



PROJECT MUSE®

Refracting Blackness: Slavery and Fitzgerald's Historical Consciousness

Garrett Bridger Gilmore

Mississippi Quarterly, Volume 70/71, Number 2, Spring 2017/2018, pp. 181-203
(Article)

Published by Johns Hopkins University Press

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/mss.2017.0011>

Mississippi
Quarterly

The Journal
of Southern Culture

1942

Edited by
William Faulkner, Robert W. Coates,
Theodore Dreiser, Frances Fitzgerald,
and F. Scott Fitzgerald, and
in cooperation with Leslie Fiedler

Vol. 70/71, No. 2 Spring 2017/18

➔ *For additional information about this article*

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/747848>

GARRETT BRIDGER GILMORE
University of Alabama

Refracting Blackness: Slavery and Fitzgerald's Historical Consciousness

WHEN AMORY BLAINE DECLARES IN *THIS SIDE OF PARADISE* THAT HE IS “for the Southern Confederacy” (31), and when he reflects that patriotism comes easy “to a homogenous race” like the Confederacy (139), F. Scott Fitzgerald’s youthful romanticism about the Lost Cause stands in full view. Fitzgerald’s critics and biographers have thoroughly traced the evolution of his identification as the last son of a fallen Maryland planter family over the course of his career, arguing that aspects of southern and Civil War mythology provide an important language for the expression of Fitzgerald’s sense of American modernity.¹ For Fitzgerald as for any other Lost Cause thinker, the apparently admirable personal qualities associated with the Old South—honesty, honor, self-composure—mask a desire for the racial and economic relations that subtended them. Fitzgerald’s readers, even as they have noted the importance both of the South and of racism in his fiction, have been seemingly uninterested in making sense of the role that the legacy of slavery plays in Fitzgerald’s conception of modernity.² While slavery

¹As Frederick Wegener explains, “although it seldom explicitly appears as a setting in his fiction, one may argue that [Fitzgerald’s] lifelong engagement with the Civil War . . . came to perform an essential role in the development not only of Fitzgerald’s historical awareness but also of his experience of the writer’s life and of his aesthetic understanding as a whole” (239). See Donaldson for a discussion of the importance of Fitzgerald’s intimate relationships with his southern father and with his wife, Zelda. For more extended studies of the Civil War as a theme and setting in Fitzgerald’s short fiction, see Noe and Fulton.

²Witness John T. Irwin’s glossing of Fitzgerald’s characterization of the Civil War: “that inevitable struggle for political supremacy . . . between those people whose power and position were based on the ownership of land and those whose wealth derived from manufacturing and trade” (13). In seeing Fitzgerald as a southerner—indeed even in seeing Fitzgerald as a sometimes-Confederate sympathizer—Irwin does not see slavery. Nowhere is this critical disinterest more apparent than John Callahan’s influential *The Illusions of a Nation: Myth and History in the Novels of F. Scott Fitzgerald* (1972). Callahan begins his study by asserting anti-black racism as the obfuscating political myth *par excellence*, even going so far to comment on its inseparability from the legacy of American slavery, yet his study proceeds as if this history of slavery is ultimately separable from Fitzgerald’s conception of modernity.

as such appears in Fitzgerald's fiction only in "The Diamond as Big as the Ritz" (1922), it nonetheless determines the scope of history explored in his mature fiction. If slavery has so far been unrecoverable from Fitzgerald's fiction, it is because its secrets constitute the whiteness that grounds his historical consciousness. Slavery must remain hidden in order for Fitzgerald's sense of the political and psychic stakes of the present—the domain of the white moneyed class—to cohere. For Fitzgerald, the end of slavery is the beginning of history; Emancipation implicitly proves to be the moment economic and racial relations become (for him) unnatural, when modernity with all of its various alienations begins.³

Much like Fitzgerald's romantic vision of the Confederacy, slavery occupies a place of ill-fated youthful desire in "The Diamond as Big as the Ritz." Fitz-Norman Culpepper Washington, the original owner of the story's titular diamond, moved west with "two dozen of the most faithful blacks, who, of course, worshipped him" (192). Fitzgerald revels in imagining and describing the world of the Washingtons, which includes still-enslaved black servants. These were, as Fitzgerald narrates,

darkies who had never realized that slavery was abolished. To make sure of this, [Washington] read them a proclamation that he had composed, which announced that General Forrest had reorganized the shattered Southern armies and defeated the North in one pitched battle. The negroes believed him implicitly. (193)

Clearly, then, the world of the Washingtons enacts an alternative—yet plausible—history. The enslaved people operate as a central piece of the

³Fitzgerald's attitude in this regard is not unique but instead reflects a dominant cultural understanding of slavery as an economic and social institution. As Edward Baptist explains of popular knowledge about slavery in the early twentieth century, "the historians of a reunified white nation insisted that slavery was a premodern institution that was not committed to profit-seeking. . . . It was an old, static system that belonged to an earlier time" (xvi). White life in the South before Emancipation, then, was not only characterized by an imaginary racial balance whose fictions could be used to police modern African Americans, but also by an equally imaginary economic balance that could justify discourses of white economic grievance. This common sense about the political economy of race would come to be challenged only in the years after *Tender is the Night*, with the publication W. E. B. Du Bois's *Black Reconstruction in America* (1935), C. L. R. James's *The Black Jacobins* (1938), and Eric Williams's *Capitalism and Slavery* (1944), all of which laid the foundation for our contemporary critical knowledge of Atlantic slavery and its economic and intellectual afterlives.

story's economic and racial imaginary. The Washington diamond is an economic paradox:

the diamond in the mountain was approximately equal in quantity to all the rest of the diamonds known to exist in the world. There was no valuing it by any regular computation, however, for it was *one solid diamond*—and if it were offered for sale not only would the bottom fall out of the market, but also, if the value should vary with its size in the usual arithmetical progression, there would not be enough gold in the world to buy a tenth part of it. (193)

To capitalize on the impossible value of the diamond, the Washington family engages in several forms of economic transubstantiation. On one hand, the diamond fragments that the first generation of the family brings to market are “invested with a history of enough fatalities, amours, revolutions, and wars to have occupied it from the days of the first Babylonian Empire” and thereby transformed into bearers of historical and social—rather than pure exchange—value. On the other hand, the second generation of Washingtons “converted [their diamonds] into the rarest of all elements—radium—so that the equivalent of a billion dollars in gold could be placed in a receptacle no bigger than a cigar box” (194). The economic reality of the diamond belies the apparent simplicity of its physical beauty, which “dazzled the eyes with a whiteness that could be compared only with itself, beyond human wish or dream” (189). Indeed, the possibility of the diamond being “compared only with itself” proves to be the family's downfall, as the secret of their wealth cannot be revealed without its destruction.

It is no accident that the diamond's beauty is described as “whiteness,” as the racial logic of the story mirrors its more explicit economic paradox. The black men and women enslaved by the Washingtons are, like the diamond, cut off from economic and linguistic circulation. The first enslaved characters to appear in the story speak “in some language which [John] could not understand, but which seemed to be an extreme form of the Southern negro's dialect” (186). Mr. Washington explains later to his son's guest John T. Unger that “they've lived so long apart from the world that their original dialect has become an almost indistinguishable patois. We bring a few of them up to speak English” (198). The enslaved people in the story are reduced simply to their functions—serving meals, preparing baths, driving limousines—in the maintenance of the Washington household as a place of what Fitzgerald deemed “luxury” he “designed utterly for [his] own amusement” (182).

These enslaved black characters complement the material source of the family's wealth—the diamond—by bringing in their own kind of value. The initial reason for the Washingtons' presence in Montana was a scheme to "take out land in [the enslaved people's] names and start a sheep and cattle ranch" (192). In the land-grabbing scheme as in the diamond estate, the presence of black people establishes a pretext for an outward-facing white economic system legitimized through the creation of fictions of legitimacy. Without the need for productive labor in the diamond estate, though, the Washingtons enslave people in a vestigial bondage. Within the story, then, there is an implicit historical recounting of post-Emancipation racial politics that struggles to find a role for black people in an increasingly financial modern economy. Indeed, as her father's estate collapses in the story's final section, Kismine Washington laments the loss of "fifty thousand dollars' worth of slaves at prewar prices" (209).

However absurd the fantasy of "The Diamond as Big as the Ritz," it is instructive for readings of Fitzgerald's later fiction because it underscores the conceptual centrality of slavery to the world that Fitzgerald felt modernity had destroyed. The story's concluding lines present a conversation between John and Kismine that underscores the naiveté of the story's fantasy without ultimately disavowing the premise of the obscene desire for luxury. John is uniformly untroubled by the Washingtons' villainous lifestyle predicated on enslavement and imprisonment, but is shocked when he learns that he too is simply an object of the Washingtons' murderous desire. John's reverence for the Washingtons' wealth is repeated in his infatuation with Kismine, who lets slip the family's horrible secret. Unable to suspect that his fate will align with that of the enslaved black servants or the imprisoned white explorers as a victim of the Washingtons' luxury, John continues to identify with the Washingtons and remains in love with Kismine *even after* he learns he is to be murdered. Having escaped death only through the destruction of the Washingtons' compound, John declares to Kismine, "There are only diamonds in the whole world, diamonds and perhaps the shabby gift of disillusion. Well, I have that at last and I will make the usual nothing of it" (216). The potential realization that the world the Washingtons hyperbolize destroys everything it touches—even, as John fancied himself, its rightful inheritors—is transformed in these closing lines into vacuous self-reflection, as if all that was at stake in this experience for John was the loss of an experiential naiveté.

In “The Diamond as Big as the Ritz,” while Fitzgerald’s white protagonist can see that the Washingtons own slaves, he cannot see structural truths about the past or present of slavery. Because he is blinded by the glimmering whiteness of the estate, John cannot see that radicalized slavery is the material basis of the Washingtons’ wealth. Similarly, John and the Washingtons’ shared whiteness covers over the fact that within the domestic economy of the estate, John has more in common with the enslaved than with the Washingtons. The double-blindness that constitutes the historical dynamic of slavery in “The Diamond as Big as the Ritz” does not disappear from Fitzgerald’s fiction; it is not exorcised through John’s final speech about disillusion. It does not disappear because, counter to the critical consensus on Fitzgerald’s racism, anti-blackness is not merely an aberration or personal failing of Fitzgerald’s. Rather, through John’s attempt to deny historical insight by insisting on a presentism defined by a “disillusion” that is his due as a wealthy white American male, we see the mechanism for slavery’s preservation in *The Great Gatsby* and *Tender is the Night*. While these works exhibit their own racist dynamics, the critic’s task is not to analyze how Fitzgerald’s racism finds expression in certain contingent historical forms, especially (as has been well documented) scientific racist discourses.⁴ Rather, we must ask how these historical forms inherit contradictions of past historical forms, and how Fitzgerald’s instigation of historical discourse in his novels consistently reaches crisis when the history of slavery threatens to come into view.

In *The Great Gatsby* (1925), Nick Carraway’s narration is shaped by the specter of slavery whose presence is forestalled in moments that challenge the reliability of his self-narration and especially his apparent awareness of the disillusionment in himself and his peers. Nick admits a piece of advice from his father: a warning against being critical of

⁴See especially early pieces of criticism on race in Fitzgerald by Gidley and Slater. Fitzgerald’s interest in the science of racial difference is typical of the post-Emancipation itinerary of American racial knowledge that M. NourbeSe Philip characterizes in an interview with Patricia Saunders:

the experience of slavery spawned anthropology and other sciences (like phrenology) that were drafted into service of proving the “inferiority” of black people, as well as the larger project of greed and a lust for power and wealth. So, the same sets of questions and issues are presenting themselves to us across these historical periods. It [is] the same story that is telling itself, but through the different technologies and processes of that particular period. (67)

anyone who has not had “the advantages” that Nick has had (1). He connects his internalization of this advice to his success in discovering intimate information about all kinds of people. Yet for Nick, receptivity proves a curse. It appears that intimate information simply erupts from those with whom he is close:

Most of the confidences were unsought—frequently I have feigned sleep, preoccupation, or a hostile levity when I realized by some unmistakable sign that an intimate revelation was quivering on the horizon; for the intimate revelations of young men, or at least the terms in which they express them, are usually plagiaristic and marred by obvious suppressions. Reserving judgments is a matter of infinite hope. I am still a little afraid of missing something if I forget that, as my father snobbishly suggested, and I snobbishly repeat, a sense of the fundamental decencies is parcelled out unequally at birth. (1-2)

Note that Nick raises the problem of “obvious suppressions” in the opening lines of his own sustained act of self-narration immediately before engaging in an obvious suppression of his own. Nick transforms his father’s statement about “advantages” into a statement exclusively concerning personality. Richard Godden argues that Nick’s tendency to reduce complex social situations to scenes of nostalgia or romance indicates a “suppressed ambivalence towards his own class” (92). In his narration Nick “spread[s] empathy where analysis should be” (95) and thereby turns “social aspiration into ‘dream,’ sexual politics into ‘romance,’ and translates class conflict as ‘tragedy’” (92). He thereby suppresses analysis of social organization in favor of meditations on the moral and intellectual capabilities of individual subjects. Rather obviously, for Nick, “fundamental decencies” are distributed unequally, though his tacit appeal to a logic of inheritance retains monetary signification. Nonetheless, Nick is hyper-aware of his “snobbish” attitude. He attempts to know how the world works, but in so doing he cannot but do the things he should not. Like John in “The Diamond as Big as the Ritz,” then, Nick foregoes identification with those whom he knows capitalism and its attendant moralities do not empower. For Nick at least, this attempt ends in failure in the form of a retreat back to his Midwestern home. As Nick recounts in the fourth paragraph of the novel, “When I came back from the East last autumn I felt that I wanted the world to be in uniform and at a sort of moral attention forever; I wanted no more riotous excursions with privileged glimpses into the human heart” (2). Restored to the bosom of his family, Nick works

through his traumatic endeavors in New York so as to reinvest in the very class stagnation that he initially sought to leave behind. Nick ultimately attempts to escape what he views as his own honesty towards and tolerance for others but what we might better understand as painful and irreconcilable contradictions in his own social position. Either way, Nick no longer wants to know the way the world really works, and *The Great Gatsby* must be read as an account of this eventuality that is both self-justifying and self-deceiving.

Two more moments render Nick's ambivalent class and race consciousness typical, one from the novel's first chapter, and one that precipitates the novel's climax. These scenes bear discussion insofar as each foregrounds an account of specifically racialized intra-class conflicts through which Nick negotiates his text's contested racist ideology. As Nick describes his family's background, he demonstrates his honesty by demystifying a bit of family lore. According to Nick, the Carraways "have a tradition that we're descended from the Dukes of Buccleuch, but the actual founder of my line was my grandfather's brother, who came here in fifty-one, sent a substitute to the Civil War, and started the wholesale hardware business that my father carries on to-day" (3). Nick unmasks a family legend about the source of its wealth; the family wants to believe that its money is hereditary, indeed aristocratic, but Nick reveals its actual historical source. The allusion to the Duke of Buccleuch ironically underscores the romantic nature of this family history: the Dukedom of Buccleuch grew from lands granted by James II to a Sir Walter Scott, whose descendent (also Sir Walter Scott) would popularize historical romance. This allusion also establishes a link between Nick's desire to transform economic advantages into personal characteristics and the romantic tendencies of the South. Nick indirectly disavows an exhausted mode of Anglo historical romance only to produce a new mode of historical romance that locates the origin of his family's modern condition in a pre-Emancipation economy. Nick does not quite face this history, as demonstrated by his choice to begin his family's narrative in 1851 with a great-uncle who simply "came here."

Despite Nick's attempts to hide it, the suppressed history of slavery in the novel is not, after all, unrecoverable. Instead, Nick's historical repression can be read through a structure of repression exhibited by the novel's other characters. Nick holds himself at a distance from each of these characters, remarking on their motivations without drawing connections to his own. Nick sees himself as one who is enlightened

concerning the distorted representations of racist ideology, as opposed to Tom Buchanan,⁵ whose “concentration” in his attempts to explain the novel’s strawman version of race science Nick finds “pathetic.” Tom’s earnestness is embarrassing, “as if his complacency, more acute than of old, was not enough to him any more” (13); Tom’s unconscious justifications for his sense of racial superiority require explicit study and enumeration in order to continue to produce a public discourse on power that Nick would like to keep hidden away.⁶ Tom participates in the manipulation of racist ideas in order to adapt them to new social demands, giving the lie to the integrity of past notions of superiority and therefore de-naturalizing them even as he reaches for an ostensibly scientific justification. Tom seeks to transform racial disparities into a world-historical narrative of racial conquest and downfall, a scale of abstraction incommensurate with Nick’s preferred focus on individual character traits. Tom’s racist efforts are distasteful to Nick not because they are racist but because they are efforts of the wrong kind. Race—unlike white class distinctions—cannot be easily reduced to differences in individual personality, and therefore Nick pushes the issue aside.

The dynamic of repression comes to a head in the novel’s hotel scene in which Gatsby reveals his love for Daisy. To this declaration, Tom responds, outraged, “Nowadays people begin by sneering at family life and family institutions, and next they’ll throw everything overboard and have intermarriage between black and white” (130). Jordan Baker’s “certain hardy scepticism” (15), the quality that most attracts Nick,

⁵Note that the final president of the unified American slave republic was James Buchanan.

⁶The upshot of Nick’s estimation of Tom’s racist beliefs is that such ideas proceed from existing institutions of power and privilege rather than the other way around. This explanation of the development of racist ideas is theorized by Ibram X. Kendi, who argues that “Time and again, powerful and brilliant men and women have produced racist ideas in order to justify the racist policies of their era, in order to redirect the blame for their era’s racial disparities away from those policies and onto Black people” (9). This moment is important in the racial-historical logic of *The Great Gatsby* because it highlights the need of existing institutions of power to produce racist ideas that justify their existence, rather than suggests that Tom’s apparent ignorance and chauvinism—purely personal traits—somehow lead to the elaboration of racist power structures. At the same time, Nick shrinks from this line of analysis, ultimately obfuscating the structure of racial power that Tom himself tries to elaborate by focusing on Tom’s subjective effort to make such knowledge knowable.

comes through in her response to Tom's outburst: "We're all white here" (130). At a certain level, Jordan's remark is another dismissive joke about Tom's racist paranoia, an attempt to cut the tension in the cramped room. But it also raises an important truth for the characters—Gatsby is white insofar as he is not black—a truth that derails Tom's displaced anger. Before Jordan's remark, Tom had been exposing Gatsby's inflated or nonexistent credentials and his attempts to "pass" as a member of the upper class. Meredith Goldsmith argues that for Tom and Nick, "racial miscegenation and immigrant ethnic assimilation provide models of identity formation and upward mobility more easily comprehensible than the amalgam of commerce, love, and ambition underlying Gatsby's rise" (443). Tom's initial attempts to rid himself of Gatsby focused on pulling back his rival's mask and exposing a racially coded impropriety, but after Jordan's comment he focuses on elements of Gatsby's popularity and, finally—most painfully—on the possibility that Daisy really does love him. Jordan's words change the trajectory of Tom's discourse when it hits its absurd, though logical, conclusion. Tom is shocked out of his flight towards miscegenation and back towards the reality of Gatsby's "commerce, love and ambition."

That Tom eventually gets to the heart of the Gatsby issue—Gatsby's money—reveals an important dynamic in the conflict over personal history that organizes the fight between Tom and Gatsby. The explicit problem Tom lands on is whether Daisy can love Gatsby. To answer this question, Tom would need to understand the truth of Daisy's desire, a truth Nick has already deemed impossible to determine from her speech and behavior. Avoiding confronting the truth of Daisy's desire, Tom instead lashes out at Gatsby's class position. Tom cannot imagine how Gatsby could have gotten "within a mile of her unless you brought the groceries to the back door" (131). For Tom, Gatsby's proximity could have come only by way of menial and implicitly racialized labor (via "the back door"). But Tom is more upset, insofar as it presents a greater threat to his own class position, by Gatsby's participation in bootlegging and bond schemes. For Tom to reveal the source of Gatsby's money would be to rob him of his social power, yet Gatsby is unable to effect the same revelation against Tom. Gatsby cannot unveil Tom's history; consequently, the source of Tom's family's money remains a mystery. Tom's victory over Gatsby turns on the supremacy of Tom's opaque class history over Gatsby's spectacular ascendancy. The opacity of Tom's wealth allows him to possess Daisy and to secure her class connection

without apparent criminal labor. Tom has a stronger claim to Daisy because the source of his wealth cannot be identified and because this is an attribute of “old money.” Like Nick’s fetishized slippages in the novel’s first pages, Tom’s material advantages become personal advantages despite the fact that Tom is utterly devoid of the decencies on which Nick fixates. Gatsby’s conscious behaviors are revealed as just another kind of labor; what Tom does naturally, Gatsby must work to perfect.

In *Tender is the Night* (1934), Fitzgerald returns to these same dynamics of economic and racial knowledge, exploring in greater detail just what histories lie beneath the truth of Jordan’s assertion that “We’re all white here.” As in *The Great Gatsby*, the moment of crisis that precipitates the downfall of *Tender’s* characters takes place in a hotel room wherein racial dynamics are made plain. If, as Susan L. Keller suggests, *Tender is the Night* responds in part to the replacement of “old models of biological racial superiority . . . with a new ‘cosmopolitan’ model of consumerist self-fashioning” (130), then we must call into question how Fitzgerald and his characters conjure the stability of both biological racial difference and consumer culture. As Felipe Smith writes, “Fitzgerald stages the Peterson murder as a quintessentially American sex/race dilemma in Paris first to demonstrate the way that Paris exacerbated disturbing American Jazz Age social trends and second to illustrate that the ‘freest’ of Americans . . . only accelerated their decline” (189). But to make Paris an American social space, Fitzgerald does more than import contemporary signs of black American culture. Rather, the history of American black-white relations plays out in this scene, signaling a failed escape from not only the present but the past as well. Revealing through psychological motifs (including Abe North’s depression and Nicole Diver’s incest-related trauma) an “undeniable contempt . . . for the commodification of human relationships” (Washington 61), *Tender is the Night* draws on the representational power of the prototypical commodified human—the enslaved African—in order to hammer home the historical production of white capitalist pathologies. Through its attention to Dick Diver, who, like John T. Unger, is chewed up and spit out by the economic and sexual demands of the leisure class, the novel brings into the open the unconscious psychic forces at play in the racial and economic self-identification of the American expatriate leisure class.

Aided by a shift in narrative technique away from first person towards third person, *Tender is the Night* provides its own interpretive frames through which history can be read. As he did in *The Great Gatsby*, Fitzgerald sets the historical scope of *Tender is the Night* by consciously linking the Civil War and the First World War, each understood as linked traumatic histories that Dick Diver, the famed psychiatrist, is unable to untangle. Central to the novel's development of the connection between the Civil War and the First World War is the network of significations that accumulate around Abe North, who, critics have noted, prefigures Dick Diver's eventual dissolution into alcoholic obscurity.⁷ North and Diver are certainly connected, but the difference in their relationships to the South and the Civil War set them on different narrative paths. Abe North is seemingly incapable of self-censure, while Dick's studied forbearance distinguishes him from his peers. Fitzgerald does not attribute Dick's detachment and reserve to his general condition as a modern or to his privileged knowledge of the human mind as a psychiatrist but to his Southern heritage: "From his father Dick had learned the somewhat conscious good manners of the young Southerner coming north after the Civil War. Often he used them and just as often he despised them because they were not a protest against how unpleasant selfishness was but against how unpleasant it looked" (164). Like Nick, then, Dick both cares for appearances and possesses an ability to see beyond them to their real foundations. But whereas this tendency constitutes a problem for the interpretation of characterization in *The Great Gatsby*, in *Tender is the Night* it exists as a trait unique to Dick that the narrative itself interrogates.

Fitzgerald's linking of Dick's ambivalent sense of propriety with his southern roots locates Dick on a continuum between Abe North (whom Matthew Bruccoli suggests "Fitzgerald thought of . . . as a characteristically American figure" [97]) and Collis Clay ("a Georgian, with the peculiarly regular, even stencilled ideas of Southerners who are educated in the North" [Fitzgerald, *Tender* 68]). Dick is thus as much like Collis Clay as he is like Abe North. Collis Clay represents another aborted path for Dick's development and another mode of inheritance of Dick's patrimony. Dick "rather liked Collis—he was 'post-war'; less difficult than most of the Southerners he had known at New Haven a

⁷See Sklar and Stern for typical treatments of the allusive significance of Lincoln and Grant. For more recent treatments, see Washington and Leverenz.

decade previously” (87).⁸ Through his timely heroic actions in the novel, Clay models an effective negotiation of the histories with which Dick cannot come to terms: that of the First World War and that of romantic entanglement with Rosemary Hoyt.

If Clay is “post-war,” then Abe North is in a sense pre-war. North manages the substantial impact of his own personal trauma experienced in the First World War by putting it into an historical context opposed to Dick’s understanding of the conflict. In the difference between North’s and Diver’s sense of the history of the First World War we see how Dick fetishizes the social relations that have produced the trauma that pursues him throughout the novel. For Dick, the intensity of violence exhibited on the Western front could only be driven by a people with

a whole-souled sentimental equipment going back further than you could remember. You had to remember Christmas, and postcards of the Crown Prince and his fiancée, and little cafés in Valence and beer gardens in Unter den Linden and weddings at the mairie, and going to the Derby, and your grandfather’s whiskers. (57)

Dick produces a string of sentimental memories taken as characteristic of “a century of middle-class love” (57). Like Nick, then, Dick substitutes romance for analysis. Yet, in *Tender is the Night*, this substitution appears as a problem to be narratively solved, rather than the ground for narrative itself. North interrupts Diver’s musings by demanding that Dick consider the real history of trench warfare: “General Grant invented this kind of battle at Petersburg in sixty-five” (57). North’s point here is narrowly historical, but its implications extend beyond even the scope of the novel. North’s reminder suggests that the history of the fractured consciousness of modernity can be traced back at least to 1865, and that the First World War might simply be a repetition of that trauma.

Civil War resonances continue as the novel’s Book I comes to a close, creating a bizarre allegory for racial politics after Reconstruction. Callahan signals the centrality of this scene to the historical consciousness of the novel, deeming it a “structural parody” of Reconstruction, a relationship that elsewhere in the novel is

⁸“Collis Clay” evokes Cassius Clay, the Kentucky abolitionist who served in the Lincoln and Grant administrations, suggesting a graceful acceptance—if not progressive welcoming—of historical transitions.

accomplished only through “authorial allusion and reflection” (111).⁹ Responsible for the false imprisonment of a black waiter significantly named Freeman, North finds himself entangled with Fitzgerald’s most elaborately imagined black character, Jules Peterson, who was a witness to Freeman’s arrest. Peterson, we are told, “had failed as a small manufacturer of shoe polish and now possessed only his formula and sufficient trade tools to fill a small box” (*Tender* 106). Peterson, despite his failure, remains a capitalist. Indeed, the promise of investment connects Peterson to Abe North, who had promised “to set [Peterson] up in business in Versailles” (106-07). But Peterson’s apparent status as a capitalist is something of a “rigmarole” (107), and with only “his formula” and small box of “tools,” his extant capital is indistinguishable from that of any common shoeshine. Thus, while Peterson presents himself as an agent of capital, he is expendable both for the novel’s narrative demands and for its characters. Fitzgerald’s description of Peterson follows a progression that registers the seriousness with which he is considered by the novel’s white characters. Peterson is introduced ironically with an air of Reconstruction-era pretension, a “small, respectable Negro, on the suave model that heels the Republican party in the border States,” and is granted the distinction of being “Afro-European” as opposed to the “three Afro-Americans” who are on his tail (106). As Peterson explains his career and predicament, “Dick regarded him politely—interest formed, dissolved, [and] he turned to Abe.” As Dick and Abe make plans of their own, Peterson steps out of the room, deferring management of his own fate to Dick and Abe, and apologizing that “It is perhaps hard to discuss my problems in front of me” (107).

Peterson fades into the background of the scene until he almost literally rematerializes as a corpse in Rosemary’s bed. Fitzgerald’s exquisite description of Rosemary’s “realiz[ation]” that someone else—Peterson’s corpse—is in her room deserves quotation in full:

Then, rather gradually, she realized without turning about that she was not alone in the room.

In an inhabited room there are refracting objects only half noticed: varnished wood, more or less polished brass, silver and ivory, and beyond these a thousand conveyers of light and shadow so mild that one scarcely thinks of them as that, the tops of picture-frames, the edges of pencils or ash-trays, of crystal or china

⁹Leverenz is more dismissive of Fitzgerald’s historical allegory: “It’s Fitzgerald’s own form of grandiosity, as if to say, Look at the meanings I’m making here!” (194).

ornaments; the totality of this refraction—appealing to equally subtle reflexes of the vision as well as to those associational fragments in the subconscious that we seem to hang on to, as a glass-fitter keeps the irregularly shaped pieces that may do some time—this fact might account for what Rosemary afterward mystically described as “realizing” that there was some one in the room, before she could determine it. But when she did realize it she turned swift in a sort of ballet step and saw that a dead Negro was stretched upon her bed. (109)

Given the density of overt references to the historical vicinity of slavery and Fitzgerald’s penchant for highlighting the structures of suppression and revelation that selectively acknowledge connections between racial and economic power, we can read this passage as an account of commodities losing their fetishistic qualities and revealing the truth of their value that connects the racial history of the past and present. Consciousness of the materiality of the commodity comes about through a process of “refraction” that crosses between the physical world and the “subconscious.” The passage runs from luxury goods (varnished wood, brass, silver, ivory) to more common items associated with clear use values (picture frames, pencils, ashtrays, crystal, and china). The value of the initial items is as apparent as their reflective qualities; like the self-referential whiteness of the Washingtons’ diamond room, shine becomes the sign of value. The more pedestrian items likewise are “conveyers of light and shadow,” but this quality is “so mild that one scarcely thinks of them as that.” Significantly, Fitzgerald uses “refraction” instead of “reflection” to describe the way these commodities interact with light. If these objects were to *reflect* light, then the passage would indicate that somehow a single image of Peterson traveled a linear—if scattered—path to some perceptive presence in Rosemary’s consciousness. But since these objects *refract* light, something else happens. Refraction involves the bending that happens when a light wave passes through a medium that alters its speed. Imagine a straw in a glass of water: the part of the straw that is visible above water appears disconnected from the part of the straw that sits below the surface. The result is the visual or perceptual displacement of the straw. The straw, in effect, splits—appearing to jump from one location to another.

This quasi-phenomenological description of the process of “realizing” takes on racial significance with the choice to name the corpse “Negro” in the paragraph’s final sentence. For what happens is that through these commodities, a generic black corpse is displaced into Rosemary’s consciousness. Consciousness of the materiality of the objects results in

the materialization, the “realizing,” of Peterson’s body. Fitzgerald specifies that this process of refraction appeals “to equally subtle reflexes of the vision as well as to those associational fragments in the subconscious.” Thus, the passage from visual displacements to material sources mirrors psychic displacements between associations and origin within some fractured psychic history. In Fitzgerald’s account, Rosemary’s perception moves towards the realization of the commodity as a double-bodied phenomenon involving both a physical and a psychological return to a past that she hasn’t yet seen properly because of her typical modes of fetishized economic and racial perception.

The key point here is that a dead black man emerges at this moment of psychic crisis for the novel’s white characters, a crisis that reveals symptomatically—that is, is refracted into a different psychic and social density—the twinned trauma of incest and the accumulation of capital in Nicole’s past. However, that this process is visible to the novel’s narrator—indeed to Fitzgerald—does not mean that Rosemary’s realization that the corpse in the room is likewise a becoming-conscious of the history of her class. Rather, the narrator denies such a realization as the next sentence tells us that Rosemary “had the preposterous idea that it was Abe North” (109). The notion is preposterous because the initial perception of the corpse produced the concept “Negro.” The characters’ resistance to the racialized class realization that the passage evokes continues at a discursive level as Book I comes to its conclusion. In death, Peterson is no longer the “Afro-European” he is credited with being upon introduction. The de-particularization of Peterson’s identity recurs several pages later when Rosemary remarks, “Do all the Americans in Paris just shoot at each other all the time?” (111). What accounts for Peterson’s becoming an African American—a “Negro”—in the space of these few pages? Is the misidentification of Peterson as American a result of Rosemary’s stress? The slippage is remarkable for the confusion it causes in the novel’s racial logic. If, as his implicit Nordicism in this novel and throughout his career suggests, Fitzgerald operates with a working hierarchy that runs white American—white European—black, Peterson’s becoming both “American” and simply “Negro” eviscerates the complexity of the real economic and racial positions that the novel’s narration has worked to establish. “American” implies white, though the narration has made exceedingly clear that the major players in this affair—besides Abe North—are black. In effect, the

psychic dynamic of the situation shifts from an event taking place in Europe to an event lodged in a longer American history.

Dick comforts Rosemary through a language that further degrades Peterson, insisting that she “mustn’t get upset over this—it’s only some nigger scrap” (110). While attempting to remind Rosemary that she is not directly involved in the murder, Dick tellingly reduces Peterson to nothing more than waste: destroyed by his aspirations, used and discarded by Abe North at the cost of a thousand francs. Here, then, black life is directly processed through a system of exchange whose output is a corpse taken out of circulation for the purpose of white social stability, much like the living enslaved people in “The Diamond as Big as the Ritz.” Peterson’s death constitutes a crisis, but it is not a tragedy in any real sense because it is not a personal loss for any white character who matters in the novel’s narrative logic. Peterson’s death is a momentary disorder that serves as an alibi through which the novel ties together its other themes, an otherwise unremarkable end to his pretensions of social agency. No longer an aspiring businessman, Peterson is reduced to scrap to be cleaned up and disposed of by the novel’s white protagonists.

Yet this easy disposal leaves a traumatic remainder that triggers Nicole’s hysteria: a blood-soaked sheet. In the logic of the novel, Peterson’s death tests Dick’s ability to maintain a mannered repose. As Dick commands Nicole to “Control [her]self!,” Rosemary, horrified at the sight of Nicole on the bathroom floor, slips into the suite’s main room and is rescued by Collis Clay (112). It is essential that the disposal of the body is accomplished through white solidarity, the shared belief in the non-value of black life masquerading as good manners. Dick’s motions in rearranging Rosemary’s room are almost unconscious, as if he acts from a script or out of habit: “Automatically Dick made the old motion of turning up his sleeves though he wore a sleeveless undershirt, and bent over the body” (110-11). Removing the evidence of possible white culpability in Peterson’s death becomes a kind of medical operation—suggesting that the very routine labor of Dick’s job as a psychiatrist is to rearrange traumatic evidence in order to establish in each of his patients, and ultimately in his wife, a new and conscious equilibrium suited to the work of their class. In the disposal of Peterson’s body, Dick finds “one use for all the pleasingness that [he] had expended over a large area he would never retrace.” The “extra effort which had firmly entrenched him” with the hotel’s owner allows Dick to call in

favors along specifically raced lines. Dick calls the owner and reports finding “a dead Negro” in the hall, adding that he calls out of concern for the hotelier and so that no other guests will have to see the body. The narration reports, “What exquisite consideration for the hotel! Only because Mr. McBeth, with his own eyes, had seen these traits in Doctor Diver two nights before, could he credit the story without question” (111). While Dick’s history of apparently profitless manners guarantees credibility, the blood, as a sign or remainder, produced by the suturing of the social, triggers a hysterical, symptomatic response in Nicole. As in “The Diamond as Big as the Ritz,” then, a white woman gives up the horrible secrets that her family would keep repressed. The dead black man rematerializes as the displaced sign of incest, another foundational violence covered over in order to preserve class stability.¹⁰

My reading of *Tender is the Night* as a work that takes up the connections between racial and class consciousness in a post-Emancipation modernity establishes two takeaway points. The first is that I find refraction a useful metaphor for expressing how something like a historical moment or trauma permeates different levels of social reality. Slavery in the American imagination is obviously not something as simple as a straw sitting in a glass of water, but the idea that different densities—we might say different forms of social, economic, and psychic resistance—can alter the appearance of the same phenomenon is an idea that travels among Fitzgerald’s novels. In effect, while slavery itself remains absent from the pages of Fitzgerald’s fiction, the white social and psychic dynamics it produced make up the very substance of the history that Fitzgerald explores. Through the visual metaphor of refraction, Fitzgerald’s metaphor for reading these racial-historical dynamics in

¹⁰The emergence of Nicole’s symptom in this context resonates with another of her racialized hysterical reactions. As Messenger explains in a footnote, “Nicole posits North Africa as a site of her deflowering and conception of a child within racial difference. . . . She states that when her daughter Topsy was born, ‘everything got dark’, and then segues into a fantasy in which she is told her baby is black” (165). In each of these moments, the potential evidence of a white woman’s sexual encounter with a black man serves as a screen for the real trauma of paternal incest. Forced miscegenation works in the novel as an exogamous violence antithetical to the real endogamous violence of incest. So whereas Godden argues, “[Nicole’s father’s] greed is such that he fails to exchange the one item that he is utterly obliged to exchange” (113), Messenger notes that Peterson and the other “dark” men of *Tender is the Night* dabble in finance, thereby facilitating, despite their racial origins, the proper circulation and exchange of capital. Thanks to Richard Godden for suggesting the link between miscegenation and incest.

scenes of otherwise insular whiteness and historical presentism, we can see at the edge of *The Great Gatsby* a history of racialized economic exploitation that Nick works actively to obscure. We can look indirectly through Nick's opaque but reflective narrative style to discover the displaced black body that initiates Nick's own familial self-fashioning.

Tom Buchanan's attempt to expose Gatsby's history recalls the novel's opening pages and exposures; read through the later scene, Nick's supposed "honesty" assumes a new valence. As Tom and Gatsby fight over control of their own private economic histories, Nick's frankness about his family's wealth appears singularly honest. Yet the novel harbors one unexamined source of value, the wealth that provides Daisy with her foundation, and therefore ultimately proves to be that over which Tom and Gatsby struggle. In Daisy we see the process that condenses economic value into personal desirability at its most efficient. If the stability of the upper class's wealth is predicated in part on its ability to forget its source (the labor of workers) without sacrificing a claim to the natural ownership of that source, then Daisy's cynicism makes a certain sense. Daisy's realization that her class casts her as little more than a vessel of social value is at once painful and empowering. Her knowledge allows her a limited power over the men she encounters and even over her cousin Nick. Her lamentation at the novel's beginning that it is best for an attractive young woman to be a fool—that is to say, to be unaware of the system that circumscribes her freedom—is in fact a statement of what Daisy knows she must do to be happy but lacks the power to accomplish. Daisy's extraordinary value and her subsequent ability to maintain the simultaneous love and frustration of Nick, Tom, Gatsby, and Jordan do not simply result from some formal necessity for the novel to have a central figure. Rather, within the logic of racial and economic cognition that organizes the novel, the particularity of Daisy's history represents the apotheosis of these factors in American culture: the disavowal, forgetting, and appropriation of the legacy of American chattel slavery.

The novel consistently describes Daisy's youth as white. Jordan remembers Daisy at eighteen, "dressed in white" with "a little white roadster" (74). Daisy's voice has long conditioned her interactions with others; Jordan recalls how, in her wild days with Tom and Daisy in Chicago, Daisy never took lovers, "and yet there's something in that voice of hers. . . ." (77). Later in the novel, when Nick attempts to particularize her vocal quality, he begins, "she's got an indiscreet voice

. . . it's full of—." Gatsby finishes his sentence, "Her voice is full of money." Nick concurs, "That was it. I'd never understood before. It was full of money—that was the inexhaustible charm that rose and fell in it, the jingle of it, the cymbal's song of it. . . . High in a white palace the king's daughter, the golden girl. . . ." (120). Later, as Nick summarizes Gatsby's story of his time with Daisy, he returns to Daisy's voice, "huskier and more charming than ever," a voice that leaves Gatsby with the image of "Daisy, gleaming like silver, safe and proud above the hot struggles of the poor" (150). So Daisy is valuable; indeed, she so embodies value that it animates her speech, allowing her an announced distance from the laboring classes.

Simply seeing *that* and *how* Daisy embodies monetary value (indiscreet, self-deceiving, nonetheless captivating) and what that value means for the class conflict that develops during the novel does not get us back to the foundational source of Daisy's value. But when we notice the repetition of whiteness as a descriptor for Daisy, we may glimpse how the racial structure that subtends the novel's economic class structures points us towards the ultimate source of value—black labor—that Nick does not bring into discourse. Tom believes that Gatsby could only have approached Daisy by delivering groceries to "the back door," and thus by blackening himself. Gatsby, sign of visible class striving and the work required for the maintenance of upper-class stability, becomes for Tom not only a phantasmatic black assault on the white institution of marriage, but also, in a metaphorical displacement, an assault on Daisy's childhood home. Tom's lack of nuance speaks an uncomfortable truth. In his paranoia, Tom further articulates structures of feeling shared by the novel's other characters that they nonetheless refuse to avow. Apparently serving the white family, Gatsby as delivery boy relegated to the home's back door also threatens to become what he actually is in the novel: Daisy's "back door man."

Note that Nick's account of the home in question amounts to the novel's closest approximation to an overt analysis of value as that which simultaneously promises and yet conceals itself:

There was a ripe mystery about it, a hint of bedrooms upstairs more beautiful and cool than other bedrooms, of gay and radiant activities taking place through its corridors, and of romances that were not musty and laid away already in lavender, but fresh and breathing and redolent of this year's shining motor-cars and of dances whose flowers were scarcely withered. It excited him, too, that many men had already loved Daisy—it increased her value in his eyes. He felt their presence all

about the house, pervading the air with the shades and echoes of still vibrant emotions. (148-49)

But if Daisy's childhood home is haunted by past lovers and signs of social status, we also must necessarily know that the house and what it holds "realize" the labor that went into their production and maintenance. The issue of what Daisy's family does is never raised. Presumably Nick knows—he is her cousin, even if only by marriage—but, typically, he focuses on Daisy's personal qualities rather than the material advantages that produced those qualities. But, through the white roadster, white dresses, and big house in an old section of Louisville, a source of value begins to materialize. Given Nick's inability to trace his own family's wealth to much before the Civil War, his narration leads us *up to* slavery and leaves us to see the "obvious suppression" of that institution for ourselves. For Nick, the transaction that inaugurated the modern Carraway family turned on the purchase of another white man's military service; military service *actually* allowed Gatsby to approach the young Daisy, despite Tom's attempts to blacken him. All but forgotten, intimations of the violently coerced labor from which postbellum America grew ensure the obfuscation of a foundational act of physical destruction and economic exploitation that carries on as Fitzgerald's worst fears about modern processes of individual commodification. Whether or not Daisy's family owned slaves (it seems likely that they would have, given their status and residence in Louisville), notions of white southern femininity hinge on the figure of the plantation mistress under constant threat of black assault. The epoch-making revolution that was the American Civil War—the radical restructuring of a large part of the American labor and property base—is something that Nick can barely see, and certainly cannot see beyond. The source of Daisy's economic and social value thus hides safe behind an all but uncrossable historical line. Though Nick fetishizes this value through personal qualities like voice, Daisy remains the seeming embodiment of pure value because the source of her value is always and already forgotten.

In rewriting these dynamics between *The Great Gatsby* and *Tender is the Night*, Fitzgerald dramatizes in the latter the structural nature of the labor that goes into the maintenance of the material and psychic health of the class that houses both Tom Buchanan and Nicole Warren. By locating his historical consciousness of this labor in the dynamic of

slavery—no doubt a result of his deeply felt struggle to identify with the southern, paternal side of his family—Fitzgerald understands the promiscuity of the sign of blackness as an inherently white manipulation with a definite and ongoing history, one whose operations must be disavowed even as they are enacted. Fitzgerald’s fiction needs to see slavery as the hyperbolic endpoint of capitalism’s dynamics of commodification and sexual exploitation as well as, contradictorily, a radically different pre-historical origin, but cannot show it directly without overshadowing the present suffering of his characters. Thus, in *Tender is the Night*, “Dick’s ‘beautiful, safe, lovely world’ that blew itself up in World War I,” was not “a non-racial, paternal, heteronormative elsewhere” (Messenger 175), but rather a paternal, heteronormative elsewhere founded on the economic and psychic dynamics of a binary white-black, free-slave social schema.

Indeed, none of Fitzgerald’s various engagements with slavery as a historical origin of the present suggest any anti-racist insight; slavery is understood to be a disaster, but for Fitzgerald it is a disaster to come for white people. Tom Buchanan’s obscene fears of black global dominance are absurd in this context, then, because they attribute an agency to black people incommensurate with Fitzgerald’s interest in them. If for Fitzgerald the future held a catastrophe for white people, it was because capitalism would soon make everyone “black,” in the most basic metaphorical sense. But this fear is not, as Chris Messenger suggests Dick’s is, an “almost atavistic emotional need . . . to exclude the black man,” or a simple failure on Fitzgerald’s part to “extend a fundamental humanity” to black characters (171,170). Rather, it is a complex engagement with the historical interrelation of economic and racial power taking place in a present defined by what historian Nell Irvin Painter has termed expansions of whiteness that only appears to be an atavistic fear or individual anti-black prejudice.¹¹ What Fitzgerald knows about blackness, then, is not what Michael Nowlin suggests, that

¹¹Racialization and its historical expressions function along the two lines Painter proposes in *The History of White People*: “The fundamental black/white binary endures, even though the category of whiteness—or we might say more precisely, a category of nonblackness—effectively expands” (396). Each element of this dynamic—a fundamental black/white binary and an ever-expanding definition of whiteness—is attended by its own representational tropes that respond to its own social and economic anxieties. It is the centrality of the history of the black/white binary, inextricable from the history of American slavery, that grounds Fitzgerald’s historical vision across his works.

Fitzgerald “might know something of what it is like to be black in Jim Crow America” (13) and therefore have some hidden or nascent sympathy for black people we could recover from his work via the centrality of slavery to his historical vision. Rather, if Fitzgerald knew anything about blackness it was that *he was not it*, despite its various cultural and aesthetic allures, and that that certainty could allow for the play of other registers of social power and signification. In dramatizing the failures of other forms of historical disavowal to combat the psychic pressures of modernity, Fitzgerald holds on to the power of the primary, constitutive exclusion and violence of slavery that continued to ground whiteness despite the upheavals of modernity.

Works Cited

- Baptist, Edward E. *The Half Has Never Been Told: Slavery and the Making of American Capitalism*. New York: Basic Books, 2014.
- Brucoli, Matthew J. *The Composition of Tender is The Night*. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1963.
- Callahan, John F. *The Illusions of a Nation: Myth and History in the Novels of F. Scott Fitzgerald*. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1972.
- Donaldson, Scott. *Fitzgerald & Hemingway: Works and Days*. New York: Columbia UP, 2009.
- Fitzgerald, F. Scott. “The Diamond as Big as the Ritz.” *The Short Stories of F. Scott Fitzgerald*. Ed. Matthew J. Brucoli. New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1989. 182-216.
- . *The Great Gatsby*. New York: Scribner, 2004.
- . *Tender is the Night*. New York: Scribner, 2004.
- . *This Side of Paradise*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1995.
- Gidley, M. “Notes on F. Scott Fitzgerald and the Passing of the Great Race.” *Journal of American Studies* 7.2 (1973): 171-81.
- Godden, Richard. *Fictions of Capital: The American Novel from James to Mailer*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990.
- Goldsmith, Meredith. “White Skin, White Mask: Passing, Posing, and Performing in *The Great Gatsby*.” *MFS: Modern Fiction Studies* 49.3 (2003): 443-68.
- Irwin, John T. *F. Scott Fitzgerald’s Fiction: “An Almost Theatrical Innocence.”* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2014.

- Keller, Susan L. "The Riviera's Golden Boy: Fitzgerald, Cosmopolitan Tanning, and Racial Commodities in *Tender is the Night*." *The F. Scott Fitzgerald Review* 8 (2010): 130-59.
- Kendi, Ibram X. *Stamped From the Beginning: The Definitive History of Racist Ideas in America*. New York: Nation Books, 2016.
- Leverenz, David. *Paternalism Incorporated: Fables of American Fatherhood, 1865-1940*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2003.
- Messenger, Chris. "'Out Upon the Mongolian Plain': Fitzgerald's Racial and Ethnic Cross-Identifying in *Tender is the Night*." *Twenty-First Century Readings of Tender is the Night*. Ed. William Blazek and Laura Rattray. Liverpool: Liverpool UP, 2007: 160-76.
- Noe, Marcia, and Fendall Fulton. "Narrative Art and Modernist Sensibility in the Civil War Fiction of F. Scott Fitzgerald." *Memory and Myth: The Civil War in Fiction and Film from Uncle Tom's Cabin to Cold Mountain*. Ed. David B. Sachsman, S. Kittrell Rushing, and Roy Morris, Jr. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue UP, 2007. 163-76.
- Nowlin, Michael. *F. Scott Fitzgerald's Racial Angles and the Business of Literary Greatness*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
- Painter, Nell Irvin. *The History of White People*. New York: W.W. Norton, 2010.
- Saunders, Patricia. "Defending the Dead, Confronting the Archive: A Conversation with M. NourbeSe Philip." *Small Axe* 26 (June 2008): 63-79.
- Sklar, Robert. *F. Scott Fitzgerald: The Last Laocoön*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1969.
- Slater, Peter Gregg. "Ethnicity in *The Great Gatsby*." *Twentieth Century Literature* 19.1 (1973): 53-62.
- Smith, Felipe. "The Figure on the Bed: Difference and American Destiny in *Tender is the Night*." *French Connections: Hemingway and Fitzgerald Abroad*. Ed. J. Gerald Kennedy and Jackson R. Bryer. New York: St. Martin's P, 1998. 187-213.
- Stern, Milton R. *The Golden Moment*. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1970.
- Washington, Bryan R. *The Politics of Exile: Ideology in Henry James, F. Scott Fitzgerald, and James Baldwin*. Boston: Northeastern UP, 1995.
- Wegener, Frederick. "The 'Two Civil Wars' of Fitzgerald." *F. Scott Fitzgerald in the Twenty-First Century*. Ed. Jackson R. Bryer, Ruth Prigozy, and Milton R. Stern. Tuscaloosa: U of Alabama P, 2003: 238-66.