

# ESTHETICISM OF THE ECONOMIC CRISIS

(Filming of the novel of Francis Scott Fitzgerald “The Great Gatsby” directed by Jack Clayton)

**Author: Igor Pop Trajkov**

Institute of Macedonian Literature, Grigor Prličev 5, 1000 Skopje, Republic of North  
Macedonia

[igorpoptrajkov@yahoo.com](mailto:igorpoptrajkov@yahoo.com)

## **Abstract**

We don't know whether for the treated phenomenon in this text should be used the terms aestheticization and estheticism of the economic crisis. The authors from this generation never stated whether this was a personal creative decision of the writers (who in regard of this are a small number); something which the readers, or the publishers were requiring, as a escapement (escapism) from the cruel reality — or perhaps this has something to do with the writers of this small group who had certain delicate, refined ancestry. There are many researches about the distant cultural phenomenon of social reaction. Namely e.g. in Canada and Japan the largest amounts of crime movies are filmed, but these are the countries which have smallest amounts of criminality. Nevertheless in the Russian movies nobody smokes or drinks, and in the American other way round. In regard of this in the reality the situation is diametrically different. My text has the aim to describe this particular reaction of these (this) author(s) in the period before the WWII. It shows that the authors in this case acted (sub)consciously, not in utilitarian manner- because the consumers would have been needing a bit elegance in the decays of the economic crisis.

**Keywords:** escapism; economic crisis; elegance; depression; complex

## **1. Introduction**

There are endless claims that the generation of the writers which appeared before the WWII in USA is one of the most significant emergences in the modern literature. Some are even forming a group which they call The Lost Generation, debating who is in this group, who should or shouldn't belong in it, and why yes or no. The name of Francis Scott Fitzgerald stands somehow separated in the prevailing classifications of this sort. Mostly because he is considered a sort of an eccentric who refused to collaborate with everybody; especially not with some literature group. Of course for this there are some very opposed facts. E.g. he factually wanted to hear the opinion regarding his writing, from his colleague Ernest Hemmingway[1]. It is truth he had little free time since he had problems with his mentally deranged wife[2]. What is particularly detaching him from the writers of this period is the underlined sense of esthetics, actually the author's capability for thoughtfully shaping the prettiness, pleasantness, decency, delicacy, with the insisting tendency more to enjoy than live[3]. The lamenting, depressive depictions from the rest of the authors from this generation[4] almost do not exist in this author, since in no way he supports the overcoming esthetics of the ugliness in these years. His characters are often something which is usually called the non-existing bourgeoisie or the bourgeoisie which is appraisalment (striving), which is fulfilling the civilization emptiness in the time between the wars. This is the time of the genesis, reformatting, final-formatting, but mostly the negation of the world before. In common though for this — as for the rest of the writers and thinkers (even though for the politicians) — from this period is that it doesn't give any depiction of the future[5].

## **2. Fitzgerald in the Economic Crisis**

For Fitzgerald it couldn't be said he is open pessimist, as for many of the rest of the writers in this group, but is somebody that wants to underline that he can perceive the irony that things cannot begin in the future if they are not conceived in the contemporaneity. Which has no notion of any ethical change, in more particular the citizens compressed in the vacuum between two wars could hardly be defined as some philanthropists. That is why the unhappiness exists (appearing as a result of the economic depression), but which is overwhelmed by the passion for life. The passion to counter the existential syndrome with the silk clothes, with the expensive alcohol, cocaine, with the dizziness of the business-risk, with the shiny bodies of the cars which infuriated the dictators across the ocean[6], home

decorations brought from the safari excursions and the other imitations of this sort by the European aristocracy- became emblematic sign of what was called- the spirit of the economic depression.

## **2.1. Depicting the American Culture and Dream**

Compared with the class categorization of his characters, the esthetics (tidiness) of his narration, the determination of the investment spirit and the strive to live in the pulsating (although risky) passion of the everydayness, Fitzgerald is in many issues similar to Sinclair Lewis (just that the characters of S. L. are not bourgeois, but from the new, yuppie, workaholic-puritan, high middle class). The insisting on the aestheticization and — in spite of the rotting of the tragedies of the economic crisis — on the perfumed reality of the American, upcoming civilization, are, it seems, the unique attributes of this in many aspects unique example of the narrative invention. Everything is indicating that nobody can be even with this author regarding how much pedantry he is showing in his storytelling, describing the purity of the ambience and many times the delusion, which produces delicacy and progress in his protagonists. That is how in his story “Gretchen’s Forty Winks”[7] he describes the habits of both of the leading male characters who are striving towards some kind of bourgeoisie ideal. One of them slaves to the puritan American standard (healthy body, sport life, cold showers every day...), while the other one is some kind of realist; perhaps because he is more of an artist. He confesses — in this small company — that he doesn’t care he usually showers only twice a week, because he is afraid that he could be late for his working obligations, spending his working hours for something which most probably nobody will notice- that he doesn’t hygienize himself regularly. These two were torn apart on two sides by the she-judge- the female leading character. She is appalled when she finds out that aside her exists someone who doesn’t shower with cold water every day. But the turn over arrives from the incredible sense of humor of Fitzgerald- that the one taking cold showers everyday obtained meningitis from it, so to speak. This undoubtedly determines this writer as cold observer in whose writing the esthetics is not per se at all. Hence it is used as measure: for re-examining the legitimacy and for the usefulness of the puritan worldview. Esthetics should be adjusted to the goal, not other way round. I think that the example of this story defines linearly what Fitzgerald wanted to reveal with “The Great Gatsby”.

## 2.2. The generation Before WWII

He wanted to indicate the American who is not satisfied by just being recognized by his high living standard, but understands that as privileged possibility for coming closely to the thing in which he utterly believed; to search for the child in himself who swore its loyalty to the puritan, yuppie morality. In this we cannot see the cold European fascism, of the always shiny boots, the tight buttocks of the ladies from Avignon or the bulldog masculinity of the freshly shaven face (whose cheek in Europe usually hides dark, violent secrets). Fitzgerald presents the warmth of the ambitious, believing yuppie, like Ford was. The author is exhilarated from the dedication of the creative business; he secretly wants to help the winning of the idea about the clean yuppie, contrasting it with the passionate, free, but subjugating European. Ford had all the money in this world, but as all successful Americans had long, perfect marriage, he was never showing how much he had. His house was wooden, so that the inhabitants could lean themselves on the warm wall, so that the family will not be alienated. He invested (as many other businessmen of his sort) in culture, in science, he was establishing foundations, he was true philanthropist. Philanthropy is instigated from the rightful esthetics- this can be laconically said about Gatsby. As catholic Fitzgerald is not afraid to convey certain civilization advantage of the Protestantism. The name Gatsby is obviously Irish (as partly the author himself). Structurally, gradually initiating his characters, the author is presenting the world of his alter ego; which tends to be above all, unlike the author who always had financial difficulties. Gatsby though cannot realize himself in his (till certain extend) suppressed feeling for philanthropy because he encounters the obstacle of the fickleness. The passion of conquering the woman Daisy Fay Buchanan — for who he was once unworthy (according to his own conviction) — transforms into blindness which declines the stagnation, by assuring the walking, with which he overtook everybody. Gatsby is not aware that there is that certain thing called destiny, which although is fashioned by ourselves, we cannot rip it off. What is done in the present already is a new destination in the future. That is how the esthetical ideal which existed in the time of the inaccessibility of the object of our desire becomes fatal consequence in the near future, burdened with the siding from the puritan consistency[8]. Esthetics cannot save us from inconsistency. If this happens anyway, than it becomes mask for the egocentricity, for the blindness of the remaining, for the incapability to perceive who is the real friend, who can give you one really good advice. That is how the chase for the carcass in the swimming-pool of the esthetics — which has high price when in dollars — is the source of the banality of the new day for which we were

hoping in vain that it could begin that something e.g. Gatsby would of have liked. Because he- himself wrapped it in the beautifully priceless involucre, and he cannot anymore see its essence why exactly like that, oh dear, Gatsby would like the day to be. Simply Gatsby is constantly thinking that the fatal woman is his unfulfilled ideal and that this thinking is the only thing which exists and will exist.

### **3. About the Movie**

In any case it cannot possibly be said that Jack Clayton as a serious director (according to the classifications of the academic film reviewers[9]), wanted to find some visual transposition of the literature basis; afore everything that is impossible since this was A-category production. large sums of money are invested in these productions; it is expected these investments are to be enriched, and is expected that plus to come back to the industry. The bosses of the studios usually go to the working dinner in some of the most expensive restaurants in the world (or for few days for a relaxing stay on exotic location) where they are planning what marketing strategy would be the best one for their production, in that very historically-consumerist momentum. In the case of this film they surely did not forget that the ones that would buy tickets had read the novel. If they had not they were surely going to be well educated; would knew well about history, about the economic crisis, the history of literature etc. So in this case they did not decide to produce easy entertainment, but a serious filming in respect to the literature grandeur. I think this is one of the rare productions which are on the same level as the novel. There are such which are more, but in these cases always the literature base is with mediocre or with currently (temporary) high value. So often many are skeptics when they go to watch production based on the literature masterpiece, in which a priori they think that film is not a very serious artistic type, in regard to film as the seventh art. They usually think that the transposition to the silver screen is desecrating, profiteer act. I am disclosing this obviousness so that I can depict that in this concrete case the consumerism has rarely positive productivity regarding the artistic values of the film “The Great Gatsby”. Of course it is not easy to have a perfect match for the exact style. Agatha Christie is considered to be a writer for who is extremely difficult certain film style to be matched with her prose, although as a writer she is consumed by the widest audiences. Her style is easily understandable, she is writing with crystal clarity. But the psychology of the consumers is that they always prefer to see something beautiful. Agatha herself — although writing for the high society — frequently depicts her characters as the ones which are from, and habitually are collaborating with the

darkest underground. Exactly this substance is hardly digestible for the ones buying most of the tickets at the box-office, which by itself represents the particularly hard intellectual bite for any film author. While in the authorship of the novel "The Great Gatsby" the pattern for discovering this is much easier. I.e. if we retell this novel in few sentences, this work of the big maestro Fitzgerald will seem as a cheap boulevard novella, with storyline based on jealousy. However the dark digressions of the author, which are portraying the almost pathological desire of a forgotten citizen (who was never gentleman) to prove to someone (to who exactly!?) that he was never not even a citizen, are showing that he was always simply Gatsby. Someone who was cognitively so high that he managed to cognize that: you didn't have the money yesterday, today you have them, but you were always like now when you have them. The fatalistic plot points that Gatsby is something which is somewhat, so to speak, diverse from this, with which he is opinionating himself with; so even now when he has the money, he is as he was when he had them not. The wretch, the Irishness in him smolders. That is the sorrow of the open sea which is taking, magnetically attracting with its blue lavishness, being actually a fatal desert. Because the real winner is the one which can resist that divine call- with the strength of his selfishness- no matter how this may seem trivial to somebody. Why is Gatsby making those opulent parties? Perhaps this is just syncretism, editorial-directorial homage for the writer from the authors of the film?[10] They — the editing and the mise-en-scène — are underlining these scenes which in the book are discretely presented, aiming to show to the viewers that it is all about that satirical cinematographic outlook towards the once existing economic crisis. Gatsby is somebody who alcoholizes and fattens his fellow citizens; only he can afford this for them. On the other hand, in the book is philosophically presented that he wants to become a star of the social life because that is the only thing which glimpses to his mind; in more particular for the reason that it is the only modus vivendi from that historical period, when everybody strives to live like those from Hollywood. The writer does not tell us that Gatsby is some Irish peasant to whom is not clear how he should be living with the wealth which he acquired almost occasionally, although he was working a lot. Fitzgerald is taking spiritually dark attitude that in such period only this was possible- not to know what to do, to exist, not to live. It's not that then was cool to be living with no goal — but one to live with goal, as being fully aware since the beginning of his life and of his career, that such goal will never be acquired. That is that Irish boat sailed faraway from its birth island. Its passengers are sad, longing for the abandoned soil. The captain could bring back the ship, to its starting point, but is not aware he should. He doesn't know that the passengers would just like to be brought back home.

Accordingly Gatsby doesn't know that he should just throw them out from his party. This would make them happy since they will wait no more in front of the unidentified door of the salvation.

In no terms it can possibly be considered that the production of this novel of Fitzgerald, directed by Jack Clayton is typically Hollywood-like. This is so mostly because it was filmed in the years which are not typical for Tinseltown. In this period the movie industry in USA was awaking from the big crisis which appeared as result of the turning the back of the international sympathy (which existed from its very beginning) and as a result of the boycott of the old, proven grandeurs; which were estimating they shouldn't take part in the war propaganda machinery, which would of have been in favor of the invasion of Vietnam. There are very authentic researches which are with relevant evidences for this attitude. But this is not the first, nor the only connection, since by the constitution and by the law the big industries in USA had the obligation to help each other. The connection of the war with the film industry (the two greatest industries, as are unofficially, intensively called) is a subject of many relevant studies[11]. So it can be freely said this production is something which was born from the workshop of Roger Corman. This producer gave little money to the newcomers, but also big freedom in filmmaking. This is how emerged the names of Francis Ford Coppola, Steven Spielberg, Martin Scorsese, Brian De Palma etc. They made big budget productions which up till nowadays are considered to be exemplar for success story at the box office. Their success is based on: big innovation; thorough notion of the film history; technological, almost science-lab improvement of the film expression; maintaining the classical, crystal clear film narration. According to many unofficial sources Coppola is what is called the hidden director of this movie. The information of this type is always unauthorized, since is connected with complex, copyright agreements. Francis Ford Coppola is insisting on the till-perfection-shaped visualization, which is assorted with the high budgeting production machinery (extra-expensive decors, sets, costumes, authentic locations...). So the movie indeed looks juicy-beautiful. You can simply have a sip from the lavishness of each frame. It couldn't be said there are some particular experiments in regard the entirety of the cinematic expression. Actually the mise-en-scène itself mostly resembles the Golden Age of Hollywood, when this novel was written. Then were produced uplifting movies[12] since as a result of the immense financial crisis the period was massively depressing. But it can hardly be claimed that these movies are just easy entertainment. On the contrary some of the most prominent writers, artists and creative businessmen were taking part in their production. The mastership of the film dialogues e.g. in the Golden Age is an

unreachable, superior quality, even for the contemporary film-makers. Then the cinema-halls literary were a league-of-their-own sanctuaries of the contemporaneity, where one poor man could go and have a little fun, but also to warm up, drink a cup of tea and take a meal. In the movie, as well as in the novel, as in the rest of the opus of Fitzgerald- it is as the economic crisis does not exist. He is always choosing characters whose destiny seems to be protecting them in some kind of safe heaven. The characters of Fitzgerald are never tragic, nor fatally sided, but are always — as in the movie & as in the novel — in a particular sadness of the everydayness. They never feel some horrible end is approaching, but are as they gave up ever reaching that one thing that they are most profoundly striving towards. In this the director is using description, encirclement and visual equation.

### **3.1. The description**

The description is realized through the narration[13], which we face already while the protagonist arrives with its motor boat; who simply explains, with partially dark intonation, that he will see somebody after long time. This is followed by the explanation of the biographic threads, back in the time, as well as by transferring the endeavor of the persuasion- characters to be presented as the ones with closeness, but which anyhow don't permeate each other. This is very openly shown in the book, which in almost satirical manner reflecting the shallowness of the socialization. Simply the carriers of the plot — for which is not suggested it will be with trivial-tragic outcome — are all aside one another. Nobody ever influenced their forming, is not influencing it and never will; because they are those who are the embodiment of the American spirit. They believe strongly in something and towards it they are strongly craving, regardless anything. What happens if their way is blocked by prosaic problems, like for example absence of money? The other writer I mentioned, as the only match for Fitzgerald- Sinclair Lewis, gives direct answers to this question. Simply in this case the citizens are forced to exchange gold for tin, so to speak[14]. In Fitzgerald's writings, as well as in the movie, this kind of directness does not exist, but for this reason there is description of the data. E.g. that the estates of ones and others cost differently; or that some are hiding something because they have to, as actually those are the rest who are ashamed- the once (more) poorer. While Fitzgerald manages to class-express himself without any dose of reactionism, the film shows the class just as an obstacle for which two life paths split. The movie even doesn't try to imply that maybe it is a lucky circumstance that Gatsby split with one of the many, well absolved characters of this writer- the stereotyped minxes.

Those are the heroines of the economic crisis's depression, who with their freshly applied nail polish and lipstick won the battle for so-and-so financial independence. Actually Fitzgerald feels frank compassion for the beautiful yuppies, which were destroyed because their mind was deluded by the skilled false whores. False- because lasciviousness was not their main profession but just a tool which helped their success; this was inevitable as a result of their deluxe talent and fanatical professional dedication. Fitzgerald justifies these kinds of emergences of the tender gender as inevitability of the economic moment. They are fated and there is no getting away from them. Hence their talent is mostly something which is not necessarily intellectually connected with the movie business. In this case we have a kind of fatal beauty, which always predicts death, which according to both — the writer and the director — is shown as a description of the obsession of wearing white[15] clothes. The film fulfills this course, but underlines something which during the years the movie was a hit, was bait for the audiences, which is the profitability. The delicacy of the lie regarding this maneuver of the femme fatale is successfully described with elegant presentation of Daisy's femininity, in the style of the well-groomed look of Mae West, including the mysterious female intuition which always predicts the next move. Since she is always lying, laying herself as well, anticipating her departure of the world of Gatsby, as someone who deserves her, as much as he himself believes in it. However he still thinks she is in everything above his level. He is throwing the super-expensive shirts, while presuming she will tell money is not important. Accordingly the stream of the destiny — which she is determining — is witty depicted through the description, and that determination is that perhaps money are not important, but are crucial!

### **3.2. The Encirclement**

The encirclement[16] is distinguishing for everything Fitzgerald has ever written. Under the term encirclement I am presenting the case when the end of the work has purpose of explaining the meaning of the narration. In this sense this author (the writer) indeed has that thing which in classical sense is defined as organized structure: beginning, middle and end. This author would never finalize his work with an open ending, in the mode in which we will not know what exactly happened further with the particular character, a type of work that will give us certain allegory which was very popular in this period. Regarding this I will use the example from the movie "Citizen Kane" and the real case of the magnate William Randolph Hearst. Since this is so in the movie "The Great Gatsby". The kind attribute of a certain

respect for the literary base does not emerge in this particular case just from the urge of the producers to attract and not-disappoint the educated, serious audience, which was in expansion in the period during the production of this movie. This is resulting also from the wish of the, so to speak, more common, tired audience which wants to obtain bit of relaxation after the disappointing working day. This audience wants everything to be visually tidied, with underlining sense of tranquil, understandable evolvement of the action, a not very quick / not very slow rhythm. In the light of these two consumerist categories, it could not possibly be said that the film implementers took attitude which is neither here, nor there, but a successful attitude, the same as the literature creator himself did- not to negate the esthetics of the economic crisis. This is actually a very rapid tendency in everything in this period before the WWII. The industrial design (the designs of the packaging, bottles, boxes, showbills), as a consequence of which the painting too (in this period the Art Nouveau and secession are flourishing, which in many cases are evolving from the advertising, from the poster esthetics, as their authors follow up this path), as well as the architecture — are reflecting the insistence on an escapist, hedonistic world, whose decorativeness not rarely is inspired by the hallucinogenic shapes and colors. Which is as somebody is saying: Don't give up artist, beauty belongs to you! This of course reflects the stubbornness of the fading civilization, burdened by the economic crisis and the overpowering, widely-accepted sadism of the fascist dictatorship, for which the law does not imply. It is completely clear that in the movie, as well as in the novel, there is law. These two trees with same root are like the father with his descendants, the one before the WWII, and the other one- the fireman quenching the flame in Vietnam. In the period of Fitzgerald, Paul Klee is very influential. After a longer period of time appears somebody like him saying it was unnatural for us to expect that art should not have likability. His ars poetica is condensed esthetics, decorum and catharsis at the same time, which is massively accepted particularly in the visual arts and negated by the group of deadeners after the WWII, led by Oskar Kokoschka[17]. So this movie should be understood as wholeness with its insistence (in many things) on the beauty threaded throughout whole action. The horror of the economic crisis is just a distant echo.

### **3.3. The Visual Equation**

The visual equation[18] is a truthful transposition of the textuality of the novel. Inasmuch the movie is canvas, it is threaded with the decorative threads of the elegant, self-ironic text of Fitzgerald. The writer doesn't let the descriptions of certain poverty, which are encircling the

rich quarts, enter the aestheticization of those quarts, because they are protected by the writer's bell jar. This last paragraph is a result of my big insistence since the European literature theoreticians can tell me that such a thing does not and cannot exist — regarding the fact the author is invisible[19]. But in USA the alter ego of the writer is relevant category[20]. This film has its visualization subdued to its certain internal mechanisms of particular proportionality, the same like music. In many things this type of visualization is something which is missing in the contemporary A-productions, which insist on holding the attention of the viewer by arranging cinematic, unexpected jumps. However “The Great Gatsby” (1974) shows that it was possible (or then it was possible) without these standardizations for the A-productions. Nowadays` audience perhaps mutated into finding fast changes of the tonality and the rhythm; the aestheticization of this melodrama with fatal crescendo proves that the evened tempo, for example, doesn't become boring if expedient to the unpredictability of the film time. This time is being developed in the same manner as in the literature base, without big jumps, but with big distances from the characters, hibernated in the bell jar of the author. The characters both in the book and in the film are caressed by the time (that tender, tickling wind), as not being ruined by the hurricane of the southern states, where the period of the economic crisis was dreadful.

#### **4. Conclusion**

This observance proves that the esthetics which never becomes kitsch with this writer, didn't became kitsch with the filming as well, since the movie authors were sticking to these three characteristics of the estheticism of the economic crisis- as literature transposition of the historical moment.

#### **Suggested bibliography:**

##### **Books**

CHATEAU, Dominique, edited by. *Subjectivity, Filmic Representation and the Spectator's Experience*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam Univ. Press, 2011.

CHATTERJEE, Anjan. *The Aesthetic Brain - How We Evolved to Desire Beauty and Enjoy Art*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 2014.

DIODATO, Roberto. *Aesthetics of the Virtual*. New York: Sunny Press, 2012.

HERZOGENRATH, Bernd, edited by. *Time and History in Deleuze and Serres, Continuum Studies in Continental Philosophy*. New York: Continuum, 2012.

JAGODZINSKI, Jan. WALLIN, Jason. *Arts-Based Research A Critique and a Proposal*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers, 2013.

PARR, Adrian, edited by. *The Deleuze Dictionary*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005.

PERNIOLA, Mario. *Art and Its Shadow*. New York: Continuum books, 2004.

WUNDT, Wilhelm Max. *Outlines of Psychology*. Calicut: Regional Engineering College, 2003.

### **Articles**

CHATTERJEE, Anjan. "The Assessment of Art Attributes" *Empirical Studies of the Arts, Vol. 28(2) 207-222, 2010 The Univ. of Pennsylvania* (2010)

RODOWICK, David. "A care for the claims of theory." *Cinema: Journal of Philosophy and the Moving Image 1: 14-68. Harvard Univ. open access* (2010)

### **Referring bibliography:**

### **Books**

BORDWELL, David. CARROLL, Noel. edited by. *Post-Theory: Reconstructing Film Studies*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1996.

BORDWELL, David. *Narration in the Fiction Film*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1985.

COREY, Melinda. OCHOA, George. BROWN, Gene. American Film Institute. *The American Film Institute desk reference*. New York : DK, 2002.

HEMINGWAY, Ernest. *A Moveable Feast*. New York: Scribner's, 2009.

LEWIS, Sinclair. *The Man Who Knew Coolidge*. San Diego: Harcourt, 1928.

MONK, Craig. *Expatriate Autobiography and American Modernism*. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 2008.

MORLEY, Catherine. *Modern American Literature*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2012.

PAVESE, Cesare. *American Literature: Essays and Opinions*. New Jersey: Routledge, 2010.

READ, Herbert. *A Concise History of Modern painting*. London: Thames & Hudson, 1985.

RULAND, Richard. *From Puritanism to Postmodernism*. New York: Penguin, 1992.

SCOTT FITZGERALS, Francis. *The Crack-up with other Pieces and Stories*. New York: Penguin Books, 1965.

TAN, Ed S. *Emotion and the Structure of Narrative Film: Film As An Emotion Machine*. New Jersey: Routledge, 2011.

## Articles

CHATMAN, Seymour. "That is Description in the Cinema?" *Cinema Journal*, Vol.23, No. 4 (1984)

DEITERMANN, Julia. "Color Symbolism in F. Scott Fitzgerald's The Great Gatsby" *GRIN Verlag* (2006)

EL NEWEHY, Sherif. *Versions of the Alter Ego: A Study of Joyce, Kushner and Ellis*. American University in Cairo (2017)

GHIOTTO, Monica Federica. WIJANARKA, Hirmavan. "American Dreams Represented through the Color in Fitzgerald's Great Gatsby" *Art* (2016)

OLESEN, Christian Gosvig. "Towards a 'Humanistic Cinematics'?" *The Datafied Society: Studying Culture through Data*. (2017)

SAMKANASHVILI, Maia. "Uses of symbols and colors in The Great Gatsby by F. Scott Fitzgerald" by Maia Samkanashvili" *Journal of Education* (2013)

WILL, Barbara. "The Great Gatsby and the Obscene Word" *College Literature* (2005)

ZHANG, Haibing. "Symbolic Meanings of Colors in The Great Gatsby" *Studies in Literature and Language* (2015)

---

[1] See about this in *The Movable Feast*, the autobiographical novel of Ernest Hemingway. Two Irishmen met in Paris. Fitzgerald was blond, beautiful, with short legs. He presented his novel to Hemingway, according to who the book was with ugly cover, with photo of a car. He torn the front cover and read it. He told Fitzgerald he had written good book

[2] Ibid. The name of his wife was Zelda

[3] For my defining of the term beauty I am mostly referring to what is called non-necessity. In this I am mostly indebted with Anjan Chatterjee and his *The Aesthetic Brain* closely

explained with the quote chosen by the author itself: “Remember that the most beautiful things in the world are the most useless, peacocks and lilies for instance.”- John Ruskin

[4] See about this e.g. on pp. 180 of Craig Monk’s “Writing the Lost Generation: Expatriate Autobiography and American Modernism”

[5] One from the many in this direction is also Barbara Will: “The Great Gatsby and the Obscene World” pp. 131 in “F. Scott Fitzgerald’s the Great Gatsby” edited by Harold Bloom, where she writes about the “oxymoronism of the non-reality of the reality” of this writer

[6] Having complexes regarding this Hitler ordered the construction of the Volkswagen- so that all Germans could have car, the same as the Americans

[7] Source of the story: “The Crack-up with other Pieces and Stories” Penguin Books, 1965

[8] This perception, especially in its economic regard is also present in Richard Ruland’s “From Puritanism to Postmodernism”, pp.352, 353

[9] Who never forget to mention that he was so serious, that he rejected some really good offers, e.g. Alien (1979)

[10] As the famous British reviewer Raymond Durgnat is saying: “This is one yuppie story from the twenties, but its polished surfaces and characters yet manage to whisper unlike their (literature) originals, which do not acquire even this, in their cold, sarcophagus air”. Since according to him the storyline of Fitzgerald is about the lost love of a smuggler which became a part of the high society

[11] See about this in “The American Film Institute desk reference”- Melinda Corey, George Ochoa, Gene Brown, American Film Institute. About this connection is being spoken in many places in the book, as well as in its end in the summary

[12] Here it is referred to the black & white luxury, which was usually consisted from contrasting backgrounds from white satin, with black cocktail dresses in front of them

[13] In the film theory usually the description is equated with the one in the literature: “The description is a developing figurine, which instead of indicating the object, is realizing it somehow visually, with lively and animating exposure of its most important parts and circumstances.” defined by Philippe Hamon in his Encyclopedia of the 18<sup>th</sup> Century, presented in the article of Seymour Chatman “That is Description in the Cinema?”, Cinema Journal, Vol.23, No. 4, 1984

[14] E.g. Sinclair Lewis is telling us that “for Christmas the tradition was a head of boar to be served (with an apple in its mouth), but because this was too expensive, they were all eating turkey...” from “The Man Who Knew Coolidge”

[15] There are indeed many analyses about the usage of the white color in the novel and why it alludes to death. Most of them are those claiming white is the clearness, innocence which Gatsby had lost. He wants to come back to those values because while they were young and innocent Daisy was wearing white. There are also theories about the entire usage of the colors in Fitzgerald's novel, including the white. See about this in "Uses of symbols and colors in The Great Gatsby by F. Scott Fitzgerald" by Maia Samkanashvili, "Symbolic Meanings of Colors in The Great Gatsby" by Haibing Zhang, "Color Symbolism in F. Scott Fitzgerald's The Great Gatsby" by Julia Deitermann, "American Dreams Represented through the Color in Fitzgerald's Great Gatsby" by Monica Federica Ghiotto & Hirmavan Wijanarka

[16] About the relationship sequence-wholeness see on pp. 81 and further in "Narration in the Fiction Film" by David Bordwell; about the relationship of the film wholeness and narration see on pp. 253 in "Post-Theory: Reconstructing Film Studies" edited by David Bordwell and Noel Carroll. About the encirclement of the film narration see in "Emotion and the Structure of Narrative Film: Film As An Emotion Machine" by Ed S. Tan, mostly in chapter 7, pp. 206

[17] See about this in "A Concise History of Modern painting" by Herbert Read. Mr. Read e.g. is presenting us an example of Oskar Kokoschka- the panting of woman which is sitting on a couch, but is actually a mannequin. Also the landscapes of Kokoschka are depicted with dead colors

[18] Excellent example about the academic necessity of this category, throughout the historic development of the film is present in the article "Towards a 'Humanistic Cinematics'?" by Christian Gosvig Olesen

[19] The contemporary academic tendencies in the film narration are alleging to the implied author, which is in between the author and the narrator. In this line are the previously end-noted authors David Bordwell and Seymour Chatman too

[20] E.g. in "Versions of the Alter Ego: A Study of Joyce, Kushner and Ellis" by Sherif El Newehy, "American Literature: Essays and Opinions" by Cesare Pavese, "Modern American Literature" by Catherine Morley- in the chapter about the lost generation, the American identity and "The Great Gatsby"