekko and Donald Trump are the ultimate pop culture capitalist heroes. Between the two of them, we see successful and prosperous 'players' at the games of business and life who never fail to win. Neither of the wives of Gekko nor Trump ever appears to be unhappy.

Sometimes they fall into slumps, like Trump's loss of much of his money in the late 1980s and Gekko's implied jail term. Jonathan Curiel states, "After five months in confinement. . . Martha Stewart, this country's most famous arbiter of domestic style reinvented herself and profited handsomely from the experience [her net worth quadrupled since last summer]. It's as if Stewart's stay at Alderson Federal Prison was the best career move she ever made. . . If anything, she became even more of a media presence after her conviction on charges of lying to investigators about the sale of stocks in IMClone Systems" (1). If Martha Stewart was given five months at a minimum security prison for perjury and suspicions of insider trading, it's hard to believe that Gordon Gekko won't be back to terrorize Wall Street in less than a year or two. Because America is about money, the greed and power lusting of the Randian anti-heroes, in real life, pop culture and literature, will never keep them down or out of the game for too long.

NOTES

PREMISE/INTRODUCTION

1. Gene Bell-Villada, “Who Was Ayn Rand?” **Salmagundi** (141/142) Winter/Spring 2004, pgs.237-38.
2. Ayn Rand. **The Romantic Manifesto**. New York: New American Library, 2nd Rev. Edition, 1975, p.169.
3. Bell-Villada, “Who Was Ayn Rand?” pgs. 233-34.
4. Christopher Hitchens, **Why Orwell Matters**. New York: Basic Books, 2002.
5. Chris Matthew Sciabarra. **Ayn Rand: The Russian Radical**. University Park, Pa. Penn State Press, 1995, p.4.

CHAPTER 1

1. On page 169 of **The Romantic Manifesto**, Rand states that, “Art does not teach-it shows, it displays the full, concretized reality of the final goal. Teaching is the task of ethics. Teaching is not the purpose of an art work, any more than it is the purpose of an airplane. Just as one can learn a great deal from an airplane by studying it or taking it apart, so one can learn a great deal from an art work—about the nature of man, of his soul, of his existence. But these are merely fringe benefits. The primary purpose of an airplane is not to teach man how to fly, but to give him the actual experience of flying. So is the primary purpose of an art work.”
2. In defense of Rand’s work as art in relation to Tolstoy’s definition, he tells what art does, not how the artist does it. See Tolstoy’s **What Is Art?** pg. 148. at the bottom of the first paragraph. Here he says, “If art is important, then it should be accessible to everyone. And if, as in our day it is not accessible to all men, then either art is not the vital matter it is represented to be, or that art which we call art is not the real thing.” The way the reader perceives the art is just as important as the way the author portrays it. As a reader of **The Fountainhead**, I am arguing here that it [and the given passage here from page 179 of the novel] evokes feeling and inspiration in me. It may or may not do the same for the typical reader—academic or otherwise.
3. Vladimir Nabokov, **Lolita**, New York: Crest Books [Fawcet World Library], 1955, p.11.
4. Douglas Fowler, **Reading Nabokov**. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, pgs.17-18.
5. **The Romantic Manifesto**, p.133. cited on page 24 of Stephen Cox’s “Ayn Rand: Theory Versus Creative Life.” **The Journal of Libertarian Studies** (8) 1 (Winter 1986).
6. pg. 299 of **The Fountainhead** quoted on page 24 of Stephen Cox’s “Ayn Rand: Theory Versus Creative Life.”
7. Nabokov’s **Lolita**, pg. 19.
8. Quoted from “**Playboy** Interview: Vladimir Nabokov,” **Playboy**, 11 (Jan. 1964), 40 in Douglas Fowler’s book **Reading Nabokov**, pgs. 55-56.
9. Kathryn Feuer. Introduction to Nikolai Chernyshevsky’s **What Is to Be Done?** Ann Arbor, Michigan: Ardis Publishers, 1986, pg.vii.
10. In **What Is To Be Done?**, Viera Pavlovna’s moral and ideological speech about life love and passion being more important than money begins in the middle of page 173 and goes to the end of the second paragraph on page 176. Rand’s fiction gives speeches in the middle of prose like this as well. See Rand’s **Atlas Shrugged**, pgs. 387-391. In this section, one of Rand’s heroes, Francisco D’Anconia, gives a speech in the middle of the prose that’s ideologically different than

Viera Pavlovna's. In D'Anconia's speech, he talks about the value of money and says that it is the root of all good.

11. D. Barton Johnson, "Nabokov, Ayn Rand, and Russian-American Literature or, the Odd Couple." *Cycnos* 12(2), 1995, pg.104.

12. Hannah Green. "Mister Nabokov" *New Yorker*, February 14, 1977, p.37 quoted from Brian Boyd, *Vladimir Nabokov: The American Years*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991, p.115.

13. Personal Interview of Vladimir Nabokov by James Mossman, September 8, 1969, for *Review*, BBC-2 (October 4) from *Vladimir Nabokov: Strong Opinions*, New York, St. Louis, etc: McGraw-Hill, 1973, pg. 148. In this interview, Nabokov is asked the question, "Why do you dislike writers who go in for soul-searching and self-revelations in print? After all, do you not do it at another remove, behind a thicket of art?" His response begins with, "If you are alluding to Dostoevsky's worst novels, then, indeed . . ."

14. *The Romantic Manifesto*, p.43.

15. Brian Boyd's *Vladimir Nabokov: The American Years*, p.111.

16. Konstantin Mochulsky "Dostoevsky and The Brothers Karamazov" Introduction to Fyodor Dostoevsky's *The Brothers Karamazov*. New York, Toronto, London, etc: Bantam Books, 1970 [originally published 1880], pg.xii.

17. This reference to Prometheus in *The Fountainhead* is on page 679 of the novel. It is near the beginning of Howard Roark's defense speech at his trial. It reads, "Prometheus was chained to a rock and torn by vultures—because he had stolen the fire of the gods."

18. For a definition and explanation of "sense of life," see *The Romantic Manifesto*, Chapters 2 [Philosophy and Sense of Life] and 3 [Art and Sense of Life], pgs. 25-44. "Sense of life" will be discussed in more detail and in relation to other writers in the second half of chapter 1.

19. *The Romantic Manifesto*, pg. 43.

20. Vladimir Nabokov. *Vladimir Nabokov: Strong Opinions*, New York, St. Louis: McGraw-Hill, 1973, pg.148.

21. Sciabarra. *Ayn Rand: The Russian Radical*, p.10.

22. See Leo Tolstoy's *What Is Art?* pg.201 [end of Chapter 12]. Here he says that professional schools of art make dull students of art, creates counterfeit art and creates a misunderstanding of art among people because it is impossible to teach a man how to become an artist.

23. Louis Torres and Michelle Marder Kamhi. *What Art Is: The Esthetic Theory of Ayn Rand*. Chicago and LaSalle, Illinois: Open Court Publishing, 2000, p.16.

24. Alkibiades (452-404 v. Christ) was a famous Athenian statesman and military leader.

25. The full quotation of Kenneth A. Telford's entire analysis of Aristotle's passage from *Poetics*, section 1451b, lines 3-13 is as follows on page 93 of the book: "The form of incidents of which the poet speaks in structuring the sequence of his plot thus puts his function somewhere between the historian who seeks the particularity of actual events and that of the philosopher or scientist who seeks universality of the possible—that is, the likelihoods and necessities of certain kinds of characters in certain kinds of situations. It is this form of his incidents, their possibility or potentiality, that guides the poet in making choices when establishing the structure of the plot."

26. Stephen Cox. "Ayn Rand: Theory Versus Creative Life." *The Journal of Libertarian Studies* (8) 1 (Winter 1986), p.20.

27. *The Romantic Manifesto*, p.25.

28. *Ibid*, p.85-86.

29. Ibid, p.87.
30. Quoted by E.M. Forster from Aristotle's **Poetics**, section 1450, lines 20-25.
31. Quoted by Torres and Kamhi from Rand's letter to Gerald Loeb, 21 August 1945, in **Letters of Ayn Rand**, 148. Quoted by Torres and Kamhi from Rand's letter to Henry Blanke, 26 February 1949, in **Letters of Ayn Rand**, 428.
32. Stephen Cox. "Ayn Rand: Theory Versus Creative Life." **The Journal of Libertarian Studies** (8) 1 (Winter 1986), p.22.
33. Page 22 of Rand's **The Romantic Manifesto** quoted by Stephen Cox on pg. 22 of his article, "Ayn Rand: Theory Versus Creative Life." This example by Rand is a contradiction of her point [see footnote number one above] on pg. 169 of **The Romantic Manifesto**. On page 169, she says that the primary purpose of art is not to teach. But in this passage, from pg. 22 of **The Romantic Manifesto**, Rand shows how her typical readers learned moral lessons from the character of Howard Roark.
34. Cox, "Ayn Rand Theory Versus Creative Life", pgs.22-23.
35. Soon after coming to the United States in 1926, Ayn Rand began her literary career as a screenwriter in Hollywood. She was taken under the wing of director Cecil B. DeMille, worked as an extra on his film, **King of Kings** and later worked in his studio as a screenwriter. For a brief description of Ayn Rand's biography, see Barbara Branden's article, "Ayn Rand: The Reluctant Feminist" in **Feminist Interpretations of Ayn Rand**. Edited by Mimi Reisel Gladstein and Chris Matthew Sciabarra, University Park: Penn State Press, 1999, pgs. 25-45.
36. Ayn Rand. **The Fountainhead**. New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1943, p. 391.
37. Cox, **Ayn Rand: Theory Versus Creative Life**, pg.20.
38. Morse Peckham, **Beyond the Tragic Vision**. New York: George Braziller, Inc., 1962, pg.87.
39. Immanuel Kant's **Critique of Judgment** quoted in Morse Peckham. **The Birth of Romanticism 1790-1815**. Greenwood, Fla.: Penkevill Publishing, 1986, pg.2.
40. Chris Matthew Sciabarra, **Ayn Rand: The Russian Radical**. Pgs. 152-53.
41. N.O. Lossky. "Ideal-Realism-parts 1 & 2" **Personalist**. (15) April (Spring 1934), pg.151.
42. Sciabarra, pg. 153.
43. Allan H. Pasco. **Sick Heroes: French Society and Literature in the Romantic Age, 1750-1850**. Exeter, Devon: University of Exeter Press, 1997, p.12.
44. Mary Shelley. **Frankenstein: Or, the Modern Prometheus** (the 1818 text). Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1974, pg. 92. Just like in different sections of **The Fountainhead**, these lines symbolize man as a creature above nature, a God-like creature standing above the earth. Furthermore, the title [Modern Prometheus] symbolizes the idea of Frankenstein as a mythical figure or God. The language in this passage also appears very similar to that of Rand's novel.
45. See **The Fountainhead**, pgs. 15 [when Howard Roark stands naked above a cliff], 391 [When Gail Wynand holds a gun to his head]—. . . "His penthouse built above the fifty seventh floor of a great residential hotel which he owned" . . . "he could see the whole city below him." 487-When Gail and Dominique are together in his penthouse, the author mentions the "fifty-seven floors below them" again. 506-Howard Roark is sitting alone on a boulder, looking down on the valley of a summer resort which he designed. 516-517-Gail Wynand operating a row of buttons. Each button connected to a wire controlling men, groups, etc-"these little knobs of colored plastic, there under his fingers". 693-695 [Dominique rising to stand above New York's tallest building with Howard Roark]. It is also interesting to note that only the three most

Nietzschean characters in the novel, Roark, Dominique and Wynand, ever stand symbolically in high places above nature and the masses. Peter Keating and Ellsworth Toohey never do this.

46. Victor Brombert. **Victor Hugo and the Visionary Novel**. Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University Press, 1984, p.7.

47. Just like Hugo, Rand puts these same types of speeches in the middle of her prose. Just like Viera Pavlovna's speech in Chernyshevsky's **What is to be Done?**, this beggar's speech in Hugo's **Ninety –Three** argues that money is the root problem. See pgs. 387-391 of Rand's **Atlas Shrugged** for a similar type of literary trait. Like most of Rand's fiction and philosophy, this speech in **Atlas Shrugged** is similar in construction [literary style] to Hugo and Chernyshevsky [putting speeches in the middle of prose] but different in stance. The speeches of both Hugo's beggar and Chernyshevsky's **What is to be Done?** argue against money while Rand's Francisco D'Anconia argues for money.

48. A major difference between Hugo and Rand is that Hugo's heroes tend to be common men of the nation (France). Rand's heroes are extraordinary men. Despite the fact that two main characters of **The Fountainhead**, Howard Roark and Gail Wynand, evolve to positions of wealth and greatness from lowly or common man socioeconomic upbringings, none of her main characters are common men. Eddie Willers of her novel **Atlas Shrugged**, who is not a main character, is the only common man type of character in her literary canon. Therefore, in the Romantic portrayals of his characters, Hugo creates his Romantic heroes with less of a spirit of individualism than Rand does.

49. Auguste Comte. **A General View of Positivism**. Stanford, California: Academic Reprints, 1953 (Originally Published 1848), pgs. 6-7, 305.

50. Ayn Rand. "The Objectivist Ethics" **The Virtue of Selfishness**. New York: New American Library, 1964, pg.27.

51. Richard Osborne, **Philosophy for Beginners**. New York: Writers and Readers Publishing, Inc, 1992, pg.134.

52. Philosophical movements like Marxism and literature like Dostoevsky's **Letters From Underground**, in relation to Rand's fiction, will be studied and discussed more thoroughly in chapter 2.

53. See Northrup Frye's essay "The Mythos of Summer: Romance" in **Anatomy of Criticism**. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1957, pgs. 186-206 for his recipe in classifying works of literature as romances.

54. See Chernyshevsky's **What Is To Be Done?** pgs. 190-191. Although Chernyshevsky's novel doesn't look Romantic, it mentions optimism [or what he calls Comteism] in the same sentence with Romanticism. On the second paragraph of page 190, it reads "And at this all four laughed, and the romanticist beat a retreat, laughing. But the officer took his place in the dispute, and the fun was much more lively than before until it was tea-time. The officer, while showing up the rigorist and the schematist much more cruelly than the romanticist had done, was himself mournfully convicted of Auguste Comteism." Furthermore, Perhaps Ayn Rand was influenced by Chernyshevsky, the father of optimistic literature, as much as she was influenced by Victor Hugo, the father of optimistic Romantic literature.

55. This is evidence to my disagreement with Gene Bell-Villada's point [Bottom of pg. 30] that Ayn Rand's contribution to art is nil and she has no writerly heirs like Nabokov does. More evidence in argument against Bell-Villada's point will come in Chapter 5.

56. Barbara and Nathaniel Branden, **Who Is Ayn Rand?** New York: Paperback Library, 1962, pg 92.

57. Branden, Nathaniel. "The Benefits and Hazards of the Philosophy of Ayn Rand." **Journal of Humanistic Psychology**, 24 (4) Fall 1984, pgs. 54-55.
58. Gustave Flaubert cited in Stephen Heath, **Landmarks of World Literature: Gustave Flaubert-Madame Bovary**, Cambridge, New York, Sydney, etal: Cambridge University Press, 1992, pg.7.
59. Victor Brombert. **Victor Hugo and the Visionary Novel**. Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University Press, 1984, pgs 209-210. The incidents critiqued here occur in pages 9-23 of **Ninety-Three** [Part I-Book I]
60. Tim Sandefur. "Frank Lloyd Wright's Humanism." **The Humanist** 59 (3) May-June 99, pg.41.
61. Charvet, P.E. "Volume IV: The Nineteenth Century" **A Literary History of France**. Ed. Charvet: New York/London: Barnes and Noble/ Ernest Been Limited, 1967, pg.301.
62. Victor Brombert. "A novelist and his century." **Unesco Courier**. 38 (November 1985), pgs. 10-11.
63. P.E. Charvet, pg.285.
64. Ibid, pgs. 289-290.

CHAPTER 2

1. William Barrett. **What Is Existentialism?** New York: Grove Press, 1964, pg.104.
2. William Barrett. **Irrational Man: A Study in Existential Philosophy**. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1958, pg. 123.
3. Jean Paul Sartre. "Existentialism." **A Casebook on Existentialism**. Edited by William V. Spanos. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1966, pg. 279.
4. Hazel E. Barnes. "Egoistic Humanism: Ayn Rand's Objectivism." **An Existentialist Ethics**. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1967, pg. 125.
5. Sartre. "Existentialism.", pg.282.
6. William Barrett. **Irrational Man**. Pg. 141.
7. Hazel Barnes **The Literature of Possibility**. Lincoln, NE.: University of Nebraska Press, 1959, pg.374. See also Dostoevsky's **The Brothers Karamazov**, pg. 317. In Ivan's and Aloysha's discussion about God, they both come to the conclusion that the Grand Inquisitor [thought to be Ivan by many scholars] doesn't believe in God. Throughout their talk, it is implied that Ivan believes God doesn't exist and he says [on pg.317], "Well since you've brought it up—I suppose everything is permitted, just as I said; I don't take it back."
8. Friedrich Nietzsche says that "God is Dead!" in the first section, or paragraph of his essay **Joyful Wisdom**. See Friedrich Nietzsche. "Joyful Wisdom." **A Casebook on Existentialism**. Edited by William V. Spanos, New York: Thomas Crowell Company, 1966, pgs. 256-260.
9. **Nietzsche's Werke** quoted in Lev Shestov's **Dostoevsky, Tolstoy and Nietzsche**. Ohio University Press, 1969, pg. 146.
10. Barrett, **Irrational Man**, pg. 190.
11. **The Fountainhead**, pg.62.
12. Friedrich Nietzsche. **Thus Spoke Zarathustra**. "On the Mount of Olives," Baltimore, Md: Penguin Books, 1969 (Originally Published 1885), p.194 quoted from Lev Shestov. **Dostoevsky, Tolstoy and Nietzsche**. Ohio University Press, 1969, pgs.188-89.

13. Gore Vidal's comment in **Esquire**, July 1961, pgs. 24-27, 67 quoted from Barbara Branden's article, "Ayn Rand: The Reluctant Feminist" in **Feminist Interpretations of Ayn Rand**. Edited by Mimi Reisel Gladstein and Chris Matthew Sciabarra, University Park: Penn State Press, 1999, pgs. 25-45.
14. Victor Brombert. **The Intellectual Hero: Studies in the French Novel**. Philadelphia and New York: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1960, p.186.
15. Hazel Barnes. **The Literature of Possibility**, pg. 262.
16. For evidence of the love/hate relationships that Peter and Dominique have with Howard Roark, see **The Fountainhead**, pg. 194, Peter yells at Roark and tells his true feelings by saying, "You rotten, lousy, conceited bastard. . . you're a flop, an incompetent, a beggar, a failure. . . You against everybody. . . You can't touch me. I have the whole world with me. . . I've always hated you. . ." On pg. 633, when Ellsworth tells Peter how he feels about Roark, he says, "I know you've worshipped him all your life. You've knelt and worshipped, while stabbing him in the back." On pg. 273, Dominique says to Roark, "You know that I hate you, Roark. I hate you for what you are, for wanting you, for having to want you."
17. Quoted from pg. 155 of Aldous Huxley's **Brave New World** in E.J. Brown's **Brave New World, 1984 and We: An Essay on Anti-Utopia**, pg. 44.
18. Rand's great heroes like Roark and the hero of **Anthem** have predecessors. The few clues about these predecessors leave us interesting questions about her utopian societies of great men who rule the world. See **The Fountainhead**, pgs.44-46 for the story about Roark's mentor, Henry Cameron [incidentally patterned after the real life architect, Louis Sullivan]. If Cameron was so great, why was he defeated by the mediocre and common architects in the 'orgy of Classicism'? Was it his alcoholism? How is Roark so different from Cameron? See **Anthem**, pgs. 50-53, the section about the few individual great men of intellect who were destroyed by the common masses through war and execution. If they were so great, how did the common masses destroy them? Rand gives us the possible implication that the numeric superiority of the masses won the battle. However, the great men who have re-emerged in Rand's novels don't look very different from the ones who have failed in the past. Perhaps Rand's point in this is that, as long as *any* of these great men exist, despite the fact that great men will never rule permanently, because they are so rare and few, mankind will never destroy itself.
19. **The Romantic Manifesto**, pgs. 109, 128.
20. Sartre's "Existentialism." pg. 276-77.
21. See "Existentialism." pg.277, middle paragraph where Sartre explains that there are two kinds of existentialists.
22. See Howard Roark in **The Fountainhead**, laughing after being kicked out of school (pg.15), is not afraid when Dominique threatens that she can have him fired at the quarry (pg.209), gives a firm refusal when Gail Wynand tries to corrupt Roark's integrity of architectural style under the threat of blocking all possible life opportunities in any profession (pgs.532-33).
23. D.H. Lawrence. "The Grand Inquisitor." **The Brothers Karamazov and the Critics**. Edited by Edward Wasiolek. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1967, pg.79.
24. D.H. Lawrence. "The Grand Inquisitor," pgs.79-80.
25. This is quoted from pg. 978 of **Atlas Shrugged**. This is a part of John Galt's 60 page speech near the novel's end.
26. Barnes. "Egoistic Humanism: Ayn Rand's Objectivism," pgs. 131-132.
27. See **Atlas Shrugged**, pgs. 379-80.
28. Nathaniel Branden. "The Benefits and Hazards of The Philosophy of Ayn Rand," pgs. 54-55.

29. See Richard Wright's **Native Son**, Jan, the communist leader tries to help Bigger all throughout the novel and treats him like he's human, [pg. 70] "Bigger, please! Don't say sir to me. . . I don't like it. You're a man just like I am; I'm no better than you." [pg.162] "Listen, Bigger, if these people are bothering you, just tell me. Don't be scared. I'm used to this sort of thing." [pg.268] "I said, 'I'm going to help that guy [Bigger], if he lets me.'" When contemplating whether or not to send a kidnap ransom note demanding money for the Dalton's daughter who is already dead, Bigger considers Mr. Dalton's capitalist evil beneath the surface, [pg.164] "Even though Mr. Dalton gave millions of dollars for Negro education, he would rent houses to Negroes only in this prescribed area, this corner of the city tumbling down from rot. . . Yes; he would send the kidnap note. He would jar them out of their senses."

30. See Albert Camus' **The Stranger**, pgs. 120-123. After the protagonist has been sentenced to death, his existential self realization comes not long before his death. "Then, I don't know why, but something inside me snapped. I started yelling at the top of my lungs, and I insulted him and told him not to waste his prayers on me. . . I was pouring out on him everything that was in my heart, cries of anger and cries of joy. . . He wasn't even sure he was alive, because he was living like a dead man. . . But I was sure about me, about everything, surer than he could ever be, sure of my life and sure of the death I had waiting for me. Yes, that was all I had. . . I had lived my life one way and I could just as well have lived it another. . . Nothing, nothing mattered, and I knew why. . . As if that blind rage had washed me clean, rid me of hope; for the first time, in that night alive with signs and stars, I opened myself to the gentle indifference of the world. Finding it so much like myself—so like a brother, really—I felt that I had been happy and that I was happy again. . ."

31. Ayn Rand. "The Objectivist Ethics." **The Virtue of Selfishness**, pg.25.

32. While no works that I've ever read of Rand's have shown where her trademark philosophical statements of Aristotle's are taken from in his work, he says similar things to these points of Rand's in his **Physics** and **Posterior Analytics**. "It is evident, therefore, in what sense every product is composed 'of' a persistent being and a form." (**Physics** Book Alpha 190b, lines 18-19). ". . . nothing comes from what 'is-not' absolutely, but insist that a thing does come from what 'is-not' in an incidental sense: it comes from its 'privation,' and this is, by itself, what 'is not' (**Physics** Book Alpha 191b, lines 15-18). The closest thing that I can find in which Aristotle says "A is A" is taken from a very difficult group of analytical syllogisms that he's doing. Rand's use of the term makes it seem like "A is A" is a totality and summation of one of Aristotle's major philosophical premises. In the context in which it is given in his **Posterior Analytics**, it doesn't look the way that Rand tries to make it seem. It reads as follows: "Then 'if B is, A must be' = 'if B is, C must be,' which above gave the conclusion 'if A is, C must be': but C and A have been identified. Consequently the upholders of circular demonstration are in the position of saying that A is, A must be—a simple way of proving anything" (**Posterior Analytics** Book 1 Chapter 2-73a lines 1-5).

33. See Richard Osborne's **Philosophy for Beginners**, pgs. 118-119. It reads: "German philosophy after Hegel resembles Greek philosophy after Aristotle. After Aristotle, philosophy turned from speculative metaphysics to ethics. It became practical and dealt with the real world". Thus, Marx built on the philosophy of Hegel and made it applicable to the real world. Hegel is referred to here as the Prussian Aristotle. As the Prussian Aristotle, it's no coincidence that much of Rand's philosophy is identical to Hegel's. On page 117 of Richard Osborne's book, **Philosophy for Beginners**, there is a chart that shows how different philosophers, after Hegel, relate to and carry on his ideological legacy. Marx is labeled as a Left Hegelian. The Existential

philosopher, Friedrich Nietzsche, is a right Hegelian labeled as “Romantic Reaction.” I believe that Ayn Rand would sit at exactly the same place on this chart as Nietzsche. Therefore, Rand is a Right Hegelian.

34. Many similarities exist in the philosophies of G.W.F. Hegel and Ayn Rand. They both have the same rational basis to their philosophies. They both basically say that all good things in man’s existence come from a rational mind. Hegel says, “This self-consciousness which apprehends itself through thinking as essentially human, and thereby frees itself from the contingent and the false, is the principle of right, morality, and all ethical life” (**Philosophy of Right** 30). In perhaps his greatest and most popular work, **Phenomenology of Mind**, Hegel says, “The individual, therefore, knowing that he can find in his *objective* actuality nothing but its unity with himself or can find only the certainty of himself in its very truth, and knowing that he thus always attains his purpose—can experience only a sense of joy in himself” (425). Rand says, “A rational process is a moral process. . . Thinking is man’s only basic virtue, from which all the others proceed” (**Atlas Shrugged** 943-44). The use and purpose of this mind is where they clash. Hegel believes it should be used for universal and social ends, while Rand believes it should be used for individual benefit. “Duty is primarily a relation to something which from my point of view is substantive, absolutely universal. . . Particular interests should in fact be set aside or completely suppressed; instead, they should be put in correspondence with the universal, and thereby both they and the universal are upheld” (**Philosophy of Right** 161-62). Rand says, “. . . man must live for his own sake.” (**The Virtue of Selfishness** 27). “Do you ask what moral obligation I owe to my fellow men? None—except the obligation I owe to myself, to material objects and to all of existence: rationality” (**Atlas Shrugged** 948).

35. See **The Fountainhead**, pgs. 532-535 when Wynand battles Roark by trying to corrupt his integrity. This is a power struggle in the novel between Rand’s two Nietzschean Supermen. Howard Roark wins and ultimately becomes the most powerful man in New York at the novel’s end. Rand’s utopian society, Galt’s Gulch, can be seen in **Atlas Shrugged**, pgs. 652-758, 1083-84.

36. Rand gives an example of how the “common good” can destroy the individual man in **Atlas Shrugged**. See the full story of Jeff Allen, co-worker of John Galt at Twentieth Century Motor Company, which is an important clue in the mystery of the strike, on pgs. 612-627.

37. In the introduction to **Anthem**, it reads, “The greatest guilt today is that of people who accept collectivism by moral default; the people who seek protection from the necessity of taking a stand, by refusing to admit to themselves the nature of that which they are accepting; the people who support plans specifically designed to achieve serfdom, but hide behind the empty assertion that they are lovers of freedom, with no concrete meaning attached to the word; the people who believe that the content of ideas need not be examined, that principles need not be defined, and that facts can be eliminated by keeping one’s eyes shut. They expect, when they find themselves in a world of bloody ruins and concentration camps, to escape moral responsibility by wailing: ‘But I didn’t mean this!’” Those who want slavery should have the grace to name by its proper name. They must face the full meaning of that which they are advocating or condoning; the full, exact, specific meaning of collectivism, of its logical implications, of the principles upon which it is based, and of the ultimate consequences to which these principles will lead. They must face it, then decide whether this is what they want or not” (viii, ix). This statement puts the blame for collectivism or Rand’s so called ‘slavery’ on the victims as much as the oppressors. Rand is implying here that nobody should want collectivism and great men never do. Why I’m mostly in agreement with Rand’s ideas here, the type of

slavery she speaks of is just as possible in a capitalistic society as a communal one. For example, drug abuse creates a slavery in which the addicts sacrifice themselves for the benefit of the criminal dealers. Furthermore, Rand's novels don't specifically lie, but they cloud the fact that her Howard Roarks and John Galt are more or less masters of the masses of slaves. Roark has the power to change public opinion of architecture and eliminate his competition. Galt has the power to cause an end to the civilized world outside his utopia. Roark will become monopolistic and Galt is Godlike. This idea is truly no different than the idea of a collectivist society—there are simply different groups of rulers and slaves. Also, the idea of all collectivist states being bad ones is not necessarily a valid one. The greatness of the American Capitalist system comes from a blend of socialism and pure capitalism. This mixture of these two systems is what makes our socioeconomic system feasible and prosperous. Extreme and pure capitalism could possibly eliminate the main difference between capitalism and communism—the middle class.

38. Hazel Barnes. "Egoistic Humanism: Ayn Rand's Objectivism." **An Existentialist Ethics**, pg. 144.

CHAPTER 3

1. In categorizing Rand's politics, Chris Matthew Sciabarra states, ". . . Rand's politics is essentially libertarian. Her defense of individual rights, limited government, and laissez-faire capitalism constituted an invaluable contribution to the reemergence of classical liberal ideology in the twentieth century. Even though her approach is broader than most of her free-market contemporaries, it is fully within the libertarian tradition" (**Ayn Rand: The Russian Radical** 267). Despite her being labeled as libertarian, and the words, anarchism and libertarianism being often used in most political discussions about Rand, she never claimed either of these titles. All Rand ever claimed to be was a "Radical for Capitalism—laissez faire Capitalism." "Objectivists are not 'conservatives.' We are radicals for capitalism. . ." ("Choose Your Issues", **The Objectivist Newsletter**, Jan. 1962, pg.1). Of anarchy and libertarianism, Rand says, "I do not join or endorse any political group or movement. More specifically, I disapprove of, disagree with, and have no connection with, the latest aberration of some conservatives, the co-called "hippies of the right," [libertarians]. . . Anarchism is the most irrational, anti-intellectual notion ever spun by the concrete-bound, context-dropping, whim-worshipping fringe of the collectivist movement, where it properly belongs" ("Brief Summary," **The Objectivist**, Sept. 1971, pg. 1). For a more in depth examination of Ayn Rand's political ideas, see Sciabarra's **Ayn Rand: The Russian Radical**, pgs. 266-294, Merrill's **The Ideas of Ayn Rand**, pgs. 127-150 and Tibor Machan's **Ayn Rand**, pgs. 23-24 and 103-111.

2. Barbara Branden. **The Passion of Ayn Rand**. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, 1986, pgs. 21-22.

3. George Woodcock. **The Crystal Spirit: A Study of George Orwell**. Minerva Press, 1966, pg. 209.

4. George Orwell quoted in Alex Zwerdling's **Orwell and the Left**. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1974, pg. 4.

5. Leonard Peikoff. **Objectivism: The Philosophy of Ayn Rand**. New York: Dutton, 1991, pg.368, quoted in Chris Matthew Sciabarra's **Ayn Rand: The Russian Radical**, pg.282.

6. Just like Orwell likens Prometheus to Hitler, Howard Roark likens himself to Prometheus on page 679 of **The Fountainhead**. Mythical heroes like Prometheus and Atlas were symbolic constants of Rand's fiction that added to the majestic and God-like aura of her work.
7. George Woodcock. **The Crystal Spirit**. pg.57.
8. Claudia Roth Pierpont. **Passionate Minds: Women Rewriting the World**. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2000, pg. 202.
9. Alex Zwerdling. **Orwell and the Left**. pg.10.
10. George Orwell, "The English Civil War," **New Statesman and Nation**, 24 (August 1940), p.193 quoted in Alex Zwerdling's **Orwell and the Left**, pg. 27.
11. Christopher Hollis. **A Study of George Orwell**. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1956, pg. 146.
12. Ayn Rand. **The Art of Fiction**. New York: Plume, 2000, pg. 163, quoted in Stephen Cox's **The Woman and the Dynamo: Isabel Paterson and the Idea of America**. New Brunswick and London: Transaction Publishers, 2004, pg. 288.
13. Stephen Cox. **The Woman and the Dynamo**, pg. 288.
14. See Averil Gardner's book, **George Orwell**. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1987, pgs. 102-105. Gardner speaks of the characters of **Animal Farm** in terms of the key political figures that each represented in relation to the Soviet regime from the Russian Revolution to the end of World War II.
15. Barbara Branden. **The Passion of Ayn Rand**. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., 1986, pg.134.
16. See Barbara Branden's **The Passion of Ayn Rand**, pgs. 134 and 135. Dominique was a character created out of Rand's hatred and disgust with the world. "She [Rand] projected what she herself felt in moments of disgust or depression, during the worst of her indignation against injustice, her contempt for depravity, her passionate rebellion against the rule of mediocrity—and asked herself: 'What if I really believed that that is all there is in life, that values and heroes have no chance in the world?' . . . Thus she projected the psychology of a woman who is motivated by the bitter conviction that values and greatness have no chance among men and are doomed to destruction." It is interesting how Rand, like Orwell, [and even Dostoevsky] touches on this dark side of man's nature. We see this darkness in **The Brothers Karamazov**, **Notes From Underground**, **Animal Farm** and **Nineteen Eighty Four**. The disturbing aspect of Rand's novels is that she blends this brutal and dark side of man's nature with extremes of optimism. Rand's hatred of mankind and the mediocre world created her optimism [a brutal and primal type of optimism—not a kind and gentle one]. Orwell's love for mankind [which he learned as a soldier in the Spanish Civil War] created the pessimism of his key works of fiction. In the typical tradition of the Randian hero, Dominique hates common mankind more than she loves its great men. Both Orwell and Rand's brutal heroes show that we must get in touch with this dark side of man. Orwell wants us to be aware of his danger and keep it under control. Rand wants her elite characters of greatness to be destroyed along with the masses if they don't develop the inner strength to rise above the masses.
17. George Orwell's **Shooting an Elephant** cited from George Woodcock's **The Crystal Spirit**, pg.78.
18. Woodcock, **The Crystal Spirit**, pg. 79.
19. See Jeff Walker's **The Ayn Rand Cult**, pgs. 272-73. Walker claims that Edward Bellamy's ideas enjoyed followings and book sales similar to those of Rand's.

20. Branden, “The Benefits and Hazards of The Philosophy of Ayn Rand,” **Journal of Humanistic Psychology**, 24 (4), Fall 1984, pgs. 58-59.
21. More of this idea of Gail Wynand as Rand’s true hero will be discussed in Chapter four. Also, the Randian hero in pop culture will be examined in Chapter seven.
22. George Orwell, “James Burnham and the Managerial Revolution.” **The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell**, Volume IV. Edited by Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus, New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc, 1968, pgs. 161, 162, 177, 179.
23. For more evidence of this point, see also **Atlas Shrugged**, pgs. 898-906. Metal tycoon Hank Rearden, whose family has lived off his wealth [representatives of common men to Rand who produce nothing but live off the wealth of industrial tycoons] because of his guilt and sense of family loyalty and duty, no longer feels pity or sympathy for his family. He claims, on pg. 902, that now the strike has happened and society is collapsing, that he doesn’t care about what becomes of his family.
24. To see where Peter Keating is used up and swept away by the other characters in **The Fountainhead**, see pg. 369, Dominique is using Peter for double duty. She wants to destroy herself with the marriage to him and also carry out Toohey’s goal of destroying Peter. [Also see pg. 432 where Dominique and Toohey both speak of carrying out Toohey’s goals] See pgs. 580-582 to see where Roark uses his friendship with Peter to get the Cortlandt building commission. See pgs. 441-442 where Gail Wynand uses Peter to prove his theory that men are either corrupt successes or honest failures by successfully offering him an architecture commission for his wife, Dominique.
25. Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus (editors). **The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell**. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1968. Volume 1, pg. 458.
26. See Jeff Walker’s **The Ayn Rand Cult**, pg. 119. Walker states, “Some of Rand’s favorite artists and writers such as Chopin, Tchaikovsky, Saint-Saens, Michelangelo, Terrence Rattigan, Oscar Wilde, Noel Coward, and Rudolf Nureyev were homosexual or bisexual. But in the interest of art, Rand turned a blind eye.”
27. George Orwell narrowly escaped death twice in the Spanish Civil War. For more in depth biographical information about Orwell’s experiences in the Spanish Civil War, see his book, **Homage to Catalonia**, George Woodcock’s **The Crystal Spirit**, pgs. 163-176 and Christopher Hitchens’ **Why Orwell Matters**, pgs. 66-78 and his essay “Looking Back on the Spanish War” in **The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell**, vol.II, pgs.249-267. Also see Christopher Hollis’ **A Study of George Orwell**, pgs. 97-98. Of Orwell’s narrow escape of death, Hollis’ account [on pgs. 96-97] reads, “At five o’clock in the morning while talking to the sentries before changing guard, he is shot through the neck, the bullet missing his windpipe ‘by about a millimeter’. . . Then, hearing the bystanders say that he has been shot through the neck, he assumes that the wound is mortal and that he will be dead in a few minutes. . . It proves of course that the wound is not mortal. . . When he gets out of hospital he finds that a pogrom is in progress against all members of the P.O.U.M. He is in great danger; his wife’s room at the hotel has been searched. His friend Kopp has been arrested and is in prison. His friend Smillie, grandson of Bob Smillie, has been arrested at the frontier in order to prevent him from returning to Britain to tell the truth and sent to die in a prison in Valencia. Orwell is only able to escape arrest himself by going ‘on the run,’ by hiding and sleeping about the town. There is nothing more that he and his wife can do in Spain. They get papers out of the British Consul and, after one last visit to the police officer to try to get Kopp’s release from prison—a visit which, though Orwell nowhere says anything of this, is of enormous risk to himself, as it involves his

confession that he belongs to the proscribed P.O.U.M. militia—Orwell and his wife are able to reach the French frontier. Fortunately, owing to Spanish inefficiency, the frontier guards have not yet received the list of persons to be apprehended, on which their names would have certainly have figured, and they are able to pass into safety.”

28. “Power tends to corrupt. Absolute power corrupts absolutely” was said by Lord Acton (1834-1902), British Historian. George Orwell quotes Lord Acton in his essay “In Pursuit of Lord Acton” in **Tribune**, March 29, 1946, pg. 19.

29. This is total speculation on my part about what I think George Orwell would say about **The Fountainhead**’s characters. I believe that not only will a wealthy Howard Roark turn into another Gail Wynand, but that Roark with wealth would be even more dangerous than Gail Wynand. Where Wynand uses money to achieve his goals, Roark uses brutality and violence. More about these ideas, in relation to Howard Roark and Gail Wynand, will be discussed in Chapter Four.

30. I sympathize with the key ideas represented by the Strikers of **Atlas Shrugged**, that the overly powerful government victimizes big business and stagnates production that could better mankind. However, it’s hard to sympathize with multi-millionaires who, if nothing else, have their productive work to keep them happy. Rand makes her mogul heroes look like poor victims. This is a hard portrayal to sell. Survival is more of a plight of the poor common man. Rand’s heroes are competing to be the most wealthy and powerful tycoons in the world—not for survival. While there’s nothing wrong with these greedy and Americanized competitions, Rand’s tycoons’ greed is disguised as need in her novels. Furthermore, one important idea that Rand’s fiction and non-fiction seems to omit is that lawyers are in business to represent either side—America is truly more about money and power than justice and morality. None of her heroes hire lawyers to defend themselves. Are Rand’s heroes too good to hire lawyers for criminal trials? In **Atlas Shrugged**, Hank Rearden hires a lawyer for his divorce, but not to defend his metal mills from government expropriation. Howard Roark and Hank Rearden are more interested in establishing moral and ethical defenses for themselves and their actions than with their own lives and property. This is not realistic. The trials of her heroes in **The Fountainhead** and **Atlas Shrugged** deal more with moral and ethical laws than legal laws. The key aspect of the American Imagination that Rand’s novels omit is that “money is power.” The American Dream is one of wealth, success and excess. With the exception of Gail Wynand, all of Rand’s heroes disguise the fact that wealth and power are their ultimate goals.

31. To see where Gail Wynand and Ellsworth Toohey admit that they want more power, see **The Fountainhead**, pgs. 498, 626 and 640. On page 640, Toohey says, “I want power. I want my world of the future. Let all live for all. Let all sacrifice and none profit. . . Universal slavery—without even the dignity of a master.” On page 626, Wynand says, “Power. I hold a power I’ve never tested. Now you’ll see the test. They’ll think what I want them to think. They’ll do as I say. Because it is my city and I do run things around here.” On page 498, Gail says, “Power, Dominique. The only thing I ever wanted. To know that there’s not a man living whom I can’t force to do—anything. Anything I choose.”

32. Unlike his British colleague and friend, E.M. Forster, Orwell never visited America and had no desire to do so.

33. See Jeff Walker’s, **The Ayn Rand Cult**, pgs. 271-72. Walker states that, just like Rand’s works, Martineau’s outsold the critically acclaimed authors of her day, such as Charles Dickens and John Stuart Mill. Furthermore, just like Rand’s, her work was heavily criticized for its lack of literary merit.

34. Orwell, “James Burnham and the Managerial Revolution,” pgs. 161-62.

35. “A good politician keeps his friends weaker than him and on his side” is my own interpretation of Machiavelli’s **The Prince** pgs. 13-15. The text reads: “Nor did he [the King] realize that with this decision [assisting the already strong Church of Pope Alexander] he had made himself weaker, abandoning his allies and those who had thrown themselves into his lap, and he had made the Church stronger by adding to it so much temporal power, in addition to the spiritual power from which it derives so much authority. . . Thus, Louis committed these five errors: he wiped out the less powerful rulers; he increased the power of an already powerful ruler in Italy; he brought into that region an extremely powerful foreigner; he did not go there to live; and he did not set up colonies there. In spite of all this, these errors [had he lived] might not have injured him if he had not made a sixth: that of reducing the dominion of the Venetians”. . .

36. Once Gail Wynand succeeds in corrupting a victim, he no longer has any desire to see him or her ever again. “Once they were broken, Wynand continued to pay them scrupulously. But he felt no further concern for them and no desire to see them again” (**The Fountainhead** 415).

CHAPTER 4

1. In **The Fountainhead**, just like Henry Cameron once was the greatest architect in New York, and controlled public opinion, so is Roark at novel’s end. In both **The Fountainhead** and **Atlas Shrugged**, Rand portrays the idea that the masses don’t know what they want or like. Roark and Toohey are fighting against one another to control public opinion in the field of architecture. Roark’s victory at novel’s end convinces the public that it wants his original and innovative skyscrapers as opposed to the classical and traditional forms of architecture. The Strikers in **Atlas Shrugged** are fighting the Looters [mostly in the form of government cronies] for economic control of society and its governmental system. From **Anthem** to **Atlas Shrugged**, all of Ayn Rand’s heroes are fighting for the same things as the villains—control of power over the masses. This idea is more or less Nietzschean. She simply weakens the dosage after **We the Living**. It matters to Rand’s heroes and her societies, who the best is at anything. In her work, there must be one individual or group—above all others. One of the main purposes of the Strike is to show the masses that they want the laissez faire Capitalist State of ruling tycoons instead of the Communist/Socialist state that they thought they wanted—therefore, the Strike succeeds in changing the thought of the masses.

2. Alvin Toffler’s personal interview with Ayn Rand in **Playboy**, March 1964 cited from **The Ayn Rand Lexicon**. Harry Binswanger, editor. New York: Meridian, 1986, pg.411.

3. **Journals of Ayn Rand** quoted in Stephen Cox’s “The Evolution of Ayn Rand.” **Liberty** 11 (July 1998), p.54. <http://www.libertysoft.com/liberty/reviews/66cox.html>, June 8, 2005.

4. Friedrich Nietzsche’s **Daybreak**, pg. 356 cited from **A Nietzsche Reader**, edited by R.J. Hollingdale, New York, Toronto, Auckland: Penguin Books, 1977, pg. 222.

5. Friedrich Nietzsche, **The Anti Christ**, pgs. 177-179 quoted in H.L. Mencken’s book **Friedrich Nietzsche**. New Brunswick and London: Transaction Publishers [Originally Published 1913], pgs. 163-164.

6. Dominique’s discussion with Alvah Scarret and decision to quit her job at **The Banner** occurs on pg. 358 of **The Fountainhead**.

7. Eddie Willers’ continual efforts to repair the Taggart Comet occur in **Atlas Shrugged**, pgs. 1076-1083.

8. The term “Friends in Washington” is used throughout **Atlas Shrugged** in reference to the looters. It’s never mentioned to refer to the strikers. See **Atlas Shrugged** pgs.469, 471, 500, 803, 809, 857, 895.
9. See **Atlas Shrugged**—Lillian confronts Dagny about wearing her husband’s bracelet, pg. 379, Hank admits his affair with Dagny and allows his wife a divorce—but no stoppage or future confrontations about his extramarital affair, pg. 497, Dagny proudly boasts about her extramarital affair with Hank on the talk show, pg. 792.
10. The masks of subordination in Rand’s heroes are not hard to see in the early parts of her novels. For an example of this in **The Fountainhead**, see pgs. 88-102. In this section, Roark is going through the struggles of getting an architecture job. He is fired from the job that Peter gets him at the prestigious firm of Francon and Heyer and is later fired from another job working for John Erik Snyte.
11. The masks of subordination in Rand’s heroes are uncovered and their true greatness and power is exposed at approximately the same place in the novels—two-thirds of the way through them. In **The Fountainhead**, this occurs around pg. 533, when Roark defies Wynand’s offer of corruption. After this, the most powerful man in New York is not Gail Wynand—it’s Howard Roark. This same greatness and power is exposed in **Atlas Shrugged** around pg. 758 when Dagny Taggart is returned to the normal world from Galt’s Gulch. After seeing Galt’s Gulch, she knows that this rumored great society of men exists and it inspires her to never give up her railroad until it can no longer be saved. Then and only then will she join Galt’s colony of great men and women. Despite the collapsing world, after seeing and living in Galt’s Gulch, she knows that greatness will always exist in men.
12. For a more in depth explanation of Hank Rearden’s powerful ultimatum to his brother, see **Atlas Shrugged**, pg. 441.
13. Maxim Gorky’s **Forty Years-The Life of Clim Samghin**, is a very long tetralogy [four part novel]. Each one of the four novels has its own title. The titles of the four novels are **Bystander**, **The Magnet**, **Other Fires** and **The Specter**. Incidentally, see **Atlas Shrugged**, pg. 876. A secondary character exists in Rand’s novel, whose name is Clem Weatherby, like Clim Samghin, who is one of the looters.
14. Leo Tolstoy, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, vol. 57 (Moscow, 1952), p.175 quoted in Edith Clowes’ “Vulgarization of the Superman” from **Nietzsche in Russia**. Edited by Bernice Glatzer Rosenthal. Princeton, N.J. Princeton University Press, 1986, pg. 319.
15. See Ronald E. Merrill’s **The Ideas of Ayn Rand**, pg. 127.
16. Introduction to **The Fountainhead**, quoted in **The Ayn Rand Lexicon**. Harry Binswanger, editor. New York: Meridian, 1986, pgs. 335-36.
17. Rand. **For the New Intellectual**. New York: New American Library, 1961, pg. 36.
18. Rand. **Return to the Primitive: The Anti-Industrial Revolution**. New York, London: Meridian, 1970, pgs. 99-100.
19. Leonid Andreev’s novel **The Story of Sergei Petrovich** (1900) is a rare collector’s item of which I could not find a copy. See Edith M. Clowes’ article, “Vulgarization of the Superman” from **Nietzsche in Russia**. Edited by Bernice Glatzer Rosenthal. Princeton, N.J. Princeton University Press, 1986, pgs. 315-329, for a brief analysis of Leonid Andreev’s novel in relation to the Nietzschean Superman. In Clowes’ article she shows the negative results on the novels’ characters in relation to Nietzschean philosophy. Howard Roark is just as negative as the heroes of **Sanine** and **The Story of Sergei Petrovich**. However, each one of the three is negative in his own way. Howard Roark is a forceful brute, Sergei Petrovich, like the oversensitive Romantic

hero of Goethe's novel, Werther, can only be perfect and the 'ideal man' by killing himself. Clowes refers to Artsybashev's hero, Sanine as a moral hedonist who is glorified and exalted as a Nietzschean superman through the physical pleasures of sex. Although she portrayed scandalous sex in her fiction, even Rand didn't advocate hedonism. Clowes' essay proclaims that Andreev, Artsybashev, and Nordau all have the depictions of the Nietzschean superman wrong. As portrayed in Andreev's and Artsybashev's works, Nietzsche was neither for hedonism nor death for the common man [or those who fail to reach superman status]. I would add Rand to this list as well. She has the Nietzschean Superman wrong as well in that he's too godlike and extreme [despite the fact that I believe Gail Wynand is her closest example of what a Nietzschean Superman would look like in our everyday American lives]. In contrast to these works, Clowes believes that Hermann Hesse's novel **Demian** (1919) is a more accurate popularization of Nietzsche's philosophy.

20. Clowes "Vulgarization of the Superman," pg. 317.

21. See **Demian**, pgs. 43-68 and 135-149 to see how Demian helps Sinclair find self-fulfillment through the use of Nietzschean philosophy with mind control, as opposed to brutishness, and the presence of Demian's mother, Frau Eva.

22. See note 19 above about how each vice in relation to and as a vulgarized representation of Nietzsche's philosophy [hedonism, suicide and bullying], are respectfully portrayed in the works **Sanine**, **The Life of Sergei Petrovich** and **Degeneration**.

23. Kirsti Minsaas interviewed by Karen Reedstrom and Thomas Gramstad. **Full Context** (February 1997) quoted in Jeff Walker's **The Ayn Rand Cult**, pgs. 123-24.

24. Mary Gaitskill's personal interview with Jeff Walker, 2 December 1991 quoted in Jeff Walker's **The Ayn Rand Cult**, pg. 324.

25. See **The Fountainhead**, pgs. 92-94, 198-200 and **Atlas Shrugged** pgs. 11-20, 65-66, 776-782, 999-1001, 1036, 1076-1083 for depictions of Rand's non-villainous common men, Eddie Willers and Mike Donnigan.

26. Aristotle, **Poetics**, Chapter 13, p. 24 quoted from Stephen Cox's "Ayn Rand: Theory Versus Creative Life." **The Journal of Libertarian Studies** (8) 1 (Winter 1986), pg.20.

27. Stephen Cox. "Ayn Rand: Theory Versus Creative Life." **The Journal of Libertarian Studies** (8) 1 (Winter 1986), pgs.20-21.

28. H.L. Mencken. **Letters**, edited by Guy J. Fergie, New York: A.A. Knopf, 1961, pgs. 9,15,27,107 cited from Patrick Bridgewater's **Nietzsche in Anglosaxony**. Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1972.

29. See **The Fountainhead**, pgs. 196-97.

30. See Sciabarra's **Ayn Rand The Russian Radical**, pg. 282. Despite Roark's integrity which I believe is a more individualized form of a 'just society' or 'democracy,' Sciabarra quotes Leonard Peikoff's **Objectivism: The Philosophy of Ayn Rand**. New York: Dutton, 1991, pg. 368, which reads, "Nor can one find any kind words for democracy in Rand's writings, since she believed that a majoritarian system would degenerate into mob rule in the absence of legally enforced rights, republican constraints, and a system of checks and balances." Of the remnants of democracy and altruism shown in Howard Roark's character, see Kristin Robinson's article "Ayn Rand's Objectivism: A Humanistic Interpretation." **The Humanist** (January/February) 1989, pg. 29. In this article she makes a similar point to the idea of Howard Roark showing altruistic and communal tendencies. She argues in her essay that Rand is a Humanist and that Roark, despite his portrayal as an individualistic and selfish hero, helps his friends to excel along with him.

31. Roark uses his brute force to gain a commission, by breaking the rules of his architecture job with John Erik Snyte. See **The Fountainhead**, pgs. 126-27. He also uses brute force, in the rape of Dominique, to gain her love and support, in which he uses both to his advantage in his career.
32. **The Call of the Wild**, pg. 87, quoted in Gerd Hurm's article "Of Wolves and Lambs." in **Nietzsche in American Literature and Thought**. Edited by Manfred Putz, Columbia, SC: Camden House, 1995, pg. 126.
33. See Nietzsche's **The Genealogy of Morals**, Essay II, Chapters 17-20, for more about Nietzsche's discussion of man's struggles with egotism and altruism.
34. See **The Fountainhead**, pgs. 656-664. Gail discovers that he caters to the masses instead of the other way around. When he reverses the stance of his paper to defend Howard Roark, a man who his paper normally criticizes, he finds that his job is only to pander to the masses.
35. Jack London quoted in Melvin Drimmer's **Nietzsche in American Thought, 1895-1925** (Diss. U of Rochester, 1965), pg. 399 from Gerd Hurm's "Of Wolves and Lambs."
36. Theodore Dreiser's **The Financier**, pg. 144 quoted in Joseph C. Schopp's article "Cowperwood's Will To Power" in **Nietzsche in American Literature and Thought**. Edited by Manfred Putz, Columbia, SC: Camden House, 1995, pg. 146.
37. Evidence of **The Banner** as Gail Wynand's work of art, or his mistress, reads in **The Fountainhead**, pg. 411 as such, "In the first years of **The Banner**'s existence Gail Wynand spent more nights on his office couch than in his bedroom. The effort he demanded of his employees was hard to perform; the effort he demanded of himself was hard to believe. He drove them like an army; he drove himself like a slave. He paid them well; he got nothing but his rent and meals. He lived in a furnished room at the time when his best reporters lived in suites at expensive hotels. He spent money faster than it came in—and he spent it all on **The Banner**. The paper was like a luxurious mistress whose every need was satisfied without inquiry about the price."
38. Evidence of Dominique and Roark being Gail's works of art can be seen in **The Fountainhead** pgs. 488-489, "He [Gail] never mentioned it, but she [Dominique] knew that he did not want her to step out of the house, neither with him nor alone. It was a quiet obsession which he did not expect to enforce. When he came home, he asked: 'Have you been out?'—never: 'Where have you been?' It was not jealousy—the 'where' did not matter. When she wanted to buy a pair of shoes, he had three stores send a collection of shoes for her choice—it prevented her visit to a store. When she said she wanted to see a certain picture, he had a projection room built on the roof". . . Sally Brent decided to outwit her boss. Sally Brent was one of the proudest possessions of **The Banner**. . . Sally Brent decided to do a story on Mrs. Gail Wynand. . . She gained admittance to Wynand's penthouse. . . [When Gail saw the story] That evening Sally Brent was fired. Her costly contract was bought off—it had three more years to run—and she was told never to enter the Banner Building again for any purpose whatsoever." Roark becomes his work of art on pg. 546 when Wynand tells Toohey not to mention Roark any more in his newspaper column. Roark and his friendship become personal property to Gail and he forbids any infringement on this within his newspaper.
39. For evidence of Roark's false sense of integrity, see Sharon Stockton's article "Hoover, Rand, Pound, and the Heroic Architect." **American Literature**, 72 (4) December 2000, pg. 821. It reads, "When Roark violently destroys his Cortlandt Housing Project, it is in a self-conscious gesture of resistance to his own anonymity [another architect has taken credit for the plans] as well as for the fact that the integrity of his vision has been compromised by a team of architects whose revisions to his plans have had no apparent goal other than appealing slavishly to the

masses, who prefer repetitions of Neo-Gothic and Renaissance styles to originality. Earlier in the novel, however, Roark does not object when his Stoddard Temple is reconstructed—also by a team of architects, whose violence to the structure is like that done to his plans for the Cortlandt Housing Project. In this case, Roark simply tells Dominique Francon, his lover, that his vision has been realized and, therefore, it doesn't matter what happens to the building itself. . . The product itself is worthless; production is everything. In this rejection of the product, Roark. . . delegitimizes Rand's own advocacy of the spirit of capitalism."

40. Gail Wynand's biographical rise from a poor longshoreman's son in a tenement slum of Hell's Kitchen to the wealthy newspaper tycoon of **The Banner** is in pgs. 400-408 of **The Fountainhead**.

41. No biographical origin is given of Howard Roark in the novel.

42. Stephen Cox. "Ayn Rand: Theory vs. Creative Life," pg. 21.

43. Wynand is more or less saying the same thing as Cowperwood. If he's going to give the masses what they want, which coincidentally, is the business of any media mogul, he may as well get rich and satisfy himself from doing it.

44. See the **Fountainhead**, pgs. 126-127, 96-97.

45. When Rand makes Gail change his mind about the stance of his paper at the last minute as a desperate effort to save his friend, Howard Roark, it's the author's unrealistic portrayal and renewal of a self-realization that Wynand determined long ago in his career. It's also a bad business move—to mix the earning potential of his business with the pleasure of his friendship with Roark. Gail keeps a clear separation of his professional and personal lives all throughout the novel. A realistic mogul would never do this. Despite the fact that Gail says, "Don't expect me to change *The Banner* or sacrifice it. I wouldn't do that for anyone on earth" (**The Fountainhead** 488), on page 620 of the novel, he goes into an unrealistic rage of fury in which he develops an immediate conviction to change his lifelong ideals—which ultimately leads to his downfall, to save Howard Roark.

46. See **The Fountainhead** pgs. 366-371. Peter Keating goes to Toohey's house to see his niece [Peter's girlfriend who he really loves] Katie. Toohey can see and sense that the two are getting closer and happier than he would like. On this trip to Toohey's house, Peter proposes marriage to Katie the very next day. When Peter gets back home that night, Dominique shows up at his door to propose marriage to him immediately. This is no coincidence. There's no other way that Dominique could have known that Peter and Katie were planning to marry the next day if Ellsworth Toohey, Katie's uncle, had not told Dominique and persuaded her to marry Peter before he could elope with Katie the next day. All throughout the novel, Dominique does double duty in the name of wanton destruction—just like an evil character, she never creates anything—she only destroys everything. In marrying Peter, she destroys her own happiness and Peter's as well. In destroying Roark, she serves her own agenda of mercy killing him and destroying greatness, while helping Toohey's evil regime destroy good at the same time. See also **The Fountainhead**, pgs. 448-449. Gail Wynand proposes marriage to Dominique and he knows that she doesn't love him. However, she accepts his offer of marriage, not out of love, but to destroy herself and to drop Peter's fleeting wealth and popularity for Gail's as Mrs. Wynand-papers—probably the most wealthy and prestigious title any woman could have in New York.

CHAPTER 5

1. See Jeff Walker's **The Ayn Rand Cult**, pgs. 119, 302-305, 330 and 345.

2. Oscar Wilde's **The Picture of Dorian Gray** cited in Chris Matthew Sciabarra's "The Illustrated Rand." **The Journal of Ayn Rand Studies** 6, no. 1 (Fall 2004): pgs. 1-20.
3. Chris Matthew Sciabarra, "The Illustrated Rand." **The Journal of Ayn Rand Studies** 6, no. 1 (Fall 2004): pgs. 1-2. See also note #4 of this same article for more supportive evidence of this point.
4. See Sciabarra's article "The Illustrated Rand." **The Journal of Ayn Rand Studies** 6, no. 1 (Fall 2004). On page 3 of this article, he states, "[The development of Randian scholarship]. . . is not measured solely by her influence on. . . fiction writers Edward Cline, Neil De Rosa, Beth Elliott, James P. Hogan, Erika Holzer, Helen Knode, Victor Koman, Ira Levin, Karen Michalson, Shelley Reuben, Kay Nolte Smith, L. Neil Smith, Alexandra York and so many others. It is measured also by the number of Rand-like characters or outright references to Rand that have appeared in fictional works of various lengths and quality. Among these are works by: Gene-Bell-Villada (**The Pianist Who Liked Ayn Rand**); William Buckley (**Getting It Right**); Don De Grazia (**American Skin**); Jeffrey Eugenides (**Middlesex**); Mary Gaitskill (**Two Girls, Fat and Thin**); John Gardner (**Mickelsson's Ghost**); Laci Golos (**Sacred Cows are Black and White**); Sky Gilbert (**The Emotionalists**); Rebecca Gilman (**Spinning into Butter**); Terry Goodkind (**Faith of the Fallen, Naked Empire**); David Gulbraa (**Tales of the Mall Masters**); Robert A. Heinlein (**The Moon is a Harsh Mistress**); Orlando Outland (**Death Wore a Fabulous New Fragrance**); Robert Rodi (**Fag Hag**); Matt Ruff (**Sewer, Gas, and Electric: The Public Works Trilogy**); J. Neil Schulman (**The Rainbow Cadenza**); Victor Sperandio (**Cra\$maker: A Federal Affaire**) and Tobias Wolff (**Old School**).
5. See Jeff Walker's **The Ayn Rand Cult**, pg. 42, for a brief but more vividly disappointing account of Erika Holzer's study under Rand's instruction than her own **Ayn Rand: My Fiction Writing Teacher**. See pgs. 61-62, 113 of **Ayn Rand: My Fiction Writing Teacher** for Holzer's description of what appears to be the same difficult lesson learned from Rand as described in pg. 42 of Walker's book.
6. This passage comes from page 5, in the first couple of opening paragraphs of the novel in Mickey Spillane's **One Lonely Night**. (New York: Penguin, 1951).
7. Gore Vidal. "Comment." **Esquire**. July 24-27, 1961, pgs. 67-68.
8. Vidal. pgs. 67-68.
9. For more details about Rand's life in Hollywood as a screenwriter, see Jeff Walker's **The Ayn Rand Cult**, pgs. 41-45, Barbara Grizzuti-Harrison's "Psyching Out Ayn Rand," pg. 68 in **Feminist Interpretations of Ayn Rand** and pgs. 73, 76-78, 82-83, and 110-111 of Barbara Branden's **The Passion of Ayn Rand**. (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1986).
10. See Barbara Grizzuti Harrison's article, "Psyching Out Ayn Rand." **Feminist Interpretations of Ayn Rand**. Edited by Mimi Reisel Gladstein and Chris Matthew Sciabarra, University Park: Penn State Press, 1999, pg. 73.
11. Robert Hunt's "Science fiction for the age of inflation: Reading Atlas Shrugged in the 1980's" in **Coordinates: Placing Science Fiction and Fantasy**. Eds., George E. Slusser, Eric S. Rabkin, and Robert Scholes. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, pg. 92, cited in Melissa Jane Hardie's "Rereading Rand's Camp Feminist Aesthetics" in **Feminist Interpretations of Ayn Rand**. Edited by Mimi Reisel Gladstein and Chris Matthew Sciabarra, University Park: Penn State Press, 1999, pgs. 363-389.
12. John Mitzel with Stephen Abbott. **Myra and Gore**. Dorchester, MA, Manifest Destiny, 1974 cited on pg. 131 of Dennis Altman's **Gore Vidal's America**. Malden, Massachusetts, Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2005.

13. For more evidence about how Howard Roark masks his true identity or reveals only what he wants others to see, just like Rusty in **Myra Breckinridge**, see pgs. 67-68 of Chapter 2 of this work and also pg. 820 of Sharon Stockton's article "Hoover, Rand, Pound, and the Heroic Architect." **American Literature**, 72 (4) December 2000.
14. See **Myra Breckinridge** pgs. 270-71 for more details about Rusty's rape of Letitia. See pgs. 195-97 to see Myra's rape of Rusty and pg. 273 to see Myra's losing her breasts.
15. Merrill cites pgs.246-47 of Cameron Hawley's **Executive Suite**.
16. See pg. 609 of **The Fountainhead**. Howard Roark says that the worst second hander is the man who lusts for power. He's speaking about his friend, Gail Wynand.
17. See **Atlas Shrugged**, pg. 627.
18. See Cameron Hawley's **Executive Suite**, pgs. 111-115 for more in depth description of the character Jesse Grimm and his relationship with the protagonist, Avery Bullard.
19. Orual's trial near the novel's end occurs on pages 251-258 of **Till We Have Faces**.
20. See **The Fountainhead**, pgs. 491-495.
21. Simone de Beauvoir's **The Second Sex**. New York: Vintage Books, 1974, pg. 79, cited in Robert Sheaffer's "Rereading Rand on Gender in the Light of Paglia." **Feminist Interpretations of Ayn Rand**. Edited by Mimi Reisel Gladstein and Chris Matthew Sciabarra, University Park: Penn State Press, 1999, pgs. 299-317.
22. See Simone de Beauvoir's **When Things of The Spirit Come First**, pgs. 32-34. The sexual descriptions of the two characters on these pages look exactly like the type of rough and violent sex described between Roark and Dominique in **The Fountainhead**. "She kissed his hand. . . All at once he penetrated her: she did not exactly feel pleasure, but this violation of her most secret flesh made her gasp with gratitude and humility. She took every one of Denis' piercing thrusts with passionate submission. . . she felt the horror of such a humiliation so strongly that she began to tremble with desire and in a jet of passion she bit Denis' shoulder" (33). . . 'I'm his thing, his slave,' she murmured to herself. . . Abruptly he turned her on her belly and made her kneel. . . 'On all fours, like animals,' she thought. . . she was like one of those victims the executioners force to dance under the whip. 'He's enjoying me, he's enjoying me,' she said to herself in a paroxysm of sensual delight' (34).
23. See **Atlas Shrugged**, pg. 632, after hearing his story and determining that his is a man of good ability, Dagny Taggart offers Jeff Allen a job on her railroad.
24. Incidentally, in Irwin Shaw's novel, **Evening in Byzantium**, which is about the fleeting glory of a great movie screenwriter, a favorite word of Rand's, ego, is used a couple of times, "He had to smile a little at the youthful egotism of her first words to him. I, I, I" (330). . . "The ailing body devoted all its time to its ailment. Illness was the supreme egotism" (344). Furthermore, Shaw mentions Rand's mentor through her Hollywood years as a screenwriter, Cecil B. DeMille. "'I am immortal tonight,' he said. 'Move over for the new Cecil B. DeMille'"(293). Irwin Shaw's novel, **Rich Man, Poor Man**, (New York: Dell, 1969-70), shows the same type of juxtaposition between the aspiring and washed up Randian heroes as in **Evening in Byzantium**. Arnold, a hospitalized black soldier who spent the greatest moments of his life during WWII in Cornwall, England, says to Gretchen [an aspiring Randian hero], "If I ever saw a girl that was due to rise, it's you. You got a neat, promising style of handling yourself. Why, I bet half the boys in this building'd ask you to marry them on the spot, you gave them any encouragement. . . I had a girl in Cornwall for three months. . . The prettiest, most joyous, loving little girl a man could ever hope to see. She was married, but that made never no mind. Her husband was out in Africa somewhere since 1939. . . We went to pubs together and

she made me Sunday dinner when I got a pass and we made love like we was Adam and Eve in the Garden. . . I became a human being in Cornwall. . . It was a sorrowful day in that town when the orders came to move to fight the enemy. . . I wrote her a letter after I was hit. . . but I never got no answer. Maybe her husband come home. And from that day to this I never touched a woman” (**Rich Man, Poor Man** 26-29).

25. From Chris Sciabarra’s long list of authors whose works reference Rand or show related characters [note 4 above], Ayn Rand is referenced on pgs. 36, 77-78 of John Gardner’s **Mickelsson’s Ghosts**. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1982), pgs. 157, 172-173, 184, 189-191, 203, 213 of Don De Grazia’s **American Skin**. (New York, London, Toronto, Sydney, Singapore: Simon and Schuster, 1998) and pgs. 63-96, 172 of Tobias Wolff’s **Old School**. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2004). Even though Mary Gaitskill’s work satirizes Rand as “Anna Granite” and refers to her philosophy as “Definitism”, Rand is mentioned practically all throughout William F. Buckley’s **Getting It Right**. (Washington, D.C.: Regnery Publishing, 2003) and Mary Gaitskill’s **Two Girls, Fat and Thin**. (New York: Poseidon Press, 1991). Even though his work is fiction., in the novel, **Getting It Right**, William F. Buckley claims, “Not one word is attributed to any public declaration by [Ayn Rand] that wasn’t actually spoken or written by [her]. This is . . . so of Ayn Rand, respecting her thought and writing” (vii). In J. Neil Schulman’s **The Rainbow Cadenza**. (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1983), influence of Rand’s is not very hard to see. The setting descriptions are colorful and full of action, “She watched as they circled around her, a merry waltz of blue sparks and red. She watched as one of the red sparks quite suddenly turned bright gold. She watched as the other lights began dancing around the gold teasing it, then finally chased it away from the waltzes of red and blue, to dance alone (11). Rand’s political philosophy can be seen, “Laissez-faire was becoming the worldwide watchword in both economics and personal lifestyle. Even the Soviet Union found affluence easing its political grip. The problems of inflation, soaring taxation, energy shortage, unemployment, the destructive business cycle, and poverty itself began disappearing” (26). The ending is also optimistic, “It spoke of passage of the seasons, each one with a memory of the past and a promise of the future. . . And above all, she knew that she had fulfilled a promise she had made to herself. She knew that she had told the colors how to make a rainbow” (299). Furthermore, in Schulman’s acknowledgments, following the novel, he specifically mentions Rand as an influence, he says, “To Robert A. Heinlein, who is wrong about H.G. Wells being possibly the greatest science fiction writer of all time—you are, sir—and to C.S. Lewis, Ayn Rand, and J.D. Salinger, the other three logographers who taught me almost everything I know about my art” (303). Although similarities to the fiction of Rand are not as easy to see in Jeffrey Eugenides’ **Middlesex**. (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2002), traces of her passionate language, along with mythical and majestic names, such as “Desdemona, Tantalus, Homer and Aristotle Onassis” (50), can be seen. ““The water nymph tried to control herself. But the boy’s beauty was too much for her. Looking was not enough. Salmacis swam nearer and nearer. And then, overpowered by desire, she caught the boy from behind, wrapping her arms around him” . . . Hermaphroditus struggled to free himself from the tenacious grip of the water nymph, ladies and gentlemen. But Salmacis was too strong. So unbridled was her lust that the two became one. Their bodies fused, male into female, female into male. Behold the god Hermaphroditus!. . .”(**Middlesex** 491).

26. Stephen King, **Danse Macabre**. New York: Berkeley, 1982, pg. 280 cited in Douglas Fowler’s **Ira Levin**. Ed. Roger C. Schlobin. Mercer Island, WA: Starmont House, 1988, pg. 21.

27. In **Feminist Interpretations of Ayn Rand**. Edited by Mimi Reisel Gladstein and Chris Matthew Sciabarra, University Park: Penn State Press, 1999, see Barbara Grizzuti Harrison's "Psyching Out Ayn Rand," pgs. 67-76 and Melissa Jane Hardie's "Rereading Rand's Camp Feminist Aesthetics" in, pgs. 363-389 for more evidence of camp in Ayn Rand's fiction.

28. Bud Corliss is the antagonist of **A Kiss Before Dying** and Guy Woodhouse is the villain of **Rosemary's Baby**. Evidence of Guy Woodhouse having traits of the Randian hero, such as selfishness and egotism can be seen on pgs. 216-224 of **Rosemary's Baby**. When Rosemary is having the birth complications with her baby, Guy shows his lack of care and insensitivity by saying, "Don't go on fighting like this, Ro, please don't!". . . When they are told that Rosemary's baby dies, he says, "We can have others, honey, and we will, just as soon as you're better". . . Following this, about Rosemary and their future life together, he says, "Let's face it, darling. . . you had the pre-partum crazies. And now you're going to rest and get over them. . . I'm going to get some more good reviews and then we're going to blow this town and be in the beautiful hills of Beverly, with the pool and the spice garden and the whole schemer. . . Got to run now and get famous". In **A Kiss Before Dying**, evidence of Bud Corliss' selfishness egotism can be seen when he's persuading Dorothy to take the poisonous pills, he uses the good old fashioned Randian logic when he says, "There isn't one logical reason why you should refuse [to take the birth control/poison pills]. . . If you refuse to take them, Dorothy, you're being stubborn, unrealistic, and unfair. Unfair more to yourself than to me," (51). The antiheroes of both works manipulative force on the protagonist women, like Roark, who want to achieve greatness [or wealth] at all costs, will resort to brutality and even murder. Although Roark will only go as far as using brutality, he is no less selfish and egotistical than Levin's antiheroes.

29. Incidentally, the university in **A Kiss Before Dying** is named "Stoddard" like the "Stoddard Temple" in **The Fountainhead**. The movie of Rand's 1943 novel is mentioned in **Rosemary's Baby**, ". . . so Rosemary turned over and it was Saturday afternoon, and she and Brian and Eddie and Jean were at the candy counter in the Orpheum, going in to see Gary Cooper and Patricia Neal in **The Fountainhead**, only it was live, not a movie" (43). There's also a secondary character in **Rosemary's Baby** named Dominick, like Dominique in **The Fountainhead**.

CHAPTER 6

1. See Jack Cashill's article "Capitalism's Hidden Heroes," in **Fortune**, Feb. 18, 1985, pgs. 157-64. In this article, he also mentions Ayn Rand's Dagny Taggart among this group of ignored and distorted capitalist heroes. He says, "Consider the plight of Ayn Rand. In many a classroom one cannot mention her name without producing a chorus of soul-shriveling guffaws. I have never heard of a college reading list that includes her name. True, Rand's **Atlas Shrugged** is a little long and a little dreamy. But that isn't why a major political statement by a controversial female author is ignored by the literary establishment—and by the feminist establishment as well. Few successful women authors have generated as little literary criticism as Rand. . . Not only does Dagny have wild affairs all over the country, but she runs a major railroad. And is she tough. She could eat Bella Abzug for breakfast and be hungry again at lunch. Yet Dagny and her creator remain pariahs among literary feminists." Today, this trend mentioned by Cashill is steadily changing. In the two decades since Cashill's article in **Fortune** was published, Chris Matthew Sciabarra's **Ayn Rand: The Russian Radical** and **Feminist Interpretations of Ayn Rand** [Mimi Gladstein Reisel and Chris Matthew Sciabarra, eds.] and Douglas Den Uyl's **The**

Philosophic Thought of Ayn Rand are just a few of the increasing number of scholarly studies on Rand's work.

2. Leonard Lutwack's **Heroic Fiction: The Epic Tradition and American Novels of the Twentieth Century**, pg. 18, cited in John Rogers Cashill's, **The Capitalist as Hero in the American Novel**. (Doctoral Thesis: Purdue University, 1982), pg. 10.

3. See **The Fountainhead**, pg. 679 and **Anthem**, pg. 115 for Rand's references to the Mythical God Prometheus.

4. See **Atlas Shrugged**, pgs. 223-244. At a press conference, Dagny Taggart and Hank Rearden are showcasing the new Taggart train, the Comet, on a track made of Rearden Metal. Both capitalist heroes agree to risk their lives by being among the first people to ride on the train. As true capitalists, they are willing to prove the quality and safety of their products with their lives.

5. See **Atlas Shrugged**, pgs. 87-88 for an example of the Capitalist heroes at their happiest when working. It reads, "They [capitalist heroes Dagny and Hank when witnessing the creation of their cooperative deal] stood at the window, watching silently, intently. She did not speak, until another load of green-blue metal came moving across the sky . . . 'Hank, this is great./Yes.' She said, 'When I think of what that metal can do, what it will make possible. . . Hank, this is the most important thing happening in the world today, and none of them know it./We know it.'"

6. Page 100 of Henry Nash Smith's, "The Search For a Capitalist Hero: Businessmen in American Fiction," in Earl Cheit, ed., **The Business Establishment** (New York: Wiley, 1964) cited on pg. 301 of Jeff Walker's **The Ayn Rand Cult**.

7. Mike Donnigan is a 'common man' type of construction worker who befriends Howard Roark in **The Fountainhead**. Eddie Willers is a common man assistant to Dagny Taggart in **Atlas Shrugged**.

8. See Jeff Walker's **The Ayn Rand Cult**, pgs. 304-05.

9. Page 42 of Howard G. Baetzhold's **Mark Twain and John Bull: The British Connection**. Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 1970 cited on page 145 of James L. Johnson's **Mark Twain and the Limits of Power**.

10. Page 286 of **Selected Mark Twain-Howells Letters, 1872-1910** cited on pg. 146 of James L. Johnson's **Mark Twain and the Limits of Power**.

11. For more about Rand's interest in the French Revolution, refer to chapter 1 of this work.

12. Page 130 of Caroline Thomas Harnsberger's **Mark Twain, Family Man**. New York: The Citadel Press, 1960, cited on page 279 of Kent Kreuer's **The Literary Response to Science, Technology and Industrialism; Studies in the Thought of Hawthorne, Melville, Whitman and Twain**.

13. For evidence of Rand's dislike of democracy, see Chris Matthew Sciabarra's **Ayn Rand: The Russian Radical**, pg. 282.

14. Page 312 of Ralph Gardner's **Horatio Alger, or The American Hero Era**. Mendota, Illinois: Wayside Press, 1964 cited on pg. 61 of John Cashill's **The Capitalist as Hero in the American Novel**.

15. John Cashill. **The Capitalist as Hero in the American Novel**, pgs. 61-62.

16. Page 85 of **Atlas Shrugged** cited in pg.193 of Judith Wilt's article, "The Romances of Ayn Rand" in the book, **Feminist Interpretations of Ayn Rand**.

17. See page 33 of Michael S. Collins' article, "Between Robin Hood and Ayn Rand: High Capitalism in the 1950s" in **Michigan Quarterly Review** 42 (2). He refers to Rand's Robin Hood-like Capitalist hero when he says, "Fighting fire with fire a night or two before revealing himself to Rearden, Danneskjold destroys a factory run by one of the government's pet

industrialists, using long-range guns mounted on his ship as Robin Hood's men might use longbows. The pet industrialist in question was to have been given the formula for Rearden Metal—renamed “Miracle Metal” by the uncomprehending government—immediately after Rearden signed the gift certificate. Not yet ready for this sort of settling of scores, Rearden recoils when, in the course of their encounter, Danneskjold reveals his name. ‘Would you rather,’ Danneskjold asks, ‘I was a law abiding citizen. . . If so, which law should I abide by? Directive 10-289?. . . There are only two modes of living left to us today: to be a looter who robs disarmed victims or to be a victim who works for the benefit of his own despoilers. I did not choose either. . . I do not rob men who are tied and gagged, I do not demand that my victims help me, I do not tell them that I am acting for their own good. I stake my life in every encounter with men, and they have a chance to match their guns and their brains against mine in fair battle’”(Atlas Shrugged 538).

18. Page 111 of Jack London's **The Iron Heel** cited on page 183 of John Cashill's **The Capitalist as Hero in the American Novel**.

19. Page 5 of “Frank Norris' Weekly Letter,” **Chicago American**, June 8, 1901, cited on page 125 of Don Graham's **The Fiction of Frank Norris: The Aesthetic Context**. Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1978.

20. Frank Norris' “Zola as a Romantic Writer,” **The Wave**, June 27, 1896 cited on pg. 111 of Jennifer Boyd's **Frank Norris: Spatial Form and Narrative Time**. New York, San Francisco, etal: Peter Lang, 1993.

21. Frank Norris' “A Plea for Romantic Fiction,” **Boston Evening Transcript**, December 18, 1901. Reprinted in **The Complete Works of Frank Norris**, vol. VII (Garden City: Doubleday, Doran and Co., Inc., 1928) cited on page. 111 of Jennifer Boyd's **Frank Norris: Spatial Form and Narrative Time**.

22. Norris' “A Plea for Romantic Fiction,” cited on page 112 of Jennifer Boyd's **Frank Norris: Spatial Form and Narrative Time**.

23. Page 109 of Donald Pizer's **Realism and Naturalism in Nineteenth-Century American Literature**, Revised Edition. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1984, cited on page 112 of Jennifer Boyd's **Frank Norris: Spatial Form and Narrative Time**.

24. Page 84 of Franklin Walker's **Frank Norris: A Biography**. New York: Russell and Russell, 1932, cited on page 4 of Lawrence E. Hussman's **Hargingers of a Century: The Novels of Frank Norris**, New York, Washington, etal: Peter Lang, 1999.

25. See **The Romantic Manifesto** pgs. 23, 37, 103-116, 117-118, 120-125 for some of Rand's key discussions about Romanticism and Naturalism as opposing literary schools.

26. Frank Norris' essay, “Zola as a Romantic Writer.” **Wave**, 15 (June 27, 1896), p.3, reprinted in Donald Pizer's **The Literary Criticism of Frank Norris**. Austin: University of Texas Press. 1964, pgs. 71-2.

27. “Frank Norris' Weekly Letter” in **Chicago American**, August 3, 1901, p. 5, reprinted in Donald Pizer's **The Literary Criticism of Frank Norris**, pgs. 73-4.

28. Page 121 of Joseph McElrath's **Frank Norris Revisited**. New York: Twayne, 1992 cited on page 5 of Lawrence E. Hussman's **Harbingers of a Century: The Novels of Frank Norris**.

29. For evidence of Victor Hugo's influence on Rand, see Barbara Branden's **The Passion of Ayn Rand**, pgs. 24-25. Rand's major heroes seem to be influenced by either the rebellious and goal-oriented character Enjolras of Hugo's **Les Miserables** or a combination of Enjolras' goal-oriented rebellion along with the humanism of the protagonist, Jean ValJean.

30. See Kristin Robinson's article, "Ayn Rand's Objectivism: A Humanistic Interpretation." **The Humanist** (January/February) 1989, pg. 29, for more about humanism in Rand's fiction.
31. Page 107 of Joseph McElrath's **Frank Norris Revisited** cited on page 181 of Lawrence E. Hussman's **Harbingers of a Century: The Novels of Frank Norris**.
32. Henry James' **The American**, pg. 138 cited in pg. 212 in John Cashill's, **Capitalist as Hero in the American Novel**.
33. Page 264 of James' **The American** cited in pg. 212 of Cashill's **Capitalist as Hero in the American Novel**.
34. Just like Rand creates one excessive hero who wins her desires, Dominique, and one who loses, Gail, Gustave Flaubert does the same in **Madame Bovary**. The excessive heroine, Madame Bovary loses in her eternal struggles for fantasy desires and Monsieur Homais, succeeds. "Homais was blissfully happy. Although he was more intoxicated with luxury than with fine food and drink, the Pommard wine did go to his head a little, and when the rum omelet appeared he advanced a number of immoral theories about women. It was chic that captivated him more than anything else. He adored an elegantly dressed woman in a tastefully furnished room; and as for physical attributes, he was not averse to 'a pretty little morsel' (**Madame Bovary** 241). . . Since Bovary's death, three different doctors have tried to establish themselves in Yonville, but they have all been swiftly driven away by Monsieur Homais' vehement attacks. He now has more patients than the devil himself could handle. . . He has just been awarded the cross of the Legion of Honor" (**Madame Bovary** 302-03). Emma says to Rodolphe, the lover who breaks her heart, " 'How did you expect me to live without you? Once you've known happiness it's impossible to get used to not having it. I was desperate! I thought I was going to die! I'll tell you all about it, you'll see. . . And you—you stayed away from me!'" (**Madame Bovary** 268).
35. See where Julia refuses to marry Charles on pgs 340-341 of Evelyn Waugh's **Brideshead Revisited**. See also pgs. 296-97 of **Brideshead Revisited** where Charles' father puts cultural tradition and religion above his happiness and discourages his divorce with Celia for a shot at a happy marriage with Julia.
36. Stevens attaches the word 'professionalism' to almost every aspect of his life. He says, "Of course, if two members of staff happen to fall in love and decide to marry, it would be churlish to be apportioning blame; but what I find a major irritation are those persons—and housekeepers are particularly guilty here—who have no genuine commitment to their profession and who are essentially going from post to post looking for romance. This sort of person is a blight on good professionalism" (**Remains of the Day** 51). He also attaches it to the idea of personal dignity. "It is surely a professional responsibility for all of us to think deeply about these things so that each of us may better strive towards attaining 'dignity' for ourselves" (**Remains of the Day** 44). Of this idea, Brian W. Shaffer says, "Indeed, Stevens' journey is figured as an attempt to break out of the house, out of himself, and out of his physical and psychological routine—to overcome his amatory and political disengagement—in the guise of a 'pleasure' trip with business implications, the 'professional motive' of restaffing Darlington Hall" (82). Of Stevens' lack of experiences outside of Darlington Hall, Mr. Cardinal says to him, " ' . . . Today's world is too foul a place for fine and noble instincts. You've seen it yourself, haven't you, Stevens? The way they've manipulated something fine and noble. You've seen it yourself, haven't you? / [Stevens replies] "I'm sorry, sir, but I can't say I have'" (**Remains of the Day** 224). Of Ryder's lack of life experience, see pg. 332 of **Brideshead Revisited** where long lives of refinement to the family kingdoms are the tradition. It reads, "We live long in our family and

marry late. Seventy-three is no age. Aunt Julia, my father's aunt, lived to be eighty-eight, born and died here, never married. . . They dug to the foundations to carry the stone for the new house; the house was a century old when Aunt Julia was born." See also Donat O'Donnell's essay "The Pieties of Evelyn Waugh" in James F. Carens' **Critical Essays on Evelyn Waugh**. This essay gives evidence to the idea that Catholicism is the problem and solution to everything in the novel. O'Donnell states, "But his [Waugh's] almost idolatrous reverence for birth and wealth has not been destroyed by the Catholic faith; on the contrary **Brideshead Revisited** breathes from beginning to end a loving patience with mortal sin among the aristocracy and an un-Christian petulance towards the minor foibles of the middle class" (51-52). He goes on to say, "In Mr. Waugh's theology, the love of money is not only not the root of all evil, it is a preliminary form of the love of God. After the publication of **Brideshead Revisited** in America, a certain Mr. McClose, of Alexandria (Va.), wrote a postcard to Mr. Waugh, saying: 'Your Brideshead Revisited is a strange way to show that Catholicism is an answer to anything. Seems more like the kiss of Death to me'" (53).

37. Page 98 of Robert Hunt's "Science Fiction for the Age of Inflation: Rereading Atlas Shrugged in the 1980s". In **Coordinates: Placing Science Fiction and Fantasy**. Eds., George E. Slusser, Eric S. Rabkin, and Robert Scholes. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1984, cited on page 369 of Melissa Jane Hardie's "Rereading Rand's Camp Feminist Aesthetics" in **Feminist Interpretations of Ayn Rand**. Edited by Mimi Reisel Gladstein and Chris Matthew Sciabarra, University Park: Penn State Press, 1999.

38. For more information about how **The Fountainhead** is an epic portraying characters [Roark and Henry Cameron] and a contextual era of American history inspired by Louis Sullivan and Frank Lloyd Wright, the real life architectural innovators of the skyscraper, see Jeff Walker's **The Ayn Rand Cult**, pgs. 314-318, 322, Barbara Branden's **The Passion of Ayn Rand**, pgs. 140, 189-91, 208-09 and Merle Seacrest's **Frank Lloyd Wright**. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1992, pgs. 494-98, 510.

39. Christopher Lehmann-Haupt, "Book of the Times," New York Times, November 6, 1978 cited on page 88 of Arnold Beichman's **Herman Wouk: The Novelist as Social Historian**. New Brunswick and London: Transaction Books, 1984.

40. See pages 11-16 of Helen Taylor's **Scarlett's Women: Gone With the Wind and Its Female Fans**. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1989,

41. The setting of Rand's rape scene may have been fictionally inspired by **Gone With the Wind**. See page 134 of Barbara Branden's **The Passion of Ayn Rand**. It reads, "As she [Rand] and Frank were driving through Virginia on their way to New York for the production of *Night of January 16th*, she had happened to notice a chain gang of convicts working on a road under construction. A little later, she noticed an old and very beautiful Southern mansion, with graceful white columns and weathered, dark red brick walls, which had the air of a feudal castle. The two images suddenly united in her mind, and she had the essence of the quarry scene in *The Fountainhead*: Dominique, fragile, delicately austere, aristocratic, the chatelaine of the surrounding countryside, walks from her estate. . . to see Howard Roark, a nameless worker drilling granite under the broiling sun. . . looking up at her with a glance that is an act of ownership. That scene led Ayn to the famous 'rape scene,' in which Roark, his identity still unknown to Dominique, takes her sexually despite her violent, terrified struggle—a struggle which she wants only to lose."

42. The scene where Rhett carries Scarlett up the stairs to ravish her occurs on page 929 of **Gone With the Wind**. New York: Warner Books, 1936. It reads, "He swung her off her feet into his

arms and started up the stairs. Her head was crushed against his chest and she heard the hard hammering of his heart beneath her ears. He hurt her and she cried out, muffled, frightened. Up the stairs, he went in the utter darkness, up, up, and she was wild with fear. He was a mad stranger and this was a black darkness she did not know, darker than death. He was like death carrying her away in arms that hurt. She screamed, stifled against him and he stopped suddenly on the landing and, turning her swiftly in his arms, bent over and kissed her with a savagery and a completeness that wiped out everything from her mind but the dark into which she was sinking and the lips on hers. He was shaking, as though he stood in a strong wind, and his lips, traveling from her mouth downward to where the wrapper had fallen from her body, fell on her soft flesh. He was muttering things she did not hear, his lips were evoking feelings never felt before. She was darkness and he was darkness and there had never been anything before this time, only darkness and his lips upon her. She tried to speak and his mouth was over hers again. Suddenly she had a wild thrill such as she had never known; joy, fear, madness, excitement, surrender to arms that were too strong, lips too bruising, fate that moved too fast. For the first time in her life she had met someone, something stronger than she, someone she could neither bully nor break, someone who was bullying and breaking her. Somehow, her arms were around his neck and her lips trembling beneath his and they were going up, up into the darkness again, a darkness that was soft and swirling and all enveloping.” The rape scene in **The Fountainhead** occurs on pages 217-218.

CHAPTER 7

1. J. Hector St. John de Crevecoeur, 1782, cited on pg. 147 of Michael Novak’s **The Spirit of Democratic Capitalism** (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1982), on pg. 15 of Douglas Den Uyl’s **The Fountainhead: An American Novel**.
2. Dean Alfange’s “The American Creed,” cited on pgs. 15 –16 of Douglas Den Uyl’s **The Fountainhead: An American Novel**.
3. Sam Walton’s “Entrepreneur’s Creed” reads, “I do not choose to be a common man. It is my right to be uncommon—If I can, I seek opportunity—not security. I do not wish to be a kept citizen, humbled and dulled by having the state look after me. I want to take the calculated risk; to dream and to build, to fail and succeed. I refuse to barter incentive for a dole; I prefer the challenges of life to the guaranteed existence; the thrill of fulfillment to the stale calm of utopia. I will never cower before any master nor bend to any threat. It is my heritage to stand erect, proud and unafraid; to think and act for myself, to enjoy the benefit of my creations and to face the world boldly and say: ‘This, with God’s help, I have done.’ All this is what it means to be an entrepreneur.”
4. Cited from **Southpoint** Magazine, February 1990 on page 148 of Sam Walton’s **Made In America**. New York, Toronto, London, etal: Doubleday, 1992.
5. Kip Schlegel and David Weisburd, eds., **White-Collar Crime Reconsidered** (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1992) cited in Martin S. Fridson’s “Wall Street” in **Oliver Stone’s USA: Film, History, and Controversy**. Ed. Robert Brent Toplin. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, pg. 120.
6. “The 100 Most Memorable Movie Lines,” **Fort Worth Star-Telegram**, October 13, 1996, Arts sec,1. cited in Martin S. Fridson’s “Wall Street” In **Oliver Stone’s USA: Film, History, and Controversy**, pg. 120.

7. The speech by Rand's hero, Francisco D'Anconia, promoting a love for money, occurs on pgs. 387-391 of **Atlas Shrugged**.
8. David Edelstein. "Raiders of the Lost Market." **Village Voice**, December 15, 1987, cited on page 127 of Norman Kagan's **The Cinema of Oliver Stone**. New York: Continuum, 2000.
9. Sean French. "Breaking News." *Sight and Sound*, Spring 1988, p.136 cited on page 127 of Norman Kagan's **The Cinema of Oliver Stone**.
10. Gary Crowds. "Personal Struggles and Political Issues." **Cineaste** 16 (3), 1988 cited on page 129 of Norman Kagan's **The Cinema of Oliver Stone**.
11. Marc Cooper, "Oliver Stone: An Interview," *Playboy*, February 1988, pgs. 51-63 cited in Martin S. Fridson's "Wall Street" In **Oliver Stone's USA: Film, History, and Controversy**, pg. 132.
12. Oliver Stone, cited on pg. 231 of **Oliver Stone's USA: Film, History and Controversy**. Ed. Robert Brent Toplin. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press, 2000.
13. "Playboy Interview: Oliver Stone." **Playboy**, February 1980 cited on page 129 of Norman Kagan.
14. McCallum, J. and Kennedy, K. (1995) "Still the King". **Sports Illustrated**, 83, 23: 25 cited on page 46 of John Sugden's **Boxing and Society: An International Analysis**: Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1996.
15. Page 176 of Theodore Dreiser's **The Financier** cited on page 157 of John Cashill's **Capitalist as Hero in the American Novel**.
16. The Skull and Bones is a secret type of college fraternity [generally at the most elite schools] which includes only sons of the highest American social order. See pages 26, 28, 33, 35, 42, 44, 183, 184, 198, 202 and 206 of Kevin Phillips **American Dynasty**. New York: Viking, 2004, for a more in depth discussion about The Skull and Bones. An elite secret society on a college campus is also portrayed in the movie **The Skulls**. Dir. Rob Cohen. Perf. Joshua Jackson, Paul Walker, Hill Harper, Leslie Bibb. Universal Studios, 2000.
17. Page 152 of Debora Silverman's **Selling Culture**. New York: Pantheon, 1986, cited on pages 54-55 of Kevin Phillips **American Dynasty**.
18. "Family, Furs and Fun: Creating *Dynasty*," Commentary by **Dynasty** creators, Richard and Esther Shapiro, bonus footage included in **Dynasty: The Complete First Season**. (Volume Four-Episodes 11-13) Twentieth Century Fox DVD, 2005. Directed by Dwight Adair and Gwen Arner. Produced by Aaron Spelling. Joan Collins, John Forsythe, Linda Evans.
19. On page 63 of **The Fountainhead: An American Novel**, Douglas Den Uyl says, "There is no separate section of this novel devoted to Dominique. Instead, she pervaded them all. In many respects, Roark, Wynand, Toohey and Keating are like satellites around her."
20. Joan Collins in **Nine to Five**, July 16, 1984 cited on page 39 of Mark Finch's "Sex and Address in *Dynasty*" **Screen**. 27 (6) Nov.-Dec. 1986, pgs. 24-43.
21. In my desire to study Alexis Colby Carrington's character on **Dynasty**, after watching season one of the show, I discovered that her character doesn't appear until the beginning of season two [episode 14]. As stated in Mark Finch's article, Alexis makes an initial courtroom appearance, at the trial for Blake's alleged murder of his son's gay lover at the end of episode 13. Only season one of **Dynasty** is currently available for purchase or rental. However, I have seen Joan Collins as Fontaine in **The Bitch** (1979). The lead character holds true to her title. Fontaine is a conceited, excessive and power mad Randian type of anti-heroine. She owns a club of pleasure-seekers while playing sex games with playboys and money and power games with mobsters and rogue members of Britain's social elite. Although her character is lovable, it's hard to feel sorry

for her when she fails at the movie's end by losing the ownership of her club. If Alexis is similar to Fontaine, which all the source evidence I've found confirms this, she fits perfectly into the role of the Randian anti-heroine.

22. Page 78 of Robert Bryce's **Pipe Dreams**. New York: Public Affairs, 2002, cited on page 155 of Kevin Phillips' **American Dynasty**.

23. Enron: The Smartest Guys in the Room. Directed by Alex Gibney. Produced by Jason Kliot, Joana Vicente. Magnolia Pictures DVD Documentary. 2006.

24. Gail Wynand's offer to Peter Keating of an architecture commission for a date with his wife occurs on pgs. 440-442 of **The Fountainhead**.

25. This description of **National Lampoon's University Tycoon** PC game comes from its 'product description' page on **Half.com**, a sales internet version of **Ebay**. This webpage was referenced on June 8, 2006. **National Lampoon's University Tycoon**. PC Video Game. Activision Value, 2004. **Half.com**. **Ebay**. 1999-2006. June 8, 2006.

<http://product.half.ebay.com/_W0QQtgZdetailsQQprZ43924087>

26. Ivana Trump is Donald Trump's ex-wife. The source information and examples I give of Trump's life are all from the 1980s time period—during his early years as a casino tycoon. This time period, the 1980s, was an excessive one in American culture and more exiting and relevant than today, in terms of Donald Trump's iconic representation in American society.

WORKS CITED

- Airline Tycoon Evolutions**. PC Video Game. Strategy First 2002. Monte Cristo Games. Developed by Spellbound. Windows 98/Me/2000/XP, CD.
- Altman, Dennis. **Gore Vidal's America**. Malden, Massachusetts, Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2005, pgs. 131-32.
- Angier, Carole. **Jean Rhys**. Middlesex, England, New York: Penguin, 1985, pgs. 98-99.
- Aristotle. **Poetics**. Chicago: A Gateway Edition, Henry Regnery Company, 1961, pgs. 17, 49.
- Artzibashev, Michael. **Sanine**. New York. The Modern Library, 1931 (Originally Published 1907), pgs. 15-16, 336.
- Baker, Susan and Gibson, Curtis S. **Gore Vidal: A Critical Companion**. Westport, Connecticut, London: Greenwood Press, 1997, pgs. 148, 158.
- Barnes, Hazel E. "Egoistic Humanism: Ayn Rand's Objectivism." **An Existentialist Ethics**. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1967, pg. 125.
- _____. **The Literature of Possibility**. Lincoln, NE.: University of Nebraska Press, 1959, pg. 262.
- Barrett, William. **Irrational Man: A Study in Existential Philosophy**. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1958, pg. 123, 139-40.
- _____. **What Is Existentialism?** New York: Grove Press, 1964, pg. 99.
- Beichman, Arnold. **Herman Wouk: The Novelist as Social Historian**. New Brunswick and London: Transaction Books, 1984, pg. 88.
- Bell-Villada, Gene. "Who Was Ayn Rand?" **Salmagundi** (141/142) Winter/Spring 2004, pgs. 236-40.
- Bellamy, Edward. **Looking Backward**. New York. Penguin Books, 1982 (Originally Published 1888), pgs. 73, 87, 94-95, 115, 117, 155-56.
- Bewley, Marius. "Scott Fitzgerald's Criticism of America." in **F. Scott Fitzgerald: A Collection of Critical Essays**. Ed. Arthur Mizener. Englewood Cliffs, N.J. Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963, pgs. 125-141.
- Bishop, Lloyd. **The Romantic Hero and his Heirs in French Literature**. New York, Berne, Frankfurt on the Main, Nancy: Peter Lang Publishing, 1984, pgs.16-17, 142.
- Boyd, Brian. **Vladimir Nabokov: The American Years**, Princeton: Princeton University Press,

- 1991, pgs. 111, 115.
- Boyd, Jennifer. **Frank Norris: Spatial Form and Narrative Time**. New York, San Francisco, et al: Peter Lang, 1993, pgs. 111-112.
- Branden, Barbara, "Ayn Rand: The Reluctant Feminist." **Feminist Interpretations of Ayn Rand**. Edited by Mimi Reisel Gladstein and Chris Matthew Sciabarra, University Park: Penn State Press, 1999, pgs. 25-45.
- _____. **The Passion of Ayn Rand**. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., 1986, pgs. 45, 136,
- Branden, Barbara and Branden, Nathaniel. **Who Is Ayn Rand?** New York: Paperback Library, 1962.
- Branden, Nathaniel. "The Benefits and Hazards of the Philosophy of Ayn Rand." **Journal of Humanistic Psychology**, 24 (4) Fall 1984, pgs. 39-64.
- Bridgewater, Patrick. **Nietzsche in Anglosaxony**. Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1972, Pg. 171.
- Brombert, Victor. **The Intellectual Hero: Studies in the French Novel**. Philadelphia and New York: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1960, pg. 7.
- _____. "A novelist and his century." **Unesco Courier**. 38 (November 1985), pgs. 10-11.
- Brown, E.J. **Brave New World, 1984, We: An Essay on Anti-Utopia**. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Ardis, 1976, pg. 38.
- Buckman, Peter. **All For Love: A Study in soap opera**. London: Secker and Warburg, 1984, pg. 62.
- Burnham, James. **The Machiavellians: Defenders of Freedom**. Washington, DC: Regnery/Gateway, 1943, pgs. 61, 43, 44, 92, 98, 118, 119, 253, 277.
- Camus, Albert. "Ivan and Rebellion against God." **The Brothers Karamazov and the Critics**. Edited by Edward Wasiolek. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1967, pgs.73-78.
- _____. **The Rebel**. New York: Vintage Books, 1956, pgs. 22, 175
- _____. **The Stranger**. New York: Vintage Books, 1988 (Originally Published 1946), pgs. 41, 65, 100.
- Carson, Tom. "Lust and Greed: How Evil are They, Really?" **Village Voice** (11) Jan. 11, 1983,

p.59.

Cashill, Jack. "Capitalism's Hidden Heroes." **Fortune**. February 18, 1985, 157-58.

Cashill, John Rogers. **The Capitalist as Hero in the American Novel**. (Doctoral Thesis: Purdue University, 1982), pgs. 10, 41, 70-71, 157, 182-83, 212, 226, 253, 256.

Chamberlain, John. "The Businessman in Fiction" **Fortune**. 38 (November 1948), pgs. 134-148.

Chambers, Whittaker. "Big Sister Is Watching You." **National Review**, December 28, 1957, pgs. 594-96.

Charvet, P.E. "Volume IV: The Nineteenth Century" **A Literary History of France**. Ed. P.E. Charvet: New York/London: Barnes and Noble/ Ernest Been Limited, 1967, 274, 293, 303.

Chernyshevsky, Nikolai. **What Is to Be Done?** Ann Arbor, Michigan: Ardis Publishing, reprint of 1886 edition, 1986 (Originally Published 1862), pgs. 19, 126, 184, 198.

Clowes, Edith M. "Vulgarization of the Superman" **Nietzsche in Russia**. Edited by Bernice Glatzer Rosenthal. Princeton, N.J. Princeton University Press, 1986. pgs. 316, 317, 318, 319, 321, 322, 326, 328.

Cody, John. "Ayn Rand's Promethean Heroes." **Reason**, November (1973), pgs. 30-35.

Collins, Michael S. "Between Robin Hood and Ayn Rand. High Capitalism in the 1950's." **Michigan Quarterly Review**. 42 (2) Spring 2003, pgs. 324-45.

Cox, Stephen. "Ayn Rand: Theory Versus Creative Life." **The Journal of Libertarian Studies** (8) 1 (Winter 1986), pgs. 20, 21, 22, 24.

_____. "The Evolution of Ayn Rand." **Liberty** 11 (July 1998), pgs. 49-57.
<http://www.libertysoft.com/liberty/reviews/66cox.html>, June 8, 2005.

_____. "The Literary Achievement of **The Fountainhead**," in **The Fountainhead: A Fiftieth Anniversary Celebration** (Poughkeepsie, N.Y.: Institute for Objectivist Studies, 1993), pgs. 7, 9, 23.

Cruver, Brian. **Anatomy of Greed: The Unshredded Truth from an Enron Insider**. New York: Carroll and Graf Publishers, 2002, pgs. 342-43.

Curiel, Jonathan. "Time Well Spent: Martha Stewart Leaves Prison Richer, More Likeable and a Hotter Commodity Than When She Went In." **San Francisco Chronicle**. Friday, March 4, 2005. June 5, 2006

<<http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?file=/c/a/2005/03/04/MARTHA.TMP&nl=top>>

- Dallas: The Complete First and Second Seasons.** Dir. Robert Day, Irving J. Moore, et al. Produced by Leonard Katzman, Created by David Jacobs. Perf. Larry Hagman, Patrick Duffy, Victoria Principal, Linda Gray. Warner Brothers Home Video. DVD 2004 (Originally aired 1978).
- De Beauvoir, Simone. **All Men Are Mortal.** Cleveland and New York: The World Publishing Company, 1955, pgs. 5, 6, 10, 51, 93.
- _____. **The Blood of Others.** New York: Pantheon Books, 1945, pgs. 4, 13, 97.
- _____. **When Things of the Spirit Come First: Five Early Tales.** London: Andre Deutsch and Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1982, pgs. 20, 23-25, 45.
- Den Uyl, Douglas J. **The Fountainhead: An American Novel.** New York: Twayne Publishers, 1999, pgs. 14-16, 45, 59, 60, 64-66, 71-73.
- Denniston, Constance. "The American Romance-Parody: A Study of Heller's Catch-22." In **Critical Essays on Catch-22.** Ed. James Nagel. Encino, California and Belmont, California: Dickenson Publishing Co., 1974, pg. 70. (Essay Page #s)
- Devil's Advocate.** Dir. Taylor Hackford. Perf. Al Pacino, Keanu Reeves, Charlize Thieron, Jeffrey Jones. Warner Brothers, 1997.
- Dickey, James. **Deliverance.** New York: Laurel/Dell Publishing, 1970, pgs. 126, 134, 136-37.
- Dostoevsky, Fyodor. **The Brothers Karamazov .** New York, Toronto, London, etc: Bantam Books, 1970 [originally published 1880], pgs. 21, 50, 94, 281, 318, 766, 923,
- _____. **Notes From Underground.** New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1969 (Originally Published 1864), pgs. 47, 65.
- Dreiser, Theodore. **The Titan.** Cleveland and New York: The World Publishing Company, 1925 (Originally Published 1914), pgs. 1, 2, 27, 448, 471, 477, 479, 526-527, 531.
- Drozd, Andrew. **Chernyshevsky's What Is To Be Done? A Reevaluation.** Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 2001, p.101.
- Dynasty: The Complete First Season.** Dir. Dwight Adair, Gwen Arner. Producer. Aaron Spelling. Perf. Joan Collins, John Forsythe, Linda Evans. Twentieth Century Fox Television. (Originally aired 1981) DVD 2005.
- Ellison, Ralph. **Invisible Man.** New York: Vintage Books, 1952, pgs. 259-60, 560.
- Enron: The Smartest Guys in the Room.** Dir. Alex Gibney. Producers. Jason Kliot, Joana Vicente. Magnolia Pictures, DVD Documentary, 2006.

- Evans, M. Stanton. "The Gospel According to Ayn Rand." **National Review**. October 3, 1967, pgs. 1059-1063.
- Ferber, Edna. **Giant**. New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1952, pgs. 105, 234, 313, 349, 350, 379, 380, 381, 383, 447.
- Finch, Mark. "Sex and Address in *Dynasty*" **Screen**. 27 (6) Nov.-Dec. 1986, pgs. 24-43.
- Fitzgerald, F. Scott. **The Great Gatsby**. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1925, pg. 133.
- _____. **The Last Tycoon**. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1941, pgs. 17, 22, 25, 128, 146.
- Flaubert, Gustave. **Madame Bovary**. Toronto, New York, London: Bantam Books, 1959 (Originally Published 1857), pgs. 107, 140, 186, 194, 229, 244, 245, 271.
- Fleming, Ian. **You Only Live Twice**. New York: New American Library, 1964, pgs. 25, 194, 214-15.
- Foner, Philip S. **Jack London: American Rebel**. New York: The Citadel Press, 1947, pgs. 6,8, 103-104, 130.
- Ford, Ford Madox. **The Good Soldier**. New York: Vintage Books, 1951 (Originally Published 1927), pgs. 27, 257-58, 262.
- Forster, E.M. **Aspects of the Novel**. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1927, pgs.64, 83-88, 93-95.
- _____. "The Machine Stops" in **The Eternal Moment**. New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1928 (Originally Published 1909), pgs. 67, 84-85.
- _____. **Two Cheers for Democracy**. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1951, pgs. 61, 332, 335.
- Fowler, Douglas. **Reading Nabokov**. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1974, pgs.17-18, 55-56.
- _____. **Ira Levin [Starmont Reader's Guide 34]** Ed. Roger C. Schlobin. Mercer Island, WA: Starmont House, 1988, pgs. 36, 40, 49.
- Fridson, Martin S. "Wall Street" in **Oliver Stone's USA: Film, History, and Controversy**. Ed. Robert Brent Toplin. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, pg. 120.
- Fulford, Robert. "Who Speaks for Capitalism." **The Toronto Globe and Mail**. January 4, 1995.
- _____. "The Appalling Charm of *The Fountainhead*." **The Toronto Globe and Mail**.

January 17, 1996.

Gladstein, Mimi Reisel. "Ayn Rand and Feminism: An Unlikely Alliance." In **Feminist Interpretations of Ayn Rand**. Edited by Mimi Reisel Gladstein and Chris Matthew Sciabarra, University Park: Penn State Press, 1999, pgs. 47-55.

Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von. **Faust**. New York: Jonathan Cape and Harrison Smith, 1930 (Originally Published 1832), pgs. 137-38.

_____. **The Sorrows of Young Werther**. New York: Random House, 1971 (Originally published 1774), pg. 33.

Goodkind, Terry. **Faith of the Fallen**. New York: Tom Doherty Associates, 2000, pgs. 734-35, 739-40, 750, 785.

Gordon, Phillip. "The Extrojective Hero: A Look at Ayn Rand." **Journal of Popular Culture**. 10(4) Spring 1977, pgs. 701-710.

Gorky, Maxim. **Bystander**. (Part 1 of the tetralogy **The Life of Clim Samgin**) New York: The Literary Guild, 1930, pgs. 7, 12, 14, 27, 29, 41, 231.

Graham, Don. **The Fiction of Frank Norris: The Aesthetic Context**. Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1978, pg. 125.

Grant, Mary Kathryn. **The Tragic Vision of Joyce Carol Oates**. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1978, pgs. 29, 59, 119-120.

Grossman, Kathryn M. **Figuring Transcendence in Les Miserables: Hugo's Romantic Sublime**. Carbondale and Edwardsville, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press, 1994 pgs. 149, 152, 188, 196.

Hardie, Melissa Jane "Rereading Rand's Camp Feminist Aesthetics" in **Feminist Interpretations of Ayn Rand**. Edited by Mimi Reisel Gladstein and Chris Matthew Sciabarra, University Park: Penn State Press, 1999, pgs. 363-389.

Harpham, Geoffrey. "Jack London and the Tradition of Superman Socialism." **American Studies** 16 (1975), pgs. 23-33.

Harrison, Barbara Grizzuti. "Psyching Out Ayn Rand." **Feminist Interpretations of Ayn Rand**. Edited by Mimi Reisel Gladstein and Chris Matthew Sciabarra, University Park: Penn State Press, 1999, pgs. 67-76.

Hawley, Cameron. **Cash McCall**. Boston, Cambridge: Houghton Mifflin/The Riverside Press, 1955, pgs. 273, 408.

_____. **Executive Suite**. New York: Dell Publishing, 1952, pgs. 18, 19, 31, 68, 112, 312,

332.

Hegel, G.W.F. **The Phenomenology of Mind**. New York and Evanston: Harper and Row, 1967 (Originally published 1807), pg. 425.

_____. **Philosophy of Right**. London, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1952 (Originally Published 1821), pg.30.

Heller, Joseph. **Catch-22**. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1955, pgs. 46, 250-51, 417, 432-33.

Hemingway, Ernest. **The Sun Also Rises**. New York, London, Toronto, etal: Simon and Schuster, 1926, pg. 152.

Hesse, Hermann. **Demian**. New York: Harper and Row, 1965 (Originally published 1919), pgs. 33, 41, 43.

Hitchens, Christopher. **Why Orwell Matters**. New York: Basic Books, 2002, pgs. 104, 126.

Hoffman, Andrew Jay. **Twain's Heroes, Twain's Worlds**. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988, pgs. 83, 118, 125-26.

Hogan, James P. **Endgame Enigma**. Toronto, New York, London, Sydney, Auckland: Bantam Books, 1987, pgs. 24, 363, 395.

Hollis, Christopher. **A Study of George Orwell**. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1956, pgs. 92, 98-99, 100-01, 104-05, 107, 147.

Holzer, Erika. **Ayn Rand: My Fiction Writing Teacher**. Indio, CA: Madison Press, 2005, pgs. 15, 17, 31-32, 102-03, 112-13, 128, 148, 313.

_____. **Double Crossing**. New York: TOR/Tom Doherty Associates, 1985, pgs. 28, 29-30, 366-67, 377.

_____. **Eye for an Eye**. New York: TOR/Tom Doherty Associates, 1993, pgs. 130, 307, 308-09.

Hugo, Victor. **Les Miserables** (Abridged Edition: Abridged, Edited and an Introduction by Paul Benichou), New York: Washington Square Press, 1964 (Originally published 1862), pgs. 74, 113, 270.

_____. **Ninety-Three**. London, Edinburgh, Dublin, and New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1873, pgs. 61, 70, 97.

Hurm, Gerd. "Of Wolves and Lambs." in **Nietzsche in American Literature and Thought**. Edited by Manfred Putz, Columbia, SC: Camden House, 1995, pgs. 115-138.

- Hurst, Fannie. **Anywoman**. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1950, pgs. 12, 60, 64, 76, 309.
- Hussman, Lawrence E. **Harbingers of a Century: The Novels of Frank Norris**. New York, Washington, D.C., etal: Peter Lang, 1999, pgs. 4, 5, 170, 179, 181, 183.
- Huxley, Aldous. **Brave New World**. New York: Bantam Books, 1932.pgs. 40, 49-50, 112-113.
- Indecent Proposal**. Dir. Adrian Lynne. Perf. Woody Harrelson, Demi Moore, Robert Redford. Paramount Pictures, 1993.
- Ishiguro, Kazuo. **Remains of the Day**. New York: Vintage International, 1988, pgs. 44, 51, 239, 244.
- Ivins, Molly and Dubose, Lou. **Bushwacked: Life in George W. Bush's America**. New York: Random House, 2003, pgs. 189, 193, 195.
- James, Henry. **The American**. Boston, New York, Chicago, etal: Houghton Mifflin, 1877, pgs. 25, 27, 135, 439, 528.
- Jeffers, Thomas L. "Dostoevsky" **Commentary** 114 (1) July/August 2002, pgs. 63-66.
- Johnson, Barton D. "Nabokov, Ayn Rand, and Russian-American Literature or, the Odd Couple." **Cycnos** 12(2), 1995, pgs. 101-108.
- Johnson, James L. **Mark Twain and the Limits of Power**. Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1982, pgs. 145-46.
- Kagan, Norman. **The Cinema of Oliver Stone**. New York: Continuum, 2000, pgs. 113.
- Kant, Immanuel. **Critique of Judgment**., translated by James Creed Meredith.1790. 28 August, 2006<<http://philosophy.eserver.org/kant/critique-of-judgement.txt>>
- Knodel, Helen. **The Ticket Out**. New York, San Diego, London: Harcourt, Inc., 2003, pgs. 15, 46, 310.
- Kolker, Robert Phillip. **Bernardo Bertolucci**. London: BFI Publishing, 1985, pgs. 135, 138, 142.
- Koman, Victor. **Solomon's Knife**. New York, Toronto: Franklin Watts, 1989, pgs. 35, 41-42, 228, 246.
- Kress, Nancy. **Beggars in Spain**. New York: William Morrow and Company, 1993, pg. 24.
- Kreuter, Kent Kirby. **The Literary Response to Science, Technology and Industrialism; Studies in the Thought of Hawthorne, Melville, Whitman and Twain**. (Doctoral

- Thesis: University of Wisconsin, 1963), pg. 279.
- Last Tango in Paris.** Dir. Bernardo Bertolucci. Perf. Marlon Brando, Maria Schneider, Jean-Pierre Leaud. Metro Goldwin Mayer, 1973.
- Lawrence, D.H. "The Grand Inquisitor." **The Brothers Karamazov and the Critics.** Edited by Edward Wasiolek. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1967, pg.79.
- _____. **Women In Love.** New York, Toronto, London, etal.: Bantam Books, 1996 (Originally Published 1920), pgs. 193, 319, 527.
- Leer, Norman. **The Limited Hero in The Novels of Ford Madox Ford.** East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press, 1966, pgs. 70, 76, 81.
- Levin, Ira. **A Kiss Before Dying.** Pleasantville, New York: ImPress, 1981 [Originally Published 1953], pgs. 11, 26, 37, 59, 72-73, 77.
- _____. **Rosemary's Baby.** New York: Random House, 1967, pgs. 211, 227, 237, 244.
- Lewis, Barry. **Kazuo Ishiguro.** Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2000, pg. 100.
- Lewis, C.S. **Till We Have Faces.** New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1956, pgs. 66, 197, 198, 204, 247, 249, 250, 267.
- Lewis, R.W.B. **The American Adam: Innocence, Tragedy and Tradition in the Nineteenth Century.** Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1955, pgs. 197-98.
- Lewis, Sinclair. **Dodsworth.** New York: The Modern Library, 1929, pgs. 32, 33, 362, 376-77.
- London, Jack. **Burning Daylight.** New York: The Macmillan Company, 1910, pgs. 6,14, 20-21, 162-63.
- _____. **The Iron Heel.** New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1908, pgs. 6, 290, 351.
- _____. **Martin Eden in Jack London: Novels and Social Writings.** New York: The Library of America, 1982 (Originally Published 1909), pgs. 848-49.
- Lossky, N.O. "Ideal-Realism-parts 1 & 2" **Personalist.** (15) April (Spring 1934), pg.151.
- Machan, Tibor R. **Ayn Rand.** New York, Washington D.C., etal: Peter Lang Publishing, 1999, pg. 103, 110-111.
- Machiavelli, Niccolo. **The Prince.** Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005 (Originally Published 1532), pgs. 9, 10, 23, 61.

- Marqusee, Mike. **Redemption Song: Muhammad Ali and the Spirit of the Sixties**. London, New York: Verso, 1999, pgs. 265-66, 283-284.
- Martineau, Harriet. **Illustrations of Political Economy**. Peterborough, Ontario, Canada, Orchard Park, NY: Broadview Press, Ed. Deborah Anna Logan, 2004, pgs. 78, 79, 81, 82,
- Marx, Karl and Engels, Friedrich. **The Communist Manifesto**. London, New York: Penguin Books, 1967 (Originally Published 1848), pgs. 96, 99, 120-21.
- Mazzarella, Sharon. **Dynasty: U.S. Serial Melodrama**. Museum of Broadcast Communications, 2005. 6 June 2006. <<http://www.museum.tv/archives/etv/D/htmlD/dynasty/dynasty.htm>>
- McElroy, Wendy. "Looking Through a Paradigm Darkly." **Feminist Interpretations of Ayn Rand**. Edited by Mimi Reisel Gladstein and Chris Matthew Sciabarra, University Park: Penn State Press, 1999, pgs. 157-171.
- McGann, Kevin. "Ayn Rand in the Stockyard of the Spirit." In **The Modern American Novel and the Movies**. Eds. Gerald Peary and Roger Shatzkin. New York: Ungar, 1978, pgs. 325-335.
- Mencken, H.L. **Friedrich Nietzsche**. New Brunswick and London: Transaction Publishers, 1993 (Originally Published 1913), pgs. 197-98.
- Merrill, Ronald E. **The Ideas of Ayn Rand**. LaSalle, Illinois: Open Court Publishing, 1991, pgs. 22, 24, 26, 47, 52, 55, 68, 127.
- Meyers, Jeffrey. "George Orwell: the Honorary Proletarian." **Philological Quarterly** 48(4) October 1969, pgs. 526-549.
- Michalson, Karen. **Enemy Glory**. New York: Tom Doherty Associates, 2001, pgs. 14, 39, 359, 364.
- Michener, James. "The Company of Giants." in **Recasting Gone With the Wind in American Culture**. Ed. Darden Ashbury Pyron. Miami: University Presses of Florida, 1983, pgs. 69-71.
- Miles, Robert. "What Is a Romantic Novel?" **Novel** 34 (2) Spring 2001, pg. 180.
- Mill, John Stuart. **Utilitarianism**. New York: The Liberal Arts Press, 1948, (Originally published 1861), pg.7.
- Mitchell, Margaret. **Gone With the Wind**. New York: Warner Books, 1936, pgs. 928-29.
- Mizener, Arthur. "The Maturity of F. Scott Fitzgerald." in **F. Scott Fitzgerald: A Collection of Critical Essays**. Ed. Arthur Mizener. Englewood Cliffs, N.J. Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963, pg. 166. pgs. 157-168. (Also published in **The Sewanee Review** LXVII (Autumn 1959),

pp.658-675.

Mochulsky, Konstantin “Dostoevsky and The Brothers Karamazov” Introduction to Fyodor Dostoevsky’s **The Brothers Karamazov**. New York, Toronto, London, etc: Bantam Books, 1970 [originally published 1880], pg.xii.

Morrison, Toni. **Sula**. New York, Toronto, London: Bantam Books, 1973, pgs. 95, 124, 149.

_____. **Beloved**. New York: Penguin, 1987, pgs. 101, 241, 242.

Nabokov, Vladimir. **Lolita**, New York: Crest Books [Fawcett World Library], 1955, pgs. 11, 19, 20, 21, 22, 152, 255, 256.

_____. **Vladimir Nabokov: Strong Opinions**, New York, St. Louis: McGraw-Hill, 1973, pg. 148.

_____. **The Gift**. New York: G.P. Putnam’s Sons, 1963, pgs. 185-86.

Nachbar, Jack and Lause, Kevin. **Pop Culture: An Introductory Text**. Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green State University Popular Press, 1992, pgs. 316, 319.

Network. Dir. Sidney Lumet. Perf. Faye Dunaway, William Holden, Peter Finch, Robert Duvall. Metro Goldwin Mayer, 1976.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. **The Birth of Tragedy**. New York, London, Toronto, etal: Anchor Doubleday Books, 1956 (Originally published 1872), pgs. 34, 50, 131.

_____. “Joyful Wisdom.” **A Casebook on Existentialism**. Edited by William V. Spanos, New York: Thomas Crowell Company, 1966, pgs. 256-260.

_____. **Thus Spoke Zarathustra**. Baltimore, Md.: Penguin Books, 1969 (Originally Published 1885), pgs. 44, 173, 206, 299.

_____. **Twilight of the Idols and The Anti-Christ**. Baltimore, Md: Penguin Books, 1968 (Originally Published 1889), pgs. 87, 116-17, 118, 178.

Nordau, Max. **Degeneration**. New York. D. Appleton and Company, 1895, pgs. 426, 451, 470.

Norris, Frank.**The Pit**. New York: Curtis Publishing, 1902, pgs. 59, 271, 304.

Oates, Joyce Carol. **Do With Me What You Will**. New York: The Vanguard Press, 1973, pgs. 24-25, 53, 55, 525, 545, 557-59, 561.

O’Donnell, Donat. “The Pieties of Evelyn Waugh” in James F. Carens’ **Critical Essays on Evelyn Waugh**. Ed. James F. Carens. Boston: G.K. Hall and Co., 1987, pgs. 48-59.

O'Donnell, John. **Trumped**. New York, London, Toronto, etal: Simon and Schuster, 1991, pgs. 19, 23, 53.

Orwell, George. **Complete Novels of George Orwell. [Animal Farm/Burmese Days/A Clergyman's Daughter/ Coming Up for Air/ Keep the Aspидistra Flying/Nineteen Eighty-Four]**. London: Secker and Warburg/Octopus, 1976, pgs. 13, 15, 23, 25, 30, 31, 63, 66, 821, 859, 860, 863, 868, 899, 900, 916.

_____. **Down and Out in Paris and London**. San Diego, New York, London: Harcourt Brace and Company, 1933, pg. 213.

_____. **Homage to Catalonia**. San Diego, New York, London: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1952, pgs. 65, 103-104, 217.

_____. "James Burnham and the Managerial Revolution." **The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell**, Volume IV. Edited by Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus, New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc, 1968, pgs. 160-181.

_____. "Looking Back on the Spanish War." **The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell**, Volume II. Edited by Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus, New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc, 1968, pgs. 249-266.

_____. **"Shooting an Elephant."** New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1950, pg. 165.

Osborne, Richard. **Philosophy for Beginners**. New York: Writers and Readers Publishing, Inc, 1992, pg. 135.

Paglia, Camille. "Reflections on Ayn Rand." **Feminist Interpretations of Ayn Rand**. Edited by Mimi Reisel Gladstein and Chris Matthew Sciabarra, University Park: Penn State Press, 1999, pgs. 77-79.

Pasco, Allan H. **Sick Heroes: French Society and Literature in the Romantic Age, 1750-1850**. Exeter, Devon: University of Exeter Press, 1997, pgs. 9, 12, 89.

Paterson, Isabel. **The God of The Machine**. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, pgs. 153, 155.

Peckham, Morse. **Beyond the Tragic Vision**. New York: George Braziller, Inc., 1962, pg.87.

_____. **The Birth of Romanticism 1790-1815**. Greenwood, Fla.: Penkevill Publishing, 1986, pg.2.

Phillips, Kevin. **American Dynasty: Aristocracy, Fortune, and the Politics of Deceit in the House of Bush**. New York: Viking, 2004, pgs. 20, 27, 41, 53, 155.

Picart, Caroline Joan. **Resentment and the 'Feminine' in Nietzsche's Politico-Aesthetics**.

- University Park: Penn State University Press, 1999, pgs. 5-7, 25, 43, 45, 60, 134-37.
- Pierpont, Claudia Roth. **Passionate Minds: Women Rewriting the World**. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2000, pgs. 216-217, 220.
- Pizer, Donald. **The Novels of Theodore Dreiser**. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1976, pgs. 190-91.
- Potts, Stephen W. **Catch-22: Antiheroic Antinovel**. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1989, pg. 113.
- Ragen, Brian Abel. **Tom Wolfe: A Critical Companion**. Westport, Connecticut, London: Greenwood Press, 2002, pgs. 144, 148, 150.
- Ralieg, John Henry. "F. Scott Fitzgerald's The Great Gatsby" in **F. Scott Fitzgerald: A Collection of Critical Essays**. Ed. Arthur Mizener. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1963, pg. 101.
- Rand, Ayn. **Anthem**. New York: New American Library, 1946, pgs. 111, 118.
- _____. **The Art of Fiction**. New York: Penguin, 2000, pgs. 132-33.
- _____. **Atlas Shrugged**. New York: New American Library, 1957, pgs. 63, 88, 194, 224, 232, 351-52, 439-440, 451-452, 463-463, 614,615, 663, 742, 749, 792, 801-802, 863-65, 933, 940, 988, 1022, 1084.
- _____. **Capitalism: The Unknown Ideal**. New York: New American Library, 1967, pg. 21, 50.
- _____. **For The New Intellectual**, New York: New American Library, 1961, pgs. 22, 81-82, 183.
- _____. **Philosophy: Who Needs It**. New York: Signet. 1982, pg. 4.
- _____. **Return of the Primitive: The Anti-Industrial Revolution**. New York, London: Meridian, 1970, pg. 100.
- _____. **The Romantic Manifesto**. New York: New American Library, 2nd Rev. Edition, 1975, pgs. 25, 43, 61, 80, 85-86, 87, 110, 111, 121, 134, 138, 162, 167, 168, 169.
- _____. **The Fountainhead**. New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1943, pgs. 15, 16, 17, 26, 49, 104, 126, 127, 142, 143, 144, 176, 179, 207, 208, 218, 220, 240, 273, 279-281, 283, 336, 364, 376, 399, 406, 407, 408, 409, 415, 416, 422, 446, 447, 487, 488, 494, 499, 532, 534, 546, 564, 565, 581, 582, 604, 605, 606, 608, 609, 612-613, 620, 633-35, 637, 640, 642, 671, 680, 685, 687-88, 690, 692-693, 694, 695.
- _____. **The Virtue of Selfishness**. New York: New American Library, 1964, pgs. viii (intro),

23, 25, 27, 30, 34.

_____. **We The Living**. New York: Random House, 1959 (Originally Published 1936), pgs. 70-71.

Reuben, Shelly. **Tabula Rasa**. Orlando, Austin, New York, San Diego, Toronto, London: Harcourt, 2005, pgs. 10, 25, 28-29, 30, 36, 37, 243-44, 290.

Rhys, Jean. **Wide Sargasso Sea**. New York, London: W.W. Norton and Co. 1966, pgs. 172, 185, 187, 190.

Riggenback, Jeff. "The Disowned Children of Ayn Rand." **Reason**. December (1982), pgs. 57-59.

Robinson, Kristin. "Ayn Rand's Objectivism: A Humanistic Interpretation." **The Humanist** (January/February) 1989, pg. 29.

Rosenblatt, Roger. "The Rugged Individual Rides Again." **Time**. October 15, 1984, pg. 116.

Rosenthal, Bernice, Glatzer. **Nietzsche in Russia**. Edited by Bernice Glatzer Rosenthal. Princeton, N.J. Princeton University Press, 1986, pg. 36.

Salinger, J.D. **The Catcher in the Rye**. New York, Toronto, London, etal: Bantam Books, 1945 pg. 104.

_____. **Nine Stories**. Boston, Toronto, London: Little, Brown and Company, 1953, pgs. 14-15.

Sartre, Jean Paul. "Existentialism." **A Casebook on Existentialism**. Edited by William V. Spanos. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1966, pgs. 275-297.

_____. **The Reprieve**. New York: Vintage, 1947, pgs. 13-14, 363-64.

Schopp, Joseph C. "Cowperwood's Will to Power" in **Nietzsche in American Literature and Thought**. Edited by Manfred Putz, Columbia, SC: Camden House, 1995, pgs. 139-154.

Schug, Charles. **The Romantic Genesis of the Modern Novel**. Pittsburgh, Pa: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1979, pg. 58.

Sciabarra, Chris Matthew. **Ayn Rand: The Russian Radical**. University Park, Pa. Penn State Press, 1995, pgs. 4, 10, 103, 108, 110, 152-53, 282, 401note 36.

Shaffer, Brian. **Understanding Kazuo Ishiguro**. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1998, pg. 86.

Shaw, Irwin. **Evening in Byzantium**. New York: Dell Publishing, 1973, pgs. 310-312.

- _____. **Nightwork**. New York: Dell Publishing, 1975, pgs. 282, 304, 314.
- Sheaffer, Robert. "Rereading Rand on Gender in the Light of Paglia." **Feminist Interpretations of Ayn Rand**. Edited by Mimi Reisel Gladstein and Chris Matthew Sciabarra, University Park: Penn State Press, 1999, pgs. 299-317.
- Sheldon, Sidney. **Master of the Game**. New York: Warner Books, 1982, pgs. 20, 39, 56.
- Shelley, Mary. **Frankenstein: Or, the Modern Prometheus** (the 1818 text). Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1974, pgs. 48-49.
- Shestov, Lev. **Dostoevsky, Tolstoy and Nietzsche**. Ohio University Press, 1969, pgs.188-89.
- Silj, Alessandro, etal. **East of Dallas: The European Challenge to American Television**. London: BFI Publishing, pgs. 15-16.
- Smith, Barnett G. **Victor Hugo: His Life and Work**. London: Ward and Downey, 1885, 49-50.
- Smith, Henry Nash. "The Search For a Capitalist Hero: Businessmen in American Fiction," in Earl Cheit, ed., **The Business Establishment** (New York: Wiley, 1964), pgs. 79, 87-88, 90, 98, 99, 110, 111.
- Smith, Kay Nolte. **Catching Fire**. New York: Coward, McCann and Geoghegan, 1982, pgs. 9, 263-64.
- _____. **Country of the Heart**. New York: Villard Books, 1987, 27, 54.
- _____. **The Watcher**. New York: Coward, McCann and Geoghegan, 1980, 15-16, 289.
- Smith, Kenneth J. "Ayn Rand: Objectivism or Existentialism." **Religious Humanism**. 4 (Winter 1970), pgs. 23-28.
- Smith, L. Neil. **Henry Martyn**. New York: Tom Doherty Associates, 1989, pgs. 23, 388, 401, 404, 437.
- Smith, Tim. "Don's King for a Day in Atlantic City." **New York Daily News**. Sports Final Edition, March 14, 2006, pg. 84.
- Spender, Stephen. "The World of Evelyn Waugh." In **Critical Essays on Evelyn Waugh**. Ed. James F. Carens. Boston: G.K. Hall and Co., 1987, pgs. 59-71.
- Spillane, Mickey. **I, The Jury**. New York: New American Library, 1947, pgs. 11, 30, 167, 168-70, 174.
- Steinbeck, John. **In Dubious Battle**. New York, Toronto, London: Bantam Books, 1936, pgs.

206, 242.

_____. **The Leader of the People in The Norton Anthology of American Literature** (Third Edition: Volume Two) New York, London: W.W. Norton and Co. 1979, 1985, 1989, pgs. 1745-1756. (Also published in Steinbeck's short story collection—**The Long Valley**).

Stockton, Sharon. "Hoover, Rand, Pound, and the Heroic Architect." **American Literature**, 72 (4) December 2000, pgs. 813-841.

Stuckey, W.J. **The Pulitzer Prize Novels: A Critical Backward Look**. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1981, pg. 159.

Styron, William. **Sophie's Choice**. New York: Random House, 1976, 1978, 1979, pgs. 42, 47, 499-500, 515.

Sugden, John. **Boxing and Society: An International Analysis**. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1996, pgs. 45-47.

Swartz, Mimi. **Power Failure: the Inside Story of the Collapse of Enron**. New York, London, etal: Doubleday, 2003, pgs. 32, 35, 36, 246.

Taylor, Helen. **Scarlett's Women: Gone With the Wind and Its Female Fans**. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1989, pgs. 12, 96, 106.

Telford, Kenneth A. "Aristotle's Poetics: Translation and Analysis." **Poetics**. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, A Gateway Edition, pg. 93.

The Betsy. Dir. Daniel Petrie. Perf. Laurence Olivier, Robert Duvall, Tommy Lee Jones, Lesley-Anne Down. Warner Brothers, 1978.

Thiele, Leslie Paul. **Friedrich Nietzsche and the Politics of the Soul**. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1990, pg. 37.

Tolstoy, Leo. **War and Peace** (edited and abridged by Manuel Komroff). New York, Toronto, London: Bantam Books, 1956, pgs. 240, 261, 262.

_____. **What Is Art?** London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1898, pgs. 123, 148, 201.

Tonetti, Claretta Micheletti. **Bertolucci: The Cinema of Ambiguity**. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1995, pgs. 128, 130-32, 134-35.

Torres, Louis and Kamhi, Michelle Marder. **What Art Is: The Esthetic Theory of Ayn Rand**. Chicago and LaSalle, Illinois: Open Court Publishing, 2000, p.16, 63-64.

- Trump, Donald. **Trump: Surviving at the Top**. New York: Random House, 1990, 152, 156, 162, 213, 221, 227.
- Tuccille, Jerome. **It Usually Begins With Ayn Rand**. New York: Stein and Day Publishers, 1971, pg. 16.
- Twain, Mark. **A Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur's Court**. New York and London: Harper and Brothers, 1917 (Originally published 1889), pgs. 5, 61, 77.
- Vickery, Walter N. **The Cult of Optimism: Political and Ideological Problems of Recent Soviet Literature**. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1963, 118-119.
- Vidal, Gore. **Myra Breckinridge**. London, Toronto, New York: Bantam Books, 1968, pgs. 17, 51-52, 69, 74, 195, 209, 276-77.
- Walker, Jeff. **The Ayn Rand Cult**. Chicago and La Salle, Illinois: Open Court, 1999, pgs. 125, 271, 275-277, 316, 323, 327, 328, 345.
- Wall Street**. Dir. Oliver Stone. Perf. Charlie Sheen, Michael Douglas, Daryl Hannah, Martin Sheen. Twentieth Century Fox, 2000.
- Walton, Sam. **Made in America: My Story**. New York, Toronto, London, etal: Doubleday, 1992, pgs. 144, 147-48.
- Waugh, Evelyn. **Brideshead Revisited**. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1944-45, pgs. 26, 39.
- Webster's New World Dictionary, Second College Edition**. Simon and Schuster. 1980.
- Wells, H.G. **The New Machiavelli**. New York: Duffield and Company, 1930, pgs. 61, 279-80.
- Wilde, Oscar. **The Soul of Man Under Socialism**. London and West Nyack, NY: Journeyman, 1988 (Originally Published 1891), pgs. 1, 4, 12, 13, 22, 25, 28.
- Wilshire, Bruce. **Romanticism and Evolution**. Lanham, New York, London: University Press of America, 1985, pgs. 15, 41, 288.
- Wilt, Judith. "The Romances of Ayn Rand." **Feminist Interpretations of Ayn Rand**. Edited by Mimi Reisel Gladstein and Chris Matthew Sciabarra, University Park: Penn State Press, 1999, pgs. 173-198.
- Wolfe, Tom. **The Bonfire of the Vanities**. New York, Toronto, London, Sydney, Auckland: Bantam Books, 1987, pgs. 686-89, 690.
- Woodcock, George. **The Crystal Spirit: A Study of George Orwell**. Minerva Press, 1966, pgs. 58, 220.

Wouk, Herman. **The Caine Mutiny**. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Co., 1951, pgs. 36, 37, 219, 340, 481, 485-86, 498.

_____. **War and Remembrance**. Boston, Toronto: Little, Brown and Co., 1978, pgs. 10, 80, 106, 951, 1039.

Wright, Richard. **Native Son**. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1940, pgs. 69, 392.

_____. **Uncle Tom's Children**. New York, Hagerstown, San Francisco, London: Harper and Row Publishers, 1940, pg. 180.

Zamyatin, Yevgeny. **We**. New York: The Viking Press, 1972 (Originally Published 1924), pgs. 64, 160, 184, 197.

Zwerdling, Alex. **Orwell and the Left**. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1974, pgs. 5, 20.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

A lifelong native of Tallahassee, Florida, Robert Powell earned a B.S. Degree in Newspaper Journalism at Florida A&M University and a M.S. Degree in English Education at Florida State University. He was honorably discharged from the United States Marine Corps Reserve after a six year enlistment. As a graduate doctoral student at Florida State University, Robert is an English instructor on the college level.