

A Deleuzian Analysis of Capitalism in Scott Fitzgerald's Novels

Narges Bayat*, Ali Taghizadeh**, Nasser Maleki***

Abstract:

This paper analyzes Scott Fitzgerald's novels in light of Deleuze and Guattari's critique of capitalism. While Deleuze and Guattari's capitalist social machine is a break from Marxism, it decodes the traditions that define subjective desires or concepts like *beauty* and *ethics*. Under capitalism, subjective desire arises as a capitalist desire and reproduces the capitalist power. In his novels, Fitzgerald addresses the idea of the American dream in a similar way. His characters often embody the contradictions of American experience such as success and failure, dream and nightmare, illusion and disillusionment. This paper critically analyzes Deleuze and Guattari's reading of *desire* within Marx's work and the role of the American dream in a capitalist system as a sort of anti-production. It seeks to illustrate how the concept of *love* in Fitzgerald's novels is tied to the idea of money and how their connection delineates, in the same way, the commodification of the desire that Deleuze traces in his reading of Marx. Accordingly, this paper also argues that similar to philosophy, fiction can be employed to provide a better understanding of our represented world.

Keywords: American dream, Capitalism, Deleuze, Desire, Fitzgerald

Introduction

To describe the positive atmosphere of American life in the 1920s, Anthony Patch calls it a "lustreless and unromantic haven" (Fitzgerald, 1986: 41). Fitzgerald himself delineates the American society of this era as "rosy and romantic" with colorful promises to the youth. However, his delineation is soon replaced by the reality of an America of defeat and failure because in the society, measures are taken to prevent the people from achieving their dreams (Mizener, 1963: 93). Fitzgerald, the fiction-writer, sees the American dream as a tenet of the national and social life in America. In his vision, it is a phenomenon that is observed in different guises of the American experience. Late in his life, when Fitzgerald (1945: 64) writes in *The Crack-Up* that American history "is the history of all aspiration, not just the American dream but the human dream", he attempts to add to the scope of the

* PhD Candidate in English Literature, Razi University, Iran, Nargesbayat@outlook.com

** Assistant Professor PhD, Razi University, Iran, altaghee@razi.ac.ir

*** Associate Professor PhD, Razi University, Iran, n.maleki@razi.ac.ir

dream so that it would cover the whole dimensions of the American life. Therefore, he underlines the importance of tradition by using the relation between the two concepts of *love* and *money*.

Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari's *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* addresses how psychoanalysis works for the capital to manipulate subjectivities (Guattari, 2008). They contend that desire has a horizontal and collective function and that a desiring-machine is created when one subject is connected to another subject. Desire is a collective production, and the unconscious internalizes the desire that is the product of the connections in which subjects enter and the structures of power they encounter. The collective and horizontal nature of desire means that desire is not created neutrally and can be controlled by power structures (Deleuze and Guattari, 1983). Put differently, structures of power promote and express a legitimate conception of desire. Therefore, with its structures of power, the state forces becoming into individuals (Deleuze and Parnet, 2007). Similarly, the representation of the American dream in Fitzgerald's novels centers on the internalization of desire.

In his fiction, Fitzgerald most clearly depicts the American dream as ambiguous. In the American capitalistic social system, his heroes often appear as victims and thus subordinate to the heroines. In his critique of the American dream, love is employed as an illusive notion that stands in a close connection with money. Fitzgerald demonstrates that the entangled love relationships in his novels are closely related to and dependent upon money. The primary goal of this study is to analyze the representation of the American dream in Fitzgerald's novels on the basis of Deleuzian capitalism.

Literature Review

In order to define Deleuzian capitalism, it is essential to explain what Marx meant by capitalism. Marx and Engels state that capitalism works by revising individuals' personal needs and desires to adjust those needs to the system and structure of capitalism (Marx and Engels, 2009). They talk about how capitalism transforms the ways individuals would desire. Capitalism has a constant need to produce accumulation and turn everything, including the desires of the individuals, into commodities to be controlled by the capitalist to produce new demands that will be satisfied by new commodities. This process is directed toward the satisfaction of a pressing need which Pfeifer (2017) describes as the requirement for the creation and proliferation of capital.

Marx asserts that the actions and desires of the capitalist are the products of social bonds of commodity exchange within which the capitalist subject is entrapped. Desire submits to the law of capital, and it becomes a commodity connected to other commodities through

exchange-value. Furthermore, Marx (2005) maintains that consumption produces the incentive for production. If production offers an external object to consumption, consumption will represent production as a need and an intrinsic image. This shows that the production of desire is the internalization of the dialectic that is described above. In addition, Pfeifer (2017) states that commodified desire internalizes the commodity network that would generate capitalist desire. Under capitalism, the commodification of desire is inevitable, and Marx (2019) explains that this kind of desire offers the promise of overcoming capitalism.

In addition, Samo Tomsic (2016) points out that under capitalism, commodity turns into pleasure. In other words, desire is directed toward commodity exchange. For Marx, commodity pleasures are desires and beliefs that belong to the superstructure. It means that they are ideological motivations that depend upon the forces of production. The forces of production create commodities and exchange values that produce particular needs and desires in the superstructure, and the satisfaction of these desires produces wealth for the capitalist and the necessity to sell labor for the worker. In this way, subjective desires express the social relations of capitalism.

Methodology and Theoretical Framework

This research is a critical analysis of Fitzgerald's representation of the American dream in his novels on the basis of Deleuze and Guattari's reading of desire within Marx's work. It uses Deleuze and Guattari's critique of capitalism to explain the commodification of desire in Fitzgerald's novels. As demonstrated above, in the process of commodification, capital exerts power over the state. Deleuze and Guattari (1983) argue that the state is inferior to the class structure in a capitalist society. The capitalist state is formed by the independent class structure, which assigns the state to serve its terms. Therefore, the state and subjectivity are tools to reproduce the social structure of the capital. When the state power is decentered and the individual desire is colonized, capital exercises its power over other areas of subjective existence.

When Marx (1978) argues that the power of money represents the power of its possessor, he implies that the capital rewrites social rules and conventions. Deleuze and Guattari (1983) explore this point when they refer to the processes of deterritorialization and decoding within capitalism. They explain that conceptions like beauty, ugliness, and factors that make an individual ethical or not are decided by the 'socius'. The socius or the social machine is the mass of various practices and traditions that pre-exist the individual and form the background of the society to which the individual belongs.

Therefore, the way production is conditioned is like how a machine sets the rules for the production of goods and desires that are indivisible from a repetition of the past (Read, 2008). This means that these codes are the traditions and social memory of society that shape the individual subjects' social identities. Subjectivity does not exist outside of a particular socius. In other words, social subjects originate from the specific traditions and beliefs of that socius.

Additionally, Deleuze and Guattari (1983) state that the capitalist social machine decodes the traditions that define subjective desires or concepts like beauty and ethics. Nevertheless, it is about the capital that capitalism deterritorializes these traditions. They assert the importance of capitalism as a social machine based on the decoded flows that would substitute intrinsic codes with money. They explain that capitalism liberates desire and controls it through social circumstances that limit the dissolution of desire; thus, desire is continuously resisting the force that moves it to its limit. It is here that there is a break from traditional Marxism. Ideology in Marxist discourse differentiates between the proper function of the capitalist system and what the individual wrongly believes about the social structures and his position in capitalism.

Based on this analysis, ideology serves the interest of the capitalist modes of production and makes these modes of production seem natural and necessary. However, to be liberated from the oppressive forces of the capital, the individual may consider these beliefs as ideological and as a false understanding of the social order. It seems that Deleuze and Guattari move in this direction to reject ideology, for when they state that instead of ideology, there are organizations of power, they seek to help the individual be free from the grasp of ideology (Deleuze and Guattari, 2004).

Furthermore, Deleuze and Guattari (2004) explain that desire does not depend on the economic base and is not controlled by ideology. Instead, it belongs to the infrastructure, and it organizes power. They affirm that desire creates a repressive structure, and power unites the economic infrastructure and desire. So it comes out that the Marxist critique explores how capitalism produces a deterritorialized desiring-subject whose job is, similar to the social structure in which he lives, to put other social institutions in the service of capital. Deleuze and Guattari's understanding of Marx demonstrates this recognition that desire is not a superstructure but an infrastructure. Under capitalism, subjective desire arises as capitalist desire and reproduces capitalist power. The next section of this research explains how this idea is similar to what Scott Fitzgerald addresses in his critique of the American dream in his novels.

Result and Discussion

To illustrate Fitzgerald's critique of the American dream, we will explicate the commodification of love in his novels on the basis of Deleuzian desire. In Fitzgerald's fictional world, the dream of his male protagonists is to win a golden girl who embodies money and the colorful promises of life. This golden girl is directly linked to the capital and symbolizes the commodification of desire and the American dream. The following sections show in what ways these heartbroken male characters epitomize the failure of the American dream.

This Side of Paradise and The Beautiful and Damned

The central theme of *This Side of Paradise* is Amory Blaine's experience of love. Throughout this novel, he has unsuccessful love affairs with various girls. Eventually, he falls in love with Rosalind. His love for Rosalind proves to be a passionate affair since it is her refusal that puts him in a catastrophic state. Amory's love for Rosalind is more profound and climactic, and it develops to the degree that it involves the question of his existence. Therefore, he suffers a great deal when Rosalind declines him. She breaks up with him to marry Dawson Ryder, a wealthy man, because she fears a life of responsibility and struggle for money.

Consequently, Amory quits his job and drinks for three weeks to get over Rosalind. Commenting on this part, Thomas J. Stavola (1979: 87) calls the egocentric Rosalind a new Isabelle addicted to the luxury and security of money. Put differently, she is a deterritorialized desiring-subject whose desire for money is a capitalist desire that serves ideology. Rosalind's decision indicates the social reality of the time when financial security is more important than romance: "I dread responsibility. I don't want to think about pots and kitchens and brooms. I want to worry whether my legs will get slick and brown, when I swim in the summer" (Fitzgerald, 1954: 210). Her love is devoid of any responsibilities or commitment.

Similarly, money has a profound significance in the novel, and Amory realizes that poverty is a curse. After his father's death, he falls into financial crisis and declares: "I detest poor people . . . I hate them for being poor. . . It's the ugliest thing in the world. It's essentially cleaner to be corrupt and rich than it is to be innocent and poor" (Fitzgerald, 1954: 275). His gloom intensifies when Amory learns that his mother gives half of her money to the church. When he finds himself trapped in poverty, he judges that communism is better than capitalism. This is the point when Amory is disgusted with capitalism and realizes that ideology serves capitalism. Being left heartbroken and penniless, Amory regards his ambition for love and money as ideological tools that serve capitalism. This understanding helps him be liberated from ideology; thus, he confesses to Mr. Ferrenby: "This is the first time in my life I've

argued Socialism” (Fitzgerald, 1954: 228). He admits that he is “sick of a system where the richest man gets the most beautiful girl if he wants her, where the artist without an income has to sell his talents to a button manufacturer” (Fitzgerald, 1954: 229). Furthermore, Amory notes that capital takes control of politics as well, and his country does not resort to ideal democracy. The congressmen buy their votes and corrupt the system of politics. He exclaims, “For two cents the voter buys his politics, prejudices, and philosophy” (Fitzgerald, 1954: 230).

While love is an important theme in *This Side of Paradise*, in *The Beautiful and Damned*, money dominates the life of Anthony and Gloria. Anthony’s expected inheritance convinces Gloria Gilbert, the golden girl, to marry him. In the beginning, Gloria’s parents are against this marriage because Anthony is not rich. Anthony, who is financially inferior to Gloria, struggles to win her love. After they get married, Anthony gets into a lawsuit with his grandfather, Adam Patch, who deprives him of his legacy in his will. Although, in the end, Anthony wins the case, it is too late. By that time, his potential is exhausted, and Gloria’s youth and beauty are wasted. In the middle of their married life, when they have spent most of their bank money, they began to look for jobs. For a short time, the husband works at an advertising firm, and the wife attempts to become an actress. However, both of them prove unsuccessful in their careers; in fact, they seem to be the victims of a corrupt society that has ignored tradition (Lee, 1989). In other words, Anthony’s subjective identity, which originates from the specific beliefs and traditions of the socius, is deterritorialized and defined by money. This makes it clear that their marriage is not filled with love. They do not have any commitment to their marriage. For example, Gloria once said: “I am a solid block of ice” (Fitzgerald, 1986: 57). As she lacks judgment, she takes money for the most valuable thing in life. Anthony’s situation also teaches him that life does not move forward without money. In such conditions, Anthony is attracted by two dominant forces operative in American society. One is money, and the other is an endless love that he at first thought, would generate a feeling of identity within him (Stavola, 1979).

In *This Side of Paradise* and *The Beautiful and Damned*, Amory and Anthony search for money and love. However, they fail to realize that their desires for a sense of identity that they are determined to link to their dream-girls are still really attached to capital, since both Rosalind and Gloria are far affluent than themselves and are dependent on money. Amory and Anthony fail to establish a sense of their identity because they are consumed by a capitalistic system that defines the self-actualization of the people through money and consumerism. This failure is comparable with Deleuze and Guattari’s belief that desire produces subjects as becoming. From their eyes, structures of power express

legitimate conceptions of desire. As a result, Amory and Anthony's search for love is a search for an infinite possibility that is still fettered to the system. Fitzgerald shows that had Amory won Rosalind as Anthony did with Gloria, the result would be the same: They will never transcend into a greater whole that would free them from a lost, hopeless battle of capitalistic bondage.

The Great Gatsby and Tender Is the Night

In *The Great Gatsby* and *Tender Is the Night*, money and love are the central issues. These novels present strong love stories that lead to the downfall of their heroes. *The Great Gatsby* is perhaps the best fictional depiction of the illusion that the American dream brings. Jay Gatsby's ambition is based on a "vast, vulgar, and meretricious beauty," and he is not more than dimly aware of the corruption of his dream (Fitzgerald, 1925: 125). However, after Gatsby's death, Nick Caraway comes to believe that "what preyed on Gatsby, what foul dust floated in the wake of his dreams..." is responsible for the disaster (Fitzgerald, 1925: 135). Thus, Gatsby's dream, based on his "extraordinary gift for hope, his romantic readiness and his heightened sensibility to the promises of life" as it is, fails because it is based on the materials provided by the American society (Fitzgerald, 1925: 88). Lionel Trilling (1950: 185) remarks that the writers of the twenties ventured to come to terms with American society's inward experience. He argues that they were concerned with the formation of the Americans as the products of a new social experiment. Therefore, the personal contradictions that Fitzgerald has experienced enhance the implications of the dream for his fictional characters.

The failure of Gatsby's dream shows that he is subject to the law of the capital that demands one's labor in exchange for money. It seems that this idea is supported by Deleuze and Guattari's critique of Marx: Gatsby's desire to win Daisy and attain the wealth and glamour that her world represents, becomes an actual commodity under capitalism. This commodity is connected to other commodities Gatsby buys, like his yellow Rolls Royce or his hydroplane, to impress Daisy. Gatsby's labor makes him rich, and based on the illusion that capitalism creates, he is free to fulfill his desire and win Daisy. However, Deleuze and Guattari agree with Marx that Desire belongs to the infrastructure. They explain that since ideology serves the capital, it controls subjective desire and directs it toward the reproduction of the capital. This shows that desire is a component of capitalism, and the system creates the illusion that the individual can attain all that he desires through his labor, while in reality, desire is controlled by the ideology that serves the system. Therefore, the fact that there is no liberation of desire, is the trap into which Gatsby falls. In other words, by following Daisy, Gatsby accepts the dream of

getting rich, a dream that the capitalist social system has implanted in him. Although he becomes a rich man, he has to abandon his desire to get Daisy and take the membership of her social class. This failure is due to Gatsby's threat to the maintenance of capitalism as a system controlled by the aristocrats. In the first pages of the novel, this crisis is depicted in Tom's violent outburst: "Civilization's going to pieces" (Fitzgerald, 1925: 14). As a member of the dominant class, Tom is worried that the lower class, including the inferior race, are taking control of the system, and he believes that this is anarchy. Gatsby is a real threat to Tom because the former wants to steal the latter's love commodity (Daisy) from Tom. Just as ideology abates any genuine threat to capitalism, Tom's measures that lead to Gatsby's death ensure the elimination of a threat to capitalism.

In *Tender Is the Night*, the relationship between love and money is manifested on a larger scale. This novel is about Dr. Dick Diver's mutual love with Nicole Diver and Rosemary Hoyt. Nicole Diver is, at first, one of his wealthy patients, but later she becomes his wife. Rosemary Hoyt is a beautiful young actress. A significant part of the novel deals with money and represents the life of the American expatriates in France who are on pleasure trips.

In this novel, love affairs are almost like a theatrical performance. Dick acts as a paternal figure in his relationships. Nicole is a psychiatric patient who is the victim of an incestuous affair with her father, Mr. Devereux Warren. Dick's sympathy and devotion to her treatment that is like paternal love, make her fall in love with Dick, and in their relationships, she acts as a daughter. On the other hand, Rosemary's love for Dick is like the role of an actress, a game that her mother, Mrs. Speers, stages for her. Rosemary tells Dick: "I think you're the most wonderful person I ever met – except my mother" (Fitzgerald, 1955: 38). She further tells Dick: "My mother. She decides business matters. I couldn't do without her" (Fitzgerald, 1955: 24). So, Mrs. Speers is a mother who manipulates her daughter for money because love has no value with her. She warns Rosemary, "You are brought up to work – not especially to marry. . . Wound yourself or him – whatever happens, it can't spoil you because economically you're a boy, not a girl!" (Fitzgerald, 1955: 40). Yet, for Rosemary, it is not easy to step forward because she is familiar with "her mother's middle-class mind, associated with her attitude about money" (Fitzgerald, 1955: 54). Like Amory in *This Side of Paradise*, Dick is repelled by capitalistic ideology and notices that love is used as a commodity exchange for money. In this way, the essential fact in the triangular love of Nicole, Dick, and Rosemary is that the couples are not committed to each other.

Like Rosemary's mother, Nicole's sister, Baby Warren, degrades Dick for his excessive pride in her parental money. Baby encourages Nicole to leave Dick for Tommy Barban. Like Mrs. Speers, Baby believes that money is superior to love and that with money, one can buy everything, including love. The wealthy Mr. Warren once hired even Dick to act in love with the unstable Nicole. Thus, the strong desire for money in this novel represents Deleuze and Guattari's belief that desire belongs to the infrastructure. They claim that it is desire that organizes the power. Likewise, Fitzgerald shows that the Warrens' wealth grants them power over the other characters like Dick.

While Nicole is an aristocrat, Rosemary is a successful movie star, and so both of them are financially secure. Therefore, they look at love as an accessory and as a commodity in their lives. For example, there are many instances of Nicole and Baby's money-oriented egoism. Baby acclaims that doctors "could be purchased in the intellectual stockyards of the South Side of Chicago" (Fitzgerald, 1955: 217). After their separation, when Nicole marries Tommy and Dick establishes his office in Buffalo, Nicole writes to Dick to see whether he needed money or not (Fitzgerald, 1955: 326). Her behavior is not out of love or sympathy for Dick but out of selfish egoism rooted in money. Additionally, Baby Warren plays a significant role in Dick's decline and Nicole's love. She boastfully refers to their rail-road property to humiliate Dick: "There's a lot of business, - the property we used to call the station property . . . it belonged to Mother. It's a question of investing the money" (Fitzgerald, 1955: 230).

Baby takes part in the critical decisions of the Warren family, including Nicole's psychiatric treatment. Like Tom Buchanan in *The Great Gatsby*, Baby Warren strongly believes in ancestral pedigree and critically investigates Dick's ancestry before his marriage to Nicole. She is skeptical about the marriage and continuously tries to debase Dick. Later, Baby defies Dick's independent individuality by telling him: "We own you, and you'll admit it sooner or later. It is absurd to keep up the pretense of independence" (Fitzgerald, 1955: 233). Eventually, Baby persuades Nicole to divorce Dick and to marry Tommy. Nicole also changes and becomes like her sister: "Nicole had been designed for change, for flight, with money as fins and wings." (Fitzgerald, 1955: 302). Fitzgerald describes the change that comes upon Nicole in this way: "Nicole is now made of - of Georgian pine, which is the hardest wood known, except lignum vitae from New Zealand" (Fitzgerald, 1955: 299).

In *Tender Is the Night*, Fitzgerald presents another perspective on the relationship between love and money. Unlike *Gatsby*, who is independent both financially and professionally, Dick lacks Nicole's financial security and Rosemary's professional prosperity. He believes



that love can free him from his unhappy situation. Nevertheless, similar to *Gatsby*, the faith in love betrays Dick. *Gatsby* and Dick fail to notice that in their capitalistic society, love depends on money and that love is like a commodity that can be bought. William Fahey (1973: 60) describes Fitzgerald's depiction of American society as a monetary society filled with superficial pleasures.

To Fitzgerald, the weakness of his country is its restlessness. For him, the independence that his nation seeks means the rejection of historical responsibility. Thus, the rejection of tradition deviates Americans from the right path of the dream, and Fitzgerald (1945: 184) believes that this leads to unhappiness. He makes it clear that his belief about the ruling passions of his country is universally applicable: "This is what I think now: that the natural state of the sentient adult is a qualified unhappiness". The unhappiness that Fitzgerald describes is the condition of the Post-Renaissance man who has survived the war and has come to reject any ties with the previous generation. Therefore, it can be suggested that Fitzgerald has an attitude of acceptance, and similar to *Gatsby*, he is hopeful about the future. In the imaginative history of the American civilization, Fitzgerald has discovered a universal model of desire that would lead to happiness as long as it is linked to tradition. Like Deleuze and Guattari, Fitzgerald implies that the dream is a desire that belongs to the infrastructure. Moreover, the protagonists of Fitzgerald's novels follow the commodification of a dream that results from ignoring historical responsibility.

Conclusion

Deleuze and Guattari's critique of capitalism analyzes how the capitalist social machine deterritorializes subjective desires. They demonstrate that in a capitalistic society, subjective desire arises as a capitalist desire that reproduces the capitalist power. Therefore, capitalism transforms subjective desires into insatiable needs for commodities and then comes to control them for the sole purpose of reproducing and sustaining the capital. The American dream is a version of capitalistic desire because it depends upon the satisfaction of commodities. Furthermore, it continuously represses the laborer working to fulfill his dreams while, in reality, his labor makes the upper class wealthier.

In his novels, Fitzgerald has embodied the contradictions of the American experience such as success and failure, dream and nightmare, illusion, and disillusionment. He has chronicled a schizophrenic society that desperately follows wild and carefree sensations that attach it to the Jazz Age of the 1920s, while its values are on the edge of decadence. However, Fitzgerald's novels remind one that things are not as simple as this. In his fiction, the pursuit of happiness is a euphemism for

possessions. The effect of class differences on personal ambitions is a further issue in Fitzgerald's fiction. Ghasemi and Tiur (2009) point out that Fitzgerald develops an awareness of social life that can fulfill an ideal dream either through personal ambition or a life committed to some private ideal. To achieve this purpose, Fitzgerald provides a first-hand account of this *brave new world* and the fevered imagination. His fiction analyses the corruption of the American dream in industrial America, which is not other than the meaning of a pursuit doomed to failure. At first, Fitzgerald's hero is compelled to follow his Romantic dreams and desires. Nevertheless, his dreams and desires are later shattered by the materials that the social structures offer as substitutes to them, and it is in this way that the American culture makes the subject always dependent on the capital and thus perpetually unsatisfied.

In the fiction of Fitzgerald, the American dream has two goals. For one, it is a search for eternal beauty and youth. Along with this, the essence of the American dream is the illusion of happiness that surrounds the leisure class. Nevertheless, its second goal is money which is a familiar Anglo-Saxon ideal of salvation. However, Fitzgerald condemns these burning ambitions because they ground the appearance of a monopoly of privileges as well as the commodification of love. This belief is in line with Deleuze and Guattari's (1983: 139) process of deterritorialization within capitalism, in which the "inscribing socius" or the traditions decide the predominance of specific concepts and characteristics over the others. As a result, when beauty and youth that belong only to the aristocracy are commercialized, money becomes the only means via which the individual can attain them. Thus, love transforms into a dream, and glamour is promised to the individual as long as he obtains money.

Fitzgerald's novels deal with how class differences make an impact on personal ambitions. In his fiction, he illustrates the American dream's corruption in industrial America through a close connection between money and love. Amory's love for Rosalind, Anthony's love for Gloria, Gatsby's love for Daisy, and Dick's love for Nicole are desires for wealth and luxury. Hence, in Fitzgerald's story-world, love is commodified. His heroes follow a recurrent pattern that dictates their aspiration for money and love as they meet their tragic fates. They suffer deplorable frustrations by chasing their dreams, and they fail to have complete control over their life because they live in a capitalistic society where money controls life and man is often measured in terms of material success and money. In this context, fiction is used as a tool that reveals the truth about our world. Here, there is a reversed relationship between fiction and reality, so fiction helps us better understand reality. In other words, Fitzgerald's fiction is a moral lesson on the failures of

the American dream. Fitzgerald's analysis of reality in his fiction is similar to Deleuze and Guattari's reading of Marx. Both of them carefully analyze the nature of the forces that operate within a real or fictional world.

REFERENCES:

- Deleuze, Gilles, and Felix Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia Volume I*. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1983.
- Deleuze, Gilles, and Felix Guattari, *On Capitalist Desire*, in David Lapoujade, ed., *Desert Islands and Other Texts: 1953-1974*, Los Angeles and New York, Semiotext(e), 2004.
- Deleuze, Gilles, and Claire Parnet, *A Conversation: What is it? What is it for?* in *Dialogues II*, 1-35, New York, Columbia University Press, 2007.
- Fahey, William. A., *F. Scott Fitzgerald and the American Dream*, New York, Crowell, 1973.
- Fitzgerald, F. Scott, *The Beautiful and Damned*, New York, Macmillan Publishing Company, 1986.
- Fitzgerald, F. Scott, *The Crack-Up*, New York, New Directions, 1945.
- Fitzgerald, F. Scott, *The Great Gatsby*, New York, Scribner's, 1925.
- Fitzgerald, F. Scott, *Tender Is the Night*, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1955.
- Fitzgerald, F. Scott, *This Side of Paradise*, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1954.
- Ghasemi, Parvin, and Mitra Tiur, *The Promise and Failure of the American Dream in Scott Fitzgerald's Fiction*, in "K@ta: a Biannual Publication on the Study of Language and Literature", 11.2, 2009, p. 117-127.
- Guattari, Felix, *Chaosophy: Texts and Interviews 1972-1977*, MIT Press, 2008.
- Lee, Robert, *Scott Fitzgerald: The Promises of Life*, New York, St. Martin's Press, 1989.
- Marx, Karl, *Capital: Volume One: A Critique of Political Economy*, United States, Dover Publications, 2019.
- Marx, Karl, *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*, in R. Tucker, ed., *The Marx-Engels Reader*, New York and London, Norton, 1978, p. 66-125.
- Marx, Karl, *Grundrisse: Foundations of the Critique of Political Economy*, Penguin Books Limited, 2005.
- Marx, Karl and Friedrich Engels, *The Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844 and the Communist Manifesto*, Prometheus Books, 2009.
- Mizener, Arthur, *F. Scott Fitzgerald: A collection of critical essays*, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, 1963.
- Pfeifer, G., *The Question of Capitalist Desire: Deleuze and Guattari with Marx*, in "Continental Thought and Theory: A Journal of Intellectual Freedom", 1.4, 2017, p. 254-269.

Read, Jason D., *The Age of Cynicism: Deleuze and Guattari on the Production of Subjectivity in Capitalism*, in I. Buchanan and N. Thoburn, eds., *Deleuze and Politics*, Edinburgh University Press, 2008, p. 139-159.

Stavola, Thomas J., *F. Scott Fitzgerald: Crisis in an American Identity*, London, Vision, 1979.

Tomsic, Samo, *The Capitalist Unconscious: Marx and Lacan*, Verso Books, 2016.

Trilling, Lionel, *The liberal imagination*, New York, Viking Press, 1950.