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Abstract: F. Scott Fitzgerald (1896-1940) wrote five novels in his career. In his novels money and love appear as pivotal issues that dominate essential areas, with profound significance. This study attempts to locate the agenda and analyze them in considerable dimension to draw the thesis that money invariably over-rules love in the American life. However, the two issues namely money and love are inseparable phenomena and the one ruinously dominates over the other.
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Introduction
For the sake of convenient management of the paper, it has been divided into two parts: Part I takes up the first two novels This Side of Paradise (1920), and The Beautiful and Damned (1922) and Part II follows the last two books The Great Gatsby (1925), and Tender is the Night (1935). The Last Tycoon (1940) that F. Scott Fitzgerald’s early friend and critic Edmund Wilson gives the finished shape after the author’s death, has however not been considered under this study. It is seen that love and money operate as perennial opponent forces in the novels which establish the point that money is a more potential strength than love whatever be its depth and dimension. All the Fitzgerald heroes fall puppet-like creatures in the hand of their heroines, who invariably operate as ‘femme fatale’ in the capitalistic society of America.

All the novels of F. Scott Fitzgerald are artistically fictionalized versions of many of his biographical matters that emulate to become superb literary products. The love affairs and money matters are also heavily drawn on his personal life situations albeit the impact of his personal life is not the subject of search; rather they have deeper literary and aesthetic magnitude. The love affairs between Amory Blaine and Rosalind, besides others in This Side of Paradise, that between Anthony and Gloria in The Beautiful and Damned, that between Gatsby and Daisy in The Great Gatsby, and that of Dick Diver
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and Nicole in *Tender is the Night* are greatly drawn on the realities in the life of their creator. We are more interested to estimate how F. Scott Fitzgerald maneuvers his fictional techniques to present the imbalance between money and love in his novels.

The thrust for money is an incipient matter in the life of F. Scott Fitzgerald, who was born in a family founded on the fortune donated by his grandmother McQuillan. From the novelist’s biography we learn that his grandmother inherited a sum of $40,000 from her husband, with which the early education of F. Scott Fitzgerald was started at Newman Academy in Boston. Thus the novelist finds that the mother enjoys a superior position over the father and plays authoritative command over him. There had been a social change of shift of family affairs where the family management was taken over by the mothers from the fathers’ hand. This female authoritative rule over the male characters was popularly called “Momism”. The impact of the change is there in the first two novels. With a special reference to *This Side of Paradise* Thomas J. Stavola records: “Reflecting this profound social change, Fitzgerald’s portrait of Amory’s father Stephen Blaine is sparse. . . . Both father and son are victims of ‘Momism’. Stephen has abdicated his position of authority and strength within the family in favour of his aggressive wife Beatrice.”

In the early part of his life the novelist realizes the value of money in life. From his biography and relevant documents obtained through many critical studies, we learn that the novelist was in need of money, especially after his father’s death. The family, as recoded by Malcolm Cowley, “. . . had some social standing and a very small fortune inherited by the mother. The fortune kept diminishing year by year, and the Fitzgeralds, like all families in their situation, had to think a lot about money.” . . . “When the only son was eleven they were living in Buffalo, where the father was working for Procter and Gamble. Malcolm Cowley further records: “One afternoon,” Fitzgerald told a reporter thirty years later, “. . . the phone rang and my mother answered it. I didn’t understand what she said, but I felt that disaster had come to us. My mother, a little while before, had given me a quarter to go swimming. I gave the money back to her. I knew something terrible had happened and I thought she couldn’t spare the money now. . . . A little later my father came home. I had been right. He had lost his job.” Besides, we know that F. Scott Fitzgerald borrowed money from his classmates and
relatives; and he took advances from his publishers. He “became a writer, to begin with, because of the prestige and the money he thought the life might bring to him. . . ”3 These are the personal experiences and impressions of life that are the raw materials for the novelist.

Stephen Blaine is subjugated by Beatrice Blaine (in This Side of Paradise) and Mr. Gilbert is governed and controlled by Mrs. Gilbert (in The Beautiful and Damned) and similar relation exists between Nicole and Dick (in Tender is the Night) and Daisy and Gatsby operate in similar style (in The Great Gatsby).

We find a recurrent pattern dictating the career of all the Fitzgerald heroes that they aspire for two things, money and love and devote their sincere efforts to meet their inevitable catastrophes. Amory Blaine in This Side of Paradise, at an embryonic stage, Anthony Patch in The Beautiful and Damned, at a little mature form, Dick Diver in Tender is the Night, in full maturity, and Jay Gatsby in The Great Gatsby follow this pattern. Of course, the case of Anthony Patch in the second novel is slightly different since he wins Gloria (his dream girl) as wife but fails to attain financial success for normal social standing. Pointing to this perennial failure of the heroes, William Troy calls F. Scott Fitzgerald “the authority of failure” that refers to a profound significance about the novelist and his works. Only for the sake of justified relevance we may note in this context that the case of Monroe Stahr in The Last Tycoon is also the same.

All the Fitzgerald protagonists suffer deplorable discomfitures after chasing their dreams. They fail to achieve full control over their situations; apparently because they are the denizens of the ‘acquisitive society’ of America, where money and only money plays the supreme command over life, where a man is measured only in terms of money and material success. Referring to this essential feature Thomas J. Stavola observes: “. . . in America there is no identity without money, the commodity that guarantees social recognition and love.”4 Commenting on the prevalent social patterns, with special consideration of money and love, William Fahey observes a more pithy but more pin-pointed opinion: He says, “It is a world filled with trivial pleasures and gaudy baubles, a society whose only bond is the cash nexus.”5

Part I

The agenda of love and money as integral ingredients appear in the fiction of F. Scott Fitzgerald, ‘a literary giant’ of the Jazz Age. The novelist captures the zeitgeist of the Jazz America and a little beyond and fictionalizes its spirit
in esthetic flare that makes him one of the greatest novelists in the American literary canon. Money and love appear with full potential, right from his first novel *This Side of Paradise*. Indeed, there is hardly any other novelist presenting the tales of the time the credit of which F. Scott Fitzgerald claims. As quoted by Rose Adrienne Gallo (in “An Affair of Youth” in the book F. Scott Fitzgerald: p 16), the novelist says to Edmund Wilson: “. . . I really believe that no one else could have written so searchingly the story of the youth of our generation.”

Although *This Side of Paradise* is considered ‘a sentimental chronicle’ of the Jazz generation, still there is a profound thematic thrust oriented to love and money. Here Amory Blaine, the protagonist gathers his experience of the serious things that money and love tell so significantly upon his life. His experience is the outcome of his social life during the period from 1912 to 1925, covering his early student career at St. Regis’ in Connecticut and Princeton. Amory gets his financial experience from his birth and build-up in a middle-class family, where the father is a figure of meager importance the reason of which is that the financial foundation of Amory’s family is constructed by the money brought into by his maternal side. In the novels we see that the women are richer, belonging to a higher social level than their men. So Beatrice Blaine, Amory’s mother plays an authoritative role over Mr. Stephen Blaine “... an ineffectual, inarticulate man with a taste for Byron and a habit of drowsing over the Encyclopaedia Britannica. . .” Beatrice’s pride and strength rest on her money; she further prides on her education she receives at the “Sacred Heart” in Europe that only the exceptionally wealthy American families could provide. Her supercilious attitude based on money is exposed in many parts of the novel. Out of her Euro-mania, she desperately plans to send Amory “abroad”, meaning Europe, for education. Some parallel situation occurs in *The Beautiful and Damned*, where Anthony Patch’s grand-father Adam Patch gets the family fortune from his wife Alicia Withers, whom he marries only on the consideration of money. In the text we read: “... Adam Patch had married an anaemic lady of thirty, Alicia Withers, who brought him one hundred thousand million dollars and an impeccable entré into the banking circles of New York.” This imbalanced relation between the husband and the wife is essentially related to the financial position of the parties involved.

Amory Blaine’s experience of love is the staple dish of *This Side of Paradise* in which the issue of money is also involved though it does not occupy the surface. He falls in love with at least three girls: first with Myra St. Claire,
then with Eleanor Savage and finally with Rosalind (in Princeton), who proves to be his most passionate affair, whose refusal puts him into a tremendous catastrophe. The effect of the love affair with the other girls like Myra St. Claire, Marylyn De Witt, Isabelle Borge (in Minneapolis), Eleanor Savage (in Ramilly), Clara Page (in Philadelphia), cannot shatter him. With Myra St. Claire, for instance, Amory has only an elementary exercise of love that starts and ends with just a kiss; Myra is a girl of thirteen years. But with Marylyn De Witt he develops a little grown-up stage of love in which he shares his aesthetic sensibilities by expressing his soul through composition of poetry that embodies his refined love without any consummation.

But, in case of Isabelle Borge, Amory is rather a passive prey in the hand of the precocious girl. After capturing Amory into her hand “Isabelle resolved secretly that she would, if necessary, force herself to like him.” However, the transitory affair takes a deteriorating course soon.

His next course of events open with another girl named Eleanor Savage. His affair with her shows that she has an obvious drive of wild sexuality (that justifies the second part of her name “savage”); then Amory is virtually a dwarfish character for her. They establish their abrupt bond on sharing of poetry and finer literary taste, but Amory’s passion for poetry does not match well with that of Eleanor; her love for poetry appears only ‘skin-deep’: her principal motive is sex-adventure for which Amory is picked. Amory is still fresh and fine; no indecent sentiment deludes him. He does not get into any blameworthy mentality; nor does he attempt any objectionable gesture on any girl, not even on Eleanor Savage despite her recurrent wild provocation. Amory does not indulge in any sexual love: it is all a teen-ager’s passion for a romantic company Amory craves for and avails from these teen-age girls. But certainly his case with Rosalind is a deeper and more mature chapter, the climax of his love-affair. He develops the love for Rosalind up to the level that entangles the question of his existence. And consequently, he suffers extremely as he is declined by Rosalind and her family. Amory starts floating around like a figure of real moral discomfiture enhanced by overdrinking.

While commenting on this part, Professor Thomas J. Stavola appropriately writes, “A new Isabelle appears, called Rosalind, ‘a sort of vampire’, who childishly treats men terribly yet still possesses an ‘endless faith in the inexhaustibility of romance’. (171) Clearly a realist very much addicted to the security and luxuries money can buy, she is fundamentally egocentric and without depth no matter what kind of lyrical phrases Fitzgerald uses to describe and glorify her.”
Rosalind, who has already been mixing with a number of lads like Howard Gillespie, Amory faces the critical situations, and fails to settle his marriage with her only because he does not have money. What Rosalind does with Amory is not a true love but a temporary romance: she prefers to marry Dawson Ryder because he is blessed with opulent money. Mrs. Connage (Rosalind’s mother) once says: “Her (Rosalind’s = I bracket)) father has marshalled eight bachelor millionaires to meet her.” Not only that, she earnestly tries to convince Rosalind, saying: “. . . You’ve already wasted over two months on a theoretical genius who hasn’t a penny to his name, but go ahead, waste your life on him. I won’t interfere.” For, she finds it useless on the daughter’s part to waste time on unbefitting lads; she must target the right fellow for marriage. So she argues Rosalind about Dawson Ryder “. . . I like him, he is floating in money . . .”

Rosalind’s refusal to marry Amory is a token of social reality of the time: the daughters of most of families are keen to choose their bridegrooms only on the scale of money because that is the ultimate security for them. This is what Professor Thomas J. Stavola observes in his evaluation. He rightly points out that “Dawson Ryder is more valuable and necessary to her than romance.” It is, therefore assumable that Dawson Ryder is also a case (like others) simply of marriage in the social eye that would guarantee the comfort and security in her personal and social life. Her affair does not essentially bud and bloom on love itself; she opts for him because he is “valuable and necessary” since he is “floating in money”. All the love cases of Fitzgerald heroines are similar: they all make romance with their heroes and secretly crave for financial security: human values are of little importance. To them, love is a hoax and a trap, a futile game since it is deeply attached with the question of money.

From a newspaper, to his utter shock, Amory learns: “Mr. and Mrs. Leland R. Connage are announcing the engagement of their daughter, Rosalind, to Mr. J. Dawson Ryder, of Hartford, Connecticut….” The catastrophic refusal crushes him altogether. Then it appears ludicrous and futile as Rosalind spuriously puts forward: “Amory, I’m yours – you know it. There have been times in the last month. I’d have been completely yours if you’d said so. But I can’t marry you and ruin both our lives.” But she behaves on a selfish ground; Amory’s ruinous fate hardly concerns her. For, she further hedonistically adds: “. . . I like sunshine and pretty things and cheerfulness – and I dread responsibility. I don’t want to think about pots and kitchens and brooms. I want to worry whether my legs will get slick and brown, when I
“swim in the summer.” This exposes her real motive. Our experience asserts that there cannot be any true love without commitment of duties and responsibilities. Rosalind’s love is only a make-shift game of passion devoid of the noble virtues of responsibilities, care and commitment: genuine love naturally entangles mutual responsibilities and duties. But Rosalind exposes herself as what in terms of the novelist is “a siren”, a “flapper” in the Jazz America. In the frustration there operates the twisted bundle of love and money that shows only a case of one-sided affair, a case of hunting for a wealthy bridegroom.

The question of money has been of so profound significance that Amory realizes in his bones that poverty is a curse: His perception is such because he falls in great financial crises after his father’s death. “For the first time he came into actual cognizance of the family finances, and realized what a tidy fortune had once been under his father’s management.” In the part entitled “FINANCIAL” of the book, we learn about the investment of the family money: ‘the bonds of the rail-road and street car companies’. Amory realizes the gradual decline of the family finance that plunges the family into a deep darkness of poverty. So he declares: “I detest poor people . . . I hate them for being poor. . . It’s the ugliest thing in the world. It’s essentially cleaner to be corrupt and rich than it is to be innocent and poor.” His gloom is further intensified as he comes to learn that his mother bequeaths half of her money to the church. Being trapped into poverty he considers that communism is the “panacea” contrary to the Capitalistic system. Amory argues with the Big Man (Mr. Ferrenby): “This is the first time in my life I’ve argued Socialism. . . I’m sick of a system where the richest man gets the most beautiful girl if he wants her, where the artist without an income has to sell his talents to a button manufacturer. . .”

In the last phase of the novel (p 276 - 277) there is an imaginary dialogue, an interior monologue, between the divided souls of Amory, where an interesting and insightful debate is staged on the theme of money. Through the development of the philosophy (of Communism) Amory is further illuminated in the humorous debate between himself and Mr. Ferrenby, providing a historical significance. For, the agenda of the dialogue is Communism for resolving the economic disparity that Amory experiences. However, the dialogue ends up in an undecided point: he fails to establish any political postulate for Mr. Ferrenby in favor of Communism.

Amory also finds that the corruptive money acts not only on love, it also works on politics. Ideal democracy is not in practice in his America: the
Congressmen buy their votes by the scanty fraction of a dollar and thereby corrupt the character of politics. Out of frustration he cries out: “. . . For two cents the voter buys his politics, prejudices, and philosophy. . . .”

We find a subtle hint of love and its associative element in the names of Amory Blaine and his mother Beatrice Blaine, which is relevant in this context. Amory shows his amorous character and his mother Beatrice goes none the less. Her old affair with Monsignor Darcy is not a trifling reference.

Beatrice’s amorous nature can be understood from the fact that she is not happy with Stephen Blaine: rather she is more dedicated to Monsignor Darcy, her ex-lover. She has not forgotten him even today, after so many years of her married life. She is morally attached to Darcy’s love; she passionately complains to Amory: “. . . I am not understood, Amory. I know that can’t express it to you, Amory, but – I am not understood.” Her ambivalent complaint indicates that she is not happy with Stephen but could be happier with Monsignor Darcy. Her unwavering commitment to Darcy as a lover is further revealed when she expresses her plan to send Amory to Darcy so that the boy might be shaped by Darcy on his moral and intellectual model. The love between Beatrice and Darcy occupies no considerable part; it is sparsely alluded in the text, but the lost love is not dead altogether; it still burns both Beatrice and Darcy. For, Darcy takes up Amory’s charge in a manner as though he were playing the father’s role for the boy. The irony is that Darcy overpampers the boy to lead to the complete ruin: he encourages Amory with indolence, avarice for and negligence to academic activities, smoking and what not. On the first day of their introduction Darcy says: “My dear boy, I’ve been waiting to see you for years. Take a big chair . . . have a cigarette – I’m sure you smoke. Well, if you’re like me, you loathe all science and mathematics –” Not only that, he instigates Amory to visit Clara Page, his cousin in Philadelphia, where Amory falls in a ‘wild love’ of the widow. Darcy deliberately forces young Amory to go to Philadelphia; it might be Darcy’s vicarious pleasure to see that Amory would get involved with a physical love with Clara. An intelligent reader may infer the motive hidden in his letter: “Do you know . . . that your third cousin, Clara Page, widowed six month and very poor, is living in Philadelphia? . . . but I wish . . . you’d go to see her. To my mind, she’s rather a remarkable woman, and just about your age.” In a subtle irony the novelist divulges Darcy’s ill-motive as he mentions Clara’s age and widowhood. The letter is a tool for alluring the young adult Amory; Darcy tickles his un-budding sexuality, the incipient process of Amory’s moral ruin.
In *The Beautiful and Damned* love and money recur in a twisting fashion. Here money dominates in the surface level, obviously in the life of Anthony and Gloria. Money (lack of it) is the only obstacle on Anthony’s way to win Gloria. Her parents are against their marriage because Anthony is not wealthy. For a long time the couple follows the money-line that tells upon their relation. Financially inferior Anthony struggles to win his love and marry Gloria despite tremendous opposition of her parents. Their conjugal life is spoiled by money: Anthony is forced to get into litigation with his grandfather Adam Patch who deprives him of his legacy by a deed of will. Though in the last event Anthony wins the case and the money, but it is then too late: all his potential is already exhausted and Gloria also loses her youth and vigor and their life turns an empty process to start afresh.

Anthony and Gloria jointly struggle to achieve financial solvency by working hard: Anthony works at an advertising firm in New York and Gloria tries to embark on a film career that was pretty lucrative; it was a trend of the time that prospective girls tried to follow film career. Mrs. Gilbert’s only concern is to get the daughter “settled” in her life with a moneyed boy. Then “...Anthony appears to be victim of a corrupt and money-dominated world which has rejected the values of the past. . .”

Anthony’s experience of love with Gloria is not altogether a happy one: Gloria does not have any unquestionable commitment; rather she is influenced by her parents. Once she says: “I am a solid block of ice.” She proves to be stone-hard, without wise judgment of things. She, like her mother, is a mundane girl who considers money to be the ultimate value that displays only an outer glow. So Anthony’s bloody situation teaches him that the wheel of life does not move forward without the fuel named money. Reading Anthony’s situation, Professor Thomas J. Stavola appropriately observes that “Money becomes for Anthony one of two larger forces in American society; the other being the romance of infinite possibility which draws his divided self into identification with a greater whole and thereby establishes a sense of identity.”

In both the two cases it shows that the failures of the heroes are the product of their dream-girls hailing from richer families, who use their love only as their toys, and play a cruel game. And it is money that ruins love.

**Part II**
When we take up the cases of *The Great Gatsby* and *Tender is the Night* we get into an enormous study of money and love. Love and money are the
central issues of these two books, where F. Scott Fitzgerald expresses his serious attitude, especially towards money. The novels present robust love stories that follow the courses leading to ultimate ruin of the heroes. In these novels these two issues operate in obvious measure, so vivid and so apparent that it is hard to miss. Interestingly the one is inseparably entangled with the other: they need not and cannot be discussed in isolation.

In *The Great Gatsby* the pivotal case of love is between Jay Gatsby and Daisy Buchanan. In addition, there are two love cases: love between Tom and Myrtle, and that between Nick Carraway, the narrator and Jordan Baker, the tennis girl. Money plays a crucial role in the first two cases. Gatsby fails to marry Daisy only because he is poor, and Tom advances his love with his mistress Myrtle because he plays the power of money on her. Of course, the case of Nick and Jordan Baker stands apart since that does not follow any constructive line, neither in maturity nor in consummation. Nick cannot advance with her as he feels “She was incurably dishonest.”

The buried love of Gatsby is exhumed when the story opens and we see that Gatsby’s love for Daisy is in multiplied flare and bears the same intensity as of the old. He comes across innumerable girls in his social life and at parties at his Rack Rent but never stretches his hand towards any of them since he is committed to Daisy. He is neither a lewd nor a lecher. He is more earnest to retrieve his lost past and rebuild his utopian castle of love. He builds the huge castle Rack-Rent and amasses enormous wealth, buys the hydroplane and meticulously provides all the amazing luxuries into his castle that lacks nothing, meant for the prevalent aristocracy, just only to display for Daisy and “repeat” his past with her. He devotes to earn more and more money only because he realizes that he cannot win Daisy without enormous money: Daisy is the money incarnate. Nick tells: “Her voice is full of money” and “. . . It was full of money – that was the inexhaustible charm that rose and fell in it, the jingle of it, the cymbals’ song of it . . . high in a white palace the king’s daughter, the golden girl . . .”

Caught in stagnancy, Daisy-obsessed Gatsby never segregates her from his mind; she is still the goddess who invisibly guides and dictates all the drives for material success. He is an ever-devoted worshipper of the goddess, whom he is determined to conquer albeit she proves unattainable. He is determined to prove that Daisy is his only life, the prime target to achieve. He constantly desires to be in Daisy’s vicinity: Jordan rightly says, “Gatsby bought that house so that Daisy would be just across the bay.” And at a later time Gatsby meaningfully appeals to Daisy, “You always have a green light that
burns all night at the end of your dock.”

for him the ‘green light’ implies Daisy’s love, the ‘dock’, Daisy herself and the ‘night’ refers to the darkness in which his life is plunged. An idealist romantic lover Gatsby is constantly worried and anxious about what happens to Daisy.

We cannot miss Gatsby’s sentiment as he almost buries Daisy under the enormous collection of shirts in his bed chamber; because once in the past he did not have any “regular clothes” to wear; he used to wear the military uniform. Now he boastfully declares to Daisy and enjoys an ego-satisfaction: “I’ve got a man in England who buys me clothes. He sends over a selection of things at the beginning of each season, spring and fall.”

In the hotel-episode in New York (Hotel Plaza), where Gatsby, Nick, Daisy, Tom and Baker go on an excursion provides evidence to Gatsby’s love for Daisy. Tom teases Gatsby in various fashions that amount to a brutal insult. In utter patience he tolerates all the insulting attacks, certainly because he never wants to hurt Daisy, in any way in any degree. Tom subtly alludes to his mysterious source of money: what he means is that Gatsby is engaged in bootlegging, an illegal means of income, meaning Gatsby belongs to the dark world and thus humiliate him in front of Daisy. Once he (Tom) categorically tells Nick: “A lot of these newly rich people are just big bootleggers, you know.”

But in the last event, in a scathing term Gatsby cracks out to Tom: “Your wife doesn’t love you . . . she never loved you. She loves me.”

Although it reveals his unpolished tongue, yet in another scale it exhibits his unquestionable love for Daisy, his “five years of unwavering devotion.” The love-battle between the two heroes is staged in this episode, which is deeply rooted with money.

After killing Myrtle under Gatsby’s yellow car (driven by Daisy), we see how intensely he suffers the anguish: he spends a considerable length of night outside Daisy’s house, only to watch if Tom would attempt any torture on her after returning from New York trip. To him any torture on Daisy means a direct torment to his essential self. After Myrtle’s death Gatsby could evade the situation, but he does not do so; rather he takes the responsibility on his shoulder and does not hide or run away, which is all for Daisy’s sake. As a matter of fact he dies by Wilson’s bullet the root cause of which is Daisy. But Daisy is just the opposite in nature. Her stone-cold nature can be testified by the fact that she expresses not even the least concern after Gatsby dies: she remains absolutely untouched, unmoved, unconcerned and perfectly well composed; she does not attend his funeral or shed a single drop of tears, nor sends “a message or a flower”. Rather she (and Tom) “. . . retreated back into
their money or their vast carelessness. . .

A few days after Gatsby’s death Nick meets Tom on a street, shakes hand with him and notices Tom’s perfect indifference and unconcerned mode. Then Nick laments the money-dominated moral psychology of his fellow Americans: “. . . Then he went into the jewelry store to buy a pearl necklace – or perhaps only a pair of cuff buttons – rid of my provincial squeamishness forever.”

Gatsby’s love for Daisy has an essential sublime move, whereas that of Tom for Myrtle follows a downward drive; one is decent but the other is mean by moral and philosophical standard: For, Myrtle is nothing more than a virtual whore whose physical and sexual pleasure he purchases by money.

Daisy is a coquette; she shows no concern or care for Gatsby; maintains stone-cold attitude towards him and pays very little value and honor to his love, though she accepts his invitation for tea at Rack-Rent and goes on the excursion to New York City. Her love is empty of virtue. But Gatsby’s love is romantic and noble: one is a romantic human soul enriched with the divine property of love and the other a robotic entity operating on the surface of futile passion for money. Daisy never pronounces any commitment. She acts like an ameba that keeps on changing its shape and form or a chameleon that changes its color every now and then. Having well set with Tom and her baby, Daisy starts flirting with Gatsby with no definite purpose: without concealing her real sentiment, she declares to Gatsby, in presence of Tom: “I love you now – isn’t that enough? I can’t help what’s past . . . I did love him once – but I loved you too.”

Daisy plays a modern American Cressida, thoroughly unpredictable a character that spoils her man altogether. Considering this coquettish aspect her character, Professor J.F. Callahan comments that covers the question of both money and love: “Daisy yields to Tom, not for love, but because he, not Jay Gatsby, is proprietor over stability and wealth.”

Certainly The Great Gatsby deals with money that happens about the protagonist Jay Gatsby: the earning and the lavish spending of it pervade the book. His ‘huge castle’ Rack-Rent, hydroplane, yellow Rolls Royce, all the pompous articles inside the castle, his spacious lawn, the swimming pool, and the grandiose parties attended by the remarkable elites – all these manifest an enormous exhibition of money. His life is dedicated to the altar of money lacking which he cannot upgrade him to an elite class by the prevalent American standard. Matthew J. Brucchi rightly comments: “An essential aspect of the American-ness and historicity of The Great Gatsby is that it is about money.”
We know that “... it was from Dan Cody that he inherited money – a legacy of twenty-five thousand dollars.”\textsuperscript{13} But it is not enough for Gatsby because his limit is the sky in reaching which Dan Cody triggers his imagination. Dan Cody, who picks him “from the gutters”, acts as the philosopher and guide to Gatsby and plays Gatsby’s career architect, though initially uses him as his business tool. He himself discovers the money-route from ‘the Nevada silver fields’ the ‘rush for metal’, and “Montana copper that makes him many times a millionaire.”\textsuperscript{14} At Dan Cody’s instruction, Gatsby operates bootlegging for his sole mission is to win Daisy, along with social eminence. Not only bootlegging, he also operates some illegal trades that he names “side line” business in drug stores. That is what Tom, out of resentment, disdainfully and rhetorically attacks Gatsby with, to stab him dumb: “I’ve heard of making a garage out of a stable... but I’m the first man who ever made a stable out of a garage.”\textsuperscript{15}

Gatsby’s sky-kissing material ambition is presented not only in the physical wealth in his possession, but it comes to light in greater scale when, after his death, Mr. Henry C. Gatz, his old father appears to attend the funeral rites. With a taste of irony we listen to what he tearfully narrates, “Jimmy always liked it better down East. He rose up to his position in the East... He had a big future before him, you know. He was only a young man but had a lot of brain power. ... If he’d of lived he’d of been a great man. A man like James J. Hill. He’d of helped build up the country.”\textsuperscript{16} We know that James J. Hill (1838-1916) was a railway tycoon, the dream-figure Gatsby’s father visualizes his son to become.

The money-hunt, albeit suspiciously involves Gatsby with “underground pipe-line to Canada” turns the prime: he did not live in any particular house, he lived on a boat “that looked like a house and was moved secretly up and down the Long Island shore.”\textsuperscript{17} In one occasion Nick reports: “I went with them out to the veranda. On the green Sound, stagnant in the heat, one small sail crawled slowly toward fresher sea.” Nick curiously notices that “Gatsby’s eyes followed it momentarily; he raised his hand and pointed across the bay.”\textsuperscript{18} This is ample evidence that Gatsby is involved in dealing contrabands and taboo commodities. His finger-signal to the vessels in his bay supports his active participation in such affairs. F. Scott Fitzgerald shows that Gatsby is the product of the time of America: he is not self-made, he is the creation of the money-based social culture that the nation had had. It has once been told that money is the prime dish of The Great Gatsby. The money-centered world and the details of its hidden activities presented in the
novel are so true that this single novel could have been enough for F. Scott Fitzgerald’s immortal place in the history of American fiction: the novelist says that he was “nothing” without *The Great Gatsby*. In Gatsby’s world of money-hunters there are big shots like Dan Cody, Wolfshiem and Clipspringer; even Ella Kaye through her role completes the cycle. The novel reveals that the money-hunt belongs to the Gatsby-community, the un-aristocratic class whom the critics call “nouveau riche” the neo-aristocrat, the upstart. Thus Gatsby earns the notorious titles like “a boorish”, “a rough-neck”, “a neo-Faustian” character against the old aristocrats epitomized by Tom Buchanan that is on decline in the face of the newly emerging moneyed class with a veneering of neo-aristocracy. F. Scott Fitzgerald presents the encounter between the “nouveau riche” and the declining old American aristocracy in *The Great Gatsby* as Theodore Dreiser does in his great novel *An American Tragedy* that comes out in the same year, 1925 (the publication-year of *The Great Gatsby*).

Gatsby is money-obsessed as he is Daisy-obsessed: for him both the two are indispensable. Considering the value of money, he also allures Nick to earn more money by following some business of “bonds or insurance or automobiles” or some “side line”, though he (Nick) is already engaged in bond-selling. He says, “Well, this would interest you. It wouldn’t take up much of your time and you might pick up a nice bit of money. It happens to be a rather confidential sort of thing.” It is the financial boom in America that puts the young adults, (the Gatsby-class) on a dynamic thrust. Both Gatsby and Nick rush into the East, to New York as New York is the magnetic allure for the Americans: it was a time “of automatic social evolution”, the magical power of which is money that the post-war young generation realizes the best. “Things were getting better each year: more grain was reaped, more iron was smelted, more rails were laid, more profits earned, more records broken, as new cities were founded and all cities grew, as the country grew, as the world apparently grew in wealth. . . .”

We bear in mind, in this context, that the financial boom that America was experiencing during the time is the undying aftermath of the American Industrialization and the immediate impact of the World War I. And, the codes and creeds were hidden in the seeds of aspiration for money in the Declaration of Independence by great Thomas Jefferson that provides the essential strength for the young generation. The newly emerging moneyed class represented by Gatsby makes inordinate and sometimes preposterous adventures to “get rich quick”. This boom time is the era that F. Scott
Fitzgerald snaps in his books. Nick’s honest efforts in earning money by bond-selling and not by following the ‘side-line’ testifies that honest morality did not yet die in the society; everybody is not a Gatsby; Nick appears Gatsby’s counter. The Jazz American social milieu reminds us of the English Victorian money culture that we find in the novels, for instance, of Charles Dickens, who criticizes the nexus culture for measuring the worth of a “gentleman” in the Victorian English mercantile society.

Gatsby’s sense of the time and culture is vindicated by Professor M.J. Bruccoli, as he maintains, “Even when the sentiments are genuine, they are formulated in monetary terms. Gatsby’s love for Daisy is an intense and worked-out variety of that which lovers of all ages have felt; its expression is distinctively that of post-war America, of a society that consumes. . . in The Great Gatsby the relationship between love and money has been suggested but not enlarged” : the novelist presents (as remarked by M.J. Bruccoli) “. . . money as a code for expressing emotions and identity.”

Again we may consider the valuable observation by Professor Matthew J. Bruccoli in this context. While considering the importance of love and money, he maintains: “One characteristic of popular American fiction is the implicit separation of love and money. Possession of one does not lead to possession of the other.”

We also notice the cynical character of money reflected through the money-mongers Dan Cody, Wolfsheim and Clipspringer, the gang-masters of Gatsby’s circle. They are not only Gatsby’s business associates, but his close companions: Clipspringer is a co-resident, a ‘boarder’ in Gatsby’s Rack-Rent as well. But after Gatsby’s death they selfishly disappear from the spot and hide for their safety, leaving the castle a desolate place where “the party was over” (188). None of them attend his funeral when the whole responsibility is undertaken by Nick single-handed. At Nick’s request Meyer Wolfshiem puts forward his philosophical reply, “Let us learn to show our friendship for a man when he is alive and not after he is dead. . . After that my own rule is to let everything alone.” His argument further shocks the reader as he says, “When a man gets killed I never like to get mixed up in it in any way. I keep out. . .” On the telephonic conversation with Klipspringer, Nick receives a reply that dumbsfound the reader and fills with bitter contempt: “What I called up about was a pair of shoes I left there. I wonder if it’d be too much trouble to have the butler send them on. You see they’re tennis shoes and I’m sort of helpless without them. My address is care of B. F. –”
Thus the quintessence of *The Great Gatsby* asserts that the brutality of money is the root cause of Gatsby’s doom, in which the mirage of love of Daisy – the “vulgar and meretricious beauty” that works as the prime catalyst.

Now let us look into *Tender is the Night*, an enormous novel of epic theme on money and love. There are a number of cases of love along with the central subject of Nicole and Dick Diver. Here the matter of love and money appear in overt fashion delineated on a mammoth scale. Dr. Dick Diver’s double-ended love with Nicole Diver (first his patient and then his wife) and Rosemary Hoyt develops the central plot. Dick’s love for Nicole is a case of slow and un-spontaneous progress that dwindles on the mid-way, because it progresses primarily through his professional commitment, but his love for Rosemary, which is an extra-marital affair, starts out of romantic sensibility. The second is a case of love at first sight that knows no law, which cares for no social or moral conventions. The Rosemary-case is a meteoric experience of shock for Dick, but it possesses the lustrous vigor that Nicole-case lacks.

In analyzing the theme of love in this novel we need to estimate the dimension and essential properties of love between Dick and Nicole and Dick and Rosemary, and further the nature of love of these three characters: their mutual care, concern and commitment. Nicole is a psychiatric patient under the medical care of Dr. Dick Diver; she is not quite a normal human being, gravely disordered in the neurological level, albeit not totally imbalanced or insane. So normal human behavior may or may not be expected of her. But it is Dick’s professional responsibility to provide the loving care for her cure that Dick is assigned to perform. Her nervous crack takes place as a result of incest by her father Mr. Devereux Warren causing her profound phobia for men. Dr. Dick’s duty is to dispel that phobia and normalize her mental order. His dedicated care charged with his innate love for Nicole develops one of the love plots. But his love with Rosemary grows like an independent sub-plot to form a love triangle in *Tender is the Night*.

A great part of *Tender is the Night* deals with money that dominates the prime nerves of the plots, in which the novelist’s attitude towards money surfaces. The story snaps the life of all the moneyed expatriates in France, where they are on pleasure trips. They are in a picnic tempo, even Rosemary, who goes to Riviera on a film shooting trip, falls into the picnic flare. Her love with Dick Diver is only a matter of side track affair, a selfish and whimsical romanticism. The emptiness of her love for Dick comes to light at a later stage.
Rosemary’s falling in love with Dick is only a crafty game that she and her mother strategically stage. Dick first falls in a fix: in one side there is Nicole, his wife and on the other side Rosemary his extramarital love, though his passion for Rosemary goes with fresh vigor. As for Rosemary, in her mother’s lap afterwards Rosemary cried and cried. “I love him, Mother. I’m desperately in love with him - I never knew I could feel that way about anybody. And he’s married . . . it’s just helpless. Oh, I love him so!” And in reply the mother (Mrs. Speers) assures: “If you’re in love it ought to make you happy . . .” since all she wants is to see her daughter happy. Once Rosemary confesses to Dick: “. . . I told you I fell in love with you the first time I saw you.”

Despite some progress on the way of their love, while Dick is sincere and flamboyant, it dies under the restrictions imposed by Mrs. Speers. She is virtually the fate-designer of the daughter, a passive toy in her mother’s hand: Rosemary tells, “My mother. She decides business matters. I couldn’t do without her.” A sort of Mammon, Mrs. Speers manipulates the daughter only as a tool for money. To the mother love counts no value: she sternly cautions Rosemary, “You are brought up to work – not specially to marry. . . Wound yourself or him – whatever happens it can’t spoil you because economically you’re a boy, not a girl.” It is not easy for Rosemary to step forward since she is aware of “her mother’s middle-class mind, associated with her attitude about money.”

It is really “helpless” since Dick is pulled more forcefully towards his duties to Nicole than towards Rosemary. Later he finds that Rosemary is playing just a fraudulent game of love. Her falsehood comes to clear light to bring the catastrophe, when Dick gets a report from Collis Clay: he tells that Rosemary was traveling with Bill Hillis, by a train from New York to Chicago, and he hears Bill Hillis asking Rosemary, “Do you mind if I pull down the curtain?” to which she says, “Please do. It’s too light in here.” By playfully quoting to Rosemary “Do you mind if I pull down the curtain?” Dick catches up her guilty conscience who gets startled and fumbles for the proper reply. Dick felt a change taking place within him. Only the image of a third person, even a vanished one, entering into his relation with Rosemary was needed to throw him off his balance and send through him waves of pain, miseries, desperation.

Defrauded Dick hardens himself with a conviction that Rosemary is a traitor, a fraud to whom he should not donate his soul. Rosemary’s repeated declarations like “I fell in
love with you the first time I saw you.”

Dick cannot compromise. He not only loses faith in her but adopts a deep disdain towards her: he considers that he did not tell her anything “. . . to imply that she possessed any part of him.”

His speculation keeps on repeating: “Not only are you beautiful but you are somehow on the grand scale. Everything you do, like pretending to be in love or pretending to be shy gets across.”

In a number of occasions, we read that Dick kisses Rosemary ‘without enjoying’ them: they are just dull and pale kisses. But Rosemary’s burning sexuality is well demonstrated when we read: “Oh, no, now. I want you to do it now. Take me, show me. I’m absolutely yours and I want to be.”

Flirtatious Rosemary offers herself to a number of men from Hollywood down to French Riviera that Dick comes to discover at no bleak suspicion but for definite certainty.

Dick’s is a love without sex while Rosemary’s is a sex without love and hence it does not develop any fruitful course. Her (Rosemary’s) fraudulence ruins Dick’s initial love that could mould a happier course for him. After realizing the swindling character of Rosemary and her mother’s strategic operation, Dick concludes to abandon them for good.

The triangular love of Rosemary, Dick Diver and Nicole is the pivotal issue in Tender is the Night. And the essential fact of the love-case is that none of the three is committed to the other: Rosemary proves false and Nicole conceitedly false. The balance of the love-war has so subtly been maneuvered that it makes Tender is the Night a great love tragedy. Dick is delicately divided between the two: his love for Rosemary starts with a glow and unmeasured passion but he dispassionately loves Nicole, first out of a deep sense of professional duty then out of a husband’s role, but his love faces recurrent hindrances from both Nicole and her sister Baby Warren. Nicole dwindles from her deep-rooted suspicion that Dick is in true love not with her but with Rosemary and Baby degrades him from excessive pride of her parental money.

Dick’s love chapter with Nicole is a shaky and delicate case; it utterly lacks the glow, the aroma, and the spirit of love. Dick-Nicole love is just a drab and dull affair that is kept going on a perfunctory scale. Dick has to act love with the psychologically unstable Nicole in which he is ‘hired’ by Nicole’s wealthy father Mr. Devereux Warren. Like Baby, Nicole, who inherits the Warren genetic properties, also treats Dick condescendingly: she also slights
his love down to a zero level promoting his alcoholism. Dick’s marriage with Nicole is not a fruit of their love: it is only a circumstantial necessity. Nicole is a “gone coon” whose ‘damaged shells’ Dick has to repair with delicate care that he performs so meticulously.

But his loving care is brutally ignored and humiliated repeatedly by both Nicole and her sister. Neither Nicole nor Baby possesses the intellectual level to estimate Dick’s skill and care. Like a traitor Nicole jumps on to Tommy Barban at Baby’s instigation since Nicole (like Baby) believes that they could purchase everything by money. Dick is “too intellectual” for them. In addition, they believe that Dick is not a match for them as far as their aristocracy is concerned: they try to refine and polish him up and convert him to an aristocrat by their standard. As for Baby, she “ . . . had looked Dick over with worldly eyes; she measured him with the warped rule of an Anglophile and found him wanting . . . and she pigeon-holed him with a shabby-snobby crowd . . . he put himself out too much to be really of the correct stuff. She could not see how he could be made into her idea of an aristocrat . . . Doctor Diver was not the sort of medical man she could envisage in the family. She only wanted to use him innocently as a convenience.” Their money-oriented egoism is exposed in plenitude when we read that Baby considers, “ . . . young doctors . . . could be purchased in the intellectual stockyards of the South Side of Chicago . . .” Or, when we see that Nicole, even after her marriage with Tommy Barban and separation with Dick, when he sets up a small office in Buffalo, Nicole “ . . . wrote to Dick if he needed money.” It is understandable that it is not out of sympathy or love for him but out of her conceited egoism embedded on money that Nicole writes such an insulting letter showing nothing more than her condescending attitude towards Dick.

In the process of the tragic decline of love Nicole’s sister Baby Warren contributes a lot in which money plays the catalyst force. Baby, by dint of that power of money, operates upon Dick and crushes him blatantly. With reference to their enormous railroad property Baby boastfully says: “There’s a lot of business, - the property we used to call the station property. The railroad only bought the centre of it at first. Now they’ve bought the rest, and it belonged to Mother. It’s a question of investing the money.” In addition, the financial magnitude of the Warren family is enormously detailed: referring to Nicole’s money, the novelist writes: “For her sake trains began their run at Chicago and traversed the round belly of the continent to California: chicle factories fumed and link belts grew link by link in factories; men mixed toothpaste in vats and drew mouthwash out of copper hogsheads;
girls canned tomatoes quickly in August or worked rudely at the Five-and-Tens on Christmas Eve; half-breed Indians toiled on Brazilian coffee plantations and dreamers were muscled out of patent rights in new tractors – these were some of the people who gave a tithe to Nicole; . . .

Nicole is married to Dick after a course of critical investigation of Dick’s ancestral pedigree instituted by Baby, who plays the key role on the Warren side and formulates all the decisions with regard to Nicole’s treatment in Zurich. She is hesitant about the marriage despite Dick’s benevolent medical treatment and extra professional care to Nicole. Still Baby avails all the chances to shoot her poisonous arrows of humiliation towards Dick. Referring to her ducal aristocracy Baby says to Dick: “. . . I don’t know whether you know Chicago or not. . . . Well, there’s a North Side and a South Side and they’re very much separated. The North Side is chic and all that, and we’ve always lived over there, at least for many years, but lots of old families, old Chicago families, if you know what I mean, still live on the South Side. . . . I don’t know whether you understand.”

She not only forces her pride of aristocracy on Dick, but she questions Dick’s intelligence to hurt him deeper. At a later development, when she realizes that Dick is not to be tamed as a pet creature, Baby bitterly shoots her insult, defying his minimal independent individuality. In a crude challenge she says: “We own you, and you’ll admit it sooner or later. It is absurd to keep up the pretence of independence.” By force of money she persuades Nicole for a separation from Dick and make a fresh bond with Tommy Barban, whom Nicole marries in the last event. As for Nicole she also changes and assumes her ancestral attitude: “Nicole had been designed for change, for flight, with money as fins and wings.” Indeed Nicole is changed in character because of her money; we read: “Nicole is now made of – of Georgian pine, which is the hardest wood known, except lignum vitae from New Zealand –”

The tragic tale of Dr. Richard Dick Diver consummates the fact that the cynical character of money ruins the divine milk of love of a generous soul: in American perspective money and love go in perennial animosity; one cannot stand the other.

**Conclusion**

In conclusion, we may say that the greater money in the hand of the girls’ families acts ruinously on the lads coming from the financially lower stratum, who aspire to win them. Through his novels F. Scott Fitzgerald draws the thesis that the boom of money in the American life crushes the divinity and
sanctity of love, in addition to some other old values. That is why we unavoidably quote in conclusion the gospel axiom pronounced by Professor Matthew J. Broccoli: “One characteristic of popular American fiction is the implicit separation of love and money. Possession of one does not lead to possession of the other . . .” After critical assessment of the zeitgeist of the American society portrayed by the novelist, Professor William Fahey remarks in the similar tone that is so pertinent to draw the conclusion to this study: “It is a world filled with trivial pleasures and gaudy baubles, a society whose only bond is the cash nexus”.  
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