II

THE FOUNTAINHEAD AS LITERATURE AND AS PHILOSOPHY

6

The Fountainhead as a Romantic Novel

Tore Boeckmann

This is the Heller House:

> The house on the sketches had been designed not by Roark, but by the cliff on which it stood. It was as if the cliff had grown and completed itself and proclaimed the purpose for which it had been waiting. The house was broken into many levels, following the ledges of the rock, rising as it rose, in gradual masses, in planes flowing together up into one consummate harmony. The walls, of the same granite as the rock, continued its vertical lines upward; the wide, projecting terraces of concrete, silver as the sea, followed the line of the waves, of the straight horizon. (124)

The Heller House, Howard Roark's first commission in *The Fountainhead*, is designed according to the architectural principles he has proclaimed in the novel's opening chapter:

> Here are my rules: what can be done with one substance must never be done with another. No two materials are alike. No two sites on earth are alike. No two buildings have the same purpose. The purpose, the site, the material determine the shape. Nothing can be reasonable or beautiful unless it's made by one central idea, and the idea sets every detail. A building is alive, like a man. Its integrity is to follow its own truth, its one single theme, and to serve its own single purpose. . . . Its maker gives it the soul and every wall, window and stairway to express it. (24)

What is the "one central idea" of the Heller House? We cannot be certain, since the house exists only as a brief description

in a novel. But one feature of that description is striking: the combination of walls, which continue the vertical lines of the rock, and projecting terraces, which follow the lines of the sea and the horizon.

Not only the site, but the materials used are integrated with this idea: the granite of the walls is the same as the rock, the concrete of the terraces is "silver as the sea." And as for the building's purpose, when Austen Heller tells Roark, "You were very considerate of me," Roark answers, "You know, I haven't thought of you at all. I thought of the house. Perhaps that's why I knew how to be considerate of you" (136–37). The implication is not that Roark was indifferent to his client's needs, but that these were so well integrated into the central design idea that Roark could just go ahead and let the building "follow its own truth."[1]

A central idea, in Roark's sense, determines everything else about an artwork. It "sets every detail." It is the artist's standard of selection, governing all his choices. And if the Heller House's central idea is indeed found in the description given of the house,[2] then, qua standard of selection, this idea has several interrelated characteristics worth noting.

First, the idea is an original creation of Roark's.

Second, the idea is unique to the Heller House. "The purpose, the site, the material determine the shape"—and these are different for every building. The site of the Heller House is particularly unusual, as is the client (and thus the purpose). So Roark has not simply copied the central idea of some other building; and he will design no more Heller Houses.

Third, the Heller House's central idea is *internal* to the building and its site, a part of their *substance.* The idea is not an abstraction like "the abode of a crusading columnist," but an imagined combination of the actual granite, concrete, sea, and horizon that will constitute the house, site, and wider setting.

These characteristics of Roark's central idea point to a distinctive method of artistic creation. "Creation," in Ayn Rand's words, "means the power to bring into existence an arrangement (or combination or integration) of natural elements that had not existed before."[3] In a superficial sense, any building is a creative achievement. But the Heller House is much more profoundly creative than most buildings, since Roark has originated not only the combination of natural elements which constitutes the completed house, but also the *standard of selection* governing his design of this totality. That standard, Roark's "one central idea," is *itself* an original combination of natural elements, unique to the Heller House, internal to it, a part—the core part—of its substance.

Creation by means of such *core combinations* is, I submit, the method of artists like Howard Roark—and of the romantic school of art.[4]

THE CLASSICIST STANDARD

In *The Fountainhead*, Roark confronts the influence of architectural classicism. For instance, it is demanded of him that he give his design for the Manhattan Bank Company building a classical façade, which means adding columns and an entablature designed by the rules of one of the five classical orders. (The bank's board suggests Doric.) Such a façade bears no relation to Roark's central idea for the building, and so he turns down the commission.

The combination of Roark's modern design and a classical façade would be a bastard abomination to a true classicist no less than to Roark. But consider how Roark's method of creation differs from that of the classicist who sets out to design, by his own standards, a *good* classical building. This architect knows from the start that his façade must have columns and an entablature—regardless of the building's purpose, site, or material. Further, the columns must have a shaft, a capital, and (except in the Doric order) a base, and the entablature an architrave, a frieze, and a cornice. The radius of the columns is the module that decides the relative sizes of the other elements; for instance, if the order is Doric, the columns are fourteen modules high, the architrave one module high, the capitals two and one-sixth modules wide (according to Vitruvius in *De Architectura*). In the Doric order, the shafts must have flutes. Whatever the order, the building must be horizontally symmetrical.

This is just a brief indication of the mind-numbingly complex set of rules that governs not merely the façade, but every part of a classical building's design. Indeed, it has been said (with some exaggeration) that from the tiniest fragment of a classical building, the whole can always be reconstructed. Given a few optional parameters like the size of the building and the order, the rules set every detail. They are a classicist architect's standard of selection.

This standard is obviously not an original creation of the individual architect, or unique to his building, but derives from ancient models and authorities. Nor is the standard internal to the substance of a building. Rather, the rules are imposed from outside, from the textbooks, on the building's material, purpose, and site.

We can see why Howard Roark, in the first chapter of *The Fountainhead*, tells the dean of his school, "I see no purpose in

doing Renaissance villas" (22). The classicist method of creation is the exact opposite of his own. The Dean, a champion of classicism, tells Roark:

> You must learn to understand—and it has been proved by all authorities—that everything beautiful in architecture has been done already. There is a treasure mine in every style of the past. We can only choose from the great masters. Who are we to improve upon them? We can only attempt, respectfully, to repeat. (23)

According to the Dean, "all the proper forms of expression have been discovered long ago" (24). Roark replies, "Expression—of what? The Parthenon did not serve the same purpose as its wooden ancestor. An airline terminal does not serve the same purpose as the Parthenon" (24). And yet, as Roark comments, "here we are, making copies in steel and concrete of copies in plaster of copies in marble of copies in wood" (24).

Roark's meeting with the Dean takes place in 1922, almost a century after Victor Hugo published his play *Cromwell* (1827), with its famous "Preface" that became the manifesto of the romantic movement in literature. In words that closely foreshadow Roark's confrontation with the Dean, Hugo attacks the classicist literary establishment of his time. "We were told that everything was done, and God was forbidden to create more Molières or Corneilles. Memory was put in place of imagination."[5] Hugo rejects the classicist "unities" of time and place, according to which the action of a play must unfold in one day and in a single location; and to the anticipated objection that "this rule that you discard is borrowed from the Greek drama," he answers, "Wherein, pray, do the Greek stage and drama resemble our stage and drama?"[6]

He asks:

> And whom are we to copy, I pray to know? The ancients? We have just shown that their stage has nothing in common with ours. . . .
>
> Whom shall we copy, then? The moderns? What! copy copies![7]

Just as Roark tells the Dean that "what can be done with one substance must never be done with another," Hugo says:

> Every plot has its proper duration as well as its appropriate place. Think of administering the same dose of time to all events! of applying the same measure to everything! You would laugh at a

> cobbler who should attempt to put the same shoe on every foot.[8]

Like the rules of architectural classicism, the unities of time and place are not the original creation of the individual artist, or unique to his work. They derive from ancient models and, supposedly, from the authority of Aristotle (who does not in fact prescribe them). As standards of selection, they are not internal to the subject matter of any given play but are imposed from outside, from the textbooks, on whatever plot idea an author starts with.

The unities of time and place govern primarily the organization of a classical play's events, but the standard that governs the nature of the events themselves is just as external to the playwright's subject matter. As one scholar puts it:

> The work of the classical artist is to give individual expression, the beauty of form, to a body of common sentiments and thoughts which he shares with his audience, thoughts and views which have for his generation the validity of universal truths.[9]

In literature, this attitude led the classicists to make conventional ideas of *propriety* a standard of selection. For instance, they objected when, in *Hernani*, Victor Hugo has a noblewoman fall in love with a bandit. For a woman to love beneath her station was improper by common sentiment and thought. Two centuries earlier, in the heyday of classicism, Corneille was attacked for having the hero of *Le Cid* appear before the heroine after he has killed her father—a similar breach of etiquette.

In the classicist view, the inclusion of such behavior in a story is as incongruous as a Doric column without flutes. Literary characters must conform to social conventions—and this is a literary convention to which an author must conform.

THE PLOT-THEME AS A LITERARY CORE COMBINATION

Rejecting the unities of time and place, Hugo champions the "unity of plot":

> This one is as essential as the other two are useless. It is the one which fixes the view-point of the drama; now, by that very fact, it excludes the other two. There can no more be three unities in the drama than three horizons in a picture.[10]

Like unity of time and place, plot is a kind of formal organization. Ayn Rand defines it as "a purposeful progression of logically connected events leading to the resolution of a climax."[11] However, in contrast to unity of time and place, unity of plot is not imposed from outside on a story's subject matter but springs from within, from the core of that subject matter itself.

Plot is based on conflict and presupposes what Ayn Rand calls a "plot-theme." The plot-theme is "the central conflict or 'situation' of a story—a conflict in terms of action, corresponding to the theme and complex enough to create a purposeful progression of events."[12] How does the central conflict "create" a plot progression? By virtue of its inner logic, which makes it unfold in a series of logically connected events.

In a plot story, the *plot-theme* is the standard of selection, the central idea that determines everything else and sets every detail. For instance, as Hugo puts it, subplots are allowable only on the condition that "these parts, being skillfully subordinated to the general plan, shall tend constantly toward the central plot."[13] Similarly, since the plot-theme determines the plot, it also determines (to repeat Hugo's phrase) the plot's "proper duration as well as its appropriate place."

The plot-theme is an original creation of the writer's, a new combination of natural elements, unique to the given story. A plot-theme is a different kind of combination than the central idea for the Heller House: a writer works not with granite and concrete and the line of the horizon, but with human action and motivation, and the elements of these are what he rearranges. But in a deeper sense, a plot-theme is exactly like Roark's central architectural idea: both constitute a standard of selection internal to an artwork—a standard at the core of the work's substance.

Both are *core combinations.*

THE CORE COMBINATION OF *THE FOUNTAINHEAD*

The relationship between Howard Roark and Dominique Francon is only a part, although an important part, of the central conflict situation in *The Fountainhead*—yet even on its own, this relationship is a core combination in miniature.

Prior to meeting Roark, Dominique has "kept herself clean and free in a single passion—to touch nothing" (242). The world, she believes, recognizes no true ideals and thus is poised to crush them.

> You want a thing and it's precious to you. Do you
> know who is standing ready to tear it out of your

> hands? You can't know, it may be so involved and so far away, but someone is ready, and you're afraid of them all. And you cringe and you crawl and you beg and you accept them—just so they'll let you keep it. (143)

Dominique's answer is to pursue no serious values. "If I found a job, a project, an idea or a person I wanted—I'd have to depend on the whole world" (143). This she refuses to do—not out of indifference to values as such, but out of a strong desire to protect them from an inimical world. When asked, "What if you found something you wanted?" she answers, "I won't find it. I won't choose to see it" (144).

Then she goes to her father's granite quarry, stands at "the edge of the great stone bowl," and she "looked down."

> She knew it was the most beautiful face she would ever see, because it was the abstraction of strength made visible. She felt a convulsion of anger, of protest, of resistance—and of pleasure. (204–5)

Dominique "had lost the freedom she loved" (209). She has found a great value that ties her to the world. She tries to stay away from the quarry, but she comes back again and again. Recognizing Roark as a true hero, she cannot resist the desire to see him. Nor can she resist him when he comes to her at night. She does not give him "the one answer that would have saved her: an answer of simple revulsion—she had found joy in her revulsion, in her terror and in his strength" (219).

The relationship of Roark and Dominique, and Dominique's inner conflict, is an original creation of Ayn Rand's—a new combination of natural elements. That some men are heroes; that some women are hero-worshipers; that some think the good is doomed to defeat; that some act to avoid whatever threatens their freedom or purity of soul; that men and women fall in love; that lovers seek the sight of their beloved, and have sex—all of this can be observed in the world. But the combination of these elements into the conflict of a woman torn between an idealistic withdrawal from values and her passionate love for a hero—that is unique to *The Fountainhead.*

This situation functions as a standard of selection for the rest of the novel. For instance, the situation dictates the violence of Roark and Dominique's first sexual encounter, where she resists him with every means possible *except* those that would actually stop him (calling for help or showing revulsion). Given her love for Roark, Dominique does not stop him; given her struggle against that love, she resists him. Any other kind of sex scene,

featuring, say, a sultrily seductive or sensuously eager Dominique, would be incongruous in the context of the central conflict.

The same conflict determines Dominique's later actions. When she is told that the man "with very bright orange hair" has left the quarry for New York, she makes an unusual decision. "She would not ask for his name. It was her last chance of freedom" (220). But she returns to New York and goes for long walks through the streets. "Each step through the streets hurt her now. She was tied to him—as he was tied to every part of the city. . . . She came home, after these walks, shaking with fever. She went out again the next day" (242–43). These actions express both Dominique's love for Roark and her resistance to that love.

Dominique's campaign to sabotage Roark's career also flows from the central conflict.

Seeing a drawing of Roark's Enright House, she judges it "the most beautiful building in New York" (273). She learns that its architect is the man she loves. When her acquaintance Joel Sutton plans to give Roark a big commission, Dominique skillfully manipulates him to give the commission to Peter Keating instead. That night she comes to Roark and tells him, "I'm going to fight you—and I'm going to destroy you. . . . I will fight to block every step you take. I will fight to tear every chance you want away from you" (272).

Dominique thinks that Roark's dedication to his career makes him vulnerable to the world, which will not merely destroy him, but given his genius, destroy him through a process of slow torture. She wants to spare him this torture—by hastening his defeat. As she says, "when I go swimming I don't like to torture myself getting into cold water by degrees. I dive right in and it's a nasty shock, but after that the rest is not so hard to take" (248). Dominique in effect wants to push Roark into the cold water, to make the rest not so hard to take.

Dominique first meets Roark when he works in the quarry; and she starts her campaign against his career a few hours after Ellsworth Toohey tells her about the terrible struggle with society that led Roark to such a position. These facts are important for understanding her actions: they make her motives concretely real. Since Roark was once reduced to a workman after making a promising start, Dominique can realistically fear that it will happen again (as indeed it almost does, after the Stoddard trial). Dominique *could* have sabotaged Roark's career simply on the basis of her general premises. As she tells him, "Roark, everything I've done all my life is because it's the kind of world that made you work in a quarry last summer" (284). But this is a very abstract statement of Dominique's unusual motives. Her motives appear much more forceful and pressing when, with reference to the

actual quarry incident, she says, "Roark, you worked in that quarry when you had the Enright House in you, and many other Enright Houses, and you were drilling granite" (273).

Dominique is here reacting to the conflict of Roark versus society—an element of the plot-theme of *The Fountainhead* different from the Roark-Dominique conflict. The *combination* of these two plot-theme conflict strands is what leads inevitably to Dominique's campaign.

A third strand is constituted by the relationship between Roark and Gail Wynand.

Like Dominique, Wynand has concluded that idealism has no chance against society. The difference is that Wynand—who has "the will of life, the prime power" (483)—does not retreat from the world. He wants to act, to live for his own sake, and so he pursues the only means to that end he thinks possible: power. "I wanted power over a collective soul and I got it" (604). His tool is the *New York Banner*—a popular newspaper he has built by expressing "the opinions, the desires, the tastes of the majority" (603).

"I've never justified myself to anyone" (493), Wynand tells Dominique in a line that is telling but untrue. For Wynand to "justify himself" would contradict his entire philosophy: it is precisely in order to act without justifying himself to anyone that he has sought power, believing that reason and justice are impotent among men. Yet no man can give up his integrity and not feel unclean—or, if he has Wynand's soul, a sense of treason. Thus, without understanding his own motive, Wynand is driven to justify himself *to himself*.

He does so by breaking men of integrity, like Dwight Carson, a talented young champion of individualism whom he drives to write a column extolling the masses. This "proves" to Wynand that integrity is a sham. "The man I couldn't break would destroy me. But I've spent years finding out how safe I am," Wynand tells Dominique. "The thing I've missed"—or, in another words, betrayed—"it doesn't exist" (497).

And then he meets Roark.

It is love at first sight. Each man responds to "the prime power" in the other—and Wynand responds to Roark's integrity. Yet given Roark's professional success (at this point of the story), his integrity is a threat to Wynand. "According to my judgment and experience," Wynand says, "you should have remained in the gutter" (548). Roark's existence disproves Wynand's philosophy, so Wynand decides to break him. He has commissioned a residence from Roark, and he tells him that the house will be the last Howard Roark design. Thereafter, Roark will build in historical styles—"within forms chosen by the taste of the people"

(532)—or Wynand will drive him to bankruptcy and make sure even the granite quarries are closed to him.

Roark gaily adapts the elevation of the Wynand house on the back of an envelope. Confronted with this demonstration of what his demand would mean in practice, Wynand gives in.

Wynand is not destroyed by this defeat. He has another way of justifying himself. "I've sold my life," he tells Roark, "but I got a good price. Power. I've never used it. I couldn't afford a personal desire. But now I'm free. Now I can use it for what I want. For what I believe. For Dominique. For you" (604).

His opportunity comes with the Cortlandt Homes affair. When Roark's design of this housing project is disfigured by politically connected second-handers, Roark blows up the project. In the frenzy of public hysteria against Roark, Wynand steps forward to defend him. "We've always made public opinion," he tells his staff. "Let's make it. Sell Roark" (624).

They are powerless to do so. The support of the *Banner* hurts Roark instead of helping him. As for the *Banner*, Wynand's lawyer says: "An unpopular cause is a dangerous business for anyone. For a popular newspaper—it's suicide" (628). The *Banner* is almost destroyed, and Wynand gives in to popular pressure, abandoning Roark's cause. He realizes that in catering to the mob, he has turned himself into its slave. "Here I am, my masters," he says, addressing in his mind the faceless masses. "I am coming to salute you and acknowledge, wherever you want me, I shall go as I'm told. I'm the man who wanted power" (659).

Roark's acquittal at his trial is his final triumph and the seal of Wynand's defeat.

The central conflict situation of *The Fountainhead* is the standard that governs the choice of these events. Given the characters of Roark and Wynand, it is logical that they would love each other, that Wynand would try to break Roark, and that Roark—the ultimately stronger personality—would prevail in this encounter. It is logical that defending Roark against the collectivist society would be the cause in which Wynand decides to test his power over the mob—and that he will find his power illusory.

In the climax, the separate plot-theme strands again work as a unity. Wynand at first sides with Roark in his conflict against society. And for Dominique, Wynand's defeat is the ultimate confirmation that the men she thought owned the world "don't own it. They own nothing. They've never won. I have seen the life of Gail Wynand, and now I know" (665). She does not have to fear that the world will crush Roark.

Ayn Rand once said that *We the Living* has the best plot of all her novels, "because it's a simple story" that has "almost a classic progression of one event leading to another." *The*

Fountainhead and *Atlas Shrugged* have plots, she continued, "but on so grand a scale, and with so many involvements, that they are not as perfect one-line plots as in *We the Living*."[14]

In making this comparative literary judgment, Ayn Rand is applying unity of plot as an external standard. But she did not do so in plotting *The Fountainhead.* Instead of imposing some kind of "perfect unity" on the novel, she let the plot-theme govern the choice of events. Observe that the superior unity of *We the Living* springs from the simplicity of its central situation.[15] *The Fountainhead* has a much more complex plot-theme, encompassing the three conflict strands we have discussed, and also the characters of Peter Keating and Ellsworth Toohey. The development of this complexity cannot form a textbook example. But since the plot-theme strands do constitute a unity, they create a coherent novel—of monumental scope.

In *The Fountainhead*, Dominique sabotages the career of a hero of independence and integrity. Wynand tries to coerce this same hero to abandon his principles and cater to the mob. Ayn Rand regarded both of these characters as moral, although profoundly mistaken. In making this judgment, she was applying her moral philosophy as an external standard. But she did not do so in choosing the events of the novel. She did not ask herself, What would a moral person do in this or that situation? A moral person, holding Ayn Rand's philosophy, would not act like Dominique or Wynand. Rather, Ayn Rand asked herself, What would *Dominique* do, in the context of this particular plot development, given her particular premises? What would *Wynand* do? (I am not here presumptuously putting thoughts in Ayn Rand's brain, but describing the *method* of romantic plot construction.)

Ayn Rand is not a classicist and does not use morality (let alone propriety) as an external standard of artistic selection.[16] She selects by the standard of her core combination, the plot-theme, which is of her own creation, unique to her novel, and part of its subject matter.

NATURALISM IN *THE FOUNTAINHEAD*

The action of *The Fountainhead* spans eighteen years and locations from New York City to the South Pacific. Yet the literati of Ayn Rand's time were not outraged by her violation of the unities of time and place. They were outraged by something else. People like Howard Roark, Dominique Francon, and Gail Wynand, they fumed—as their heirs are fuming still—do not exist. The events of *The Fountainhead* mirror nothing observable in the world around us.

Victor Hugo had won the battle against literary classicism. After the "Preface to *Cromwell*," romanticism flourished briefly as the dominant school. Then it was supplanted by naturalism—the portrayal of "things as they are." It was against naturalism that Ayn Rand would be fighting *her* esthetic battle.

What is the naturalist standard of selection?

Consider the following touches from *Elmer Gantry*, Sinclair Lewis's portrayal of a smarmy American evangelist.

At the beginning, Elmer is a boorish young lout. His views on religion are characteristic of his type: "after giving minutes and minutes to theological profundities Elmer had concluded that 'there must be something to all this religious guff if all these wise old birds believe it, and some time a fellow had ought to settle down and cut out the hell-raising.'"[17]

Much later in the novel, at a low point in his career as a preacher, Elmer makes a brief excursion into the New Age (or "New Thought") movement of his time. What is his attitude?

> In some ways he preferred New Thought to standard Protestantism. It was safer to play with. He had never been sure but that there might be something to the doctrines he had preached as an evangelist. Perhaps God really had dictated every word of the Bible. Perhaps there really was a hell of burning sulphur. Perhaps the Holy Ghost really was hovering around watching him and reporting. But he knew with serenity that all of his New Thoughts, his theosophical utterances, were pure and uncontaminated bunk.[18]

The reader chuckles at this, recognizing the acuity of Lewis's observation: this *would* be Elmer's attitude. Why? Because the dogmas of traditional religion have been inculcated in him from a very young age by men of graver moral authority than the peddlers of New Thought—as indicated in the first quote from the novel.

Every aspect of Elmer's childhood, college years, religious awakening, life at a theological seminary, and preaching career is on the same order: it contributes to a pattern that is taken from real life. Lewis has observed that certain traits—emotions, thoughts, actions—commonly occur together to constitute a type of man. His observations govern his creative process: he selects the most telling of the relevant traits and unites them in his novel, drawing a portrait the reader can recognize as accurate from his own perception of reality.[19]

The naturalist standard of selection is *an observed characteristic pattern*.

This standard is more first-handed than that of classicism. It takes perceptiveness and a complex process of abstraction to identify a (significant) characteristic pattern and then select its essential features, discarding accidental details. This is why Lewis's portrait of Elmer Gantry can be simultaneously recognizable by and a revelation to the reader, who has encountered this type of man in real life but has not done the same mental work.

A naturalist's standard of selection is (or should be) his own original *identification*, and unique to his work. But as in classicism, the naturalist standard is not the individual artist's *creation* and is not internal to his work. It is found in the outside world. The artist combines certain elements in his art because he has seen them go together like that in reality.

At the time when she started planning *The Fountainhead*, Ayn Rand listed Sinclair Lewis as her favorite author.[20] This evaluation was presumably caused not by Lewis's naturalist method, but by his brilliant satire of aspects of American society that Ayn Rand too despised. Nevertheless, a definite methodological influence of Lewis *is* apparent in *The Fountainhead*. (And Ayn Rand would not have named him her favorite in any other period of her life.)[21]

A typical Lewis novel features some broad sociological field of early twentieth-century America—medicine in *Arrowsmith*, religion in *Elmer Gantry*. In charting the career of his protagonist from college onward, Lewis presents not merely a certain type of man, but a satirical survey of an entire profession. This is what Ayn Rand does for architecture in the first part of *The Fountainhead*.

Lewis's systematic studies of his subject matter have been compared to "anthropological field research."[22] For *Elmer Gantry*, he not only read widely on religion and interviewed countless clergymen (sometimes, as he put it, "getting them drunk enough to tell the truth"), but he also spoke from the pulpit in Kansas City churches, "to give me a real feeling of the church from the inside."[23] Similarly, Ayn Rand read widely on architecture—and worked for six months as a file clerk for a prominent New York architect.

The fruits of her research are found mainly in Part One of *The Fountainhead*, which tells the story of two architects and the first six years of their careers. At the beginning, Howard Roark, a creator of intransigent integrity, and Peter Keating, an opportunistic parasite, leave the same school. At the end, Keating is made partner in a leading architectural firm. Roark goes to work in a granite quarry.

How is this story told?

Consider the key steps of Roark's career. He is expelled from architectural school for refusing to copy the Greeks. He works as a draftsman for the one architect he admires, Henry Cameron. When Cameron retires, his health broken by his struggle with society, Keating gets Roark a job with Guy Francon. Roark again refuses to copy the Greeks, and Francon fires him. Making the rounds of architects, Roark is turned down everywhere until John Erik Snyte hires him. Roark starts his own practice when he secures a commission from Snyte's client Austen Heller, who wants the Heller House as originally designed by Roark, not as conventionalized by Snyte. Roark turns down Snyte's offer of a reconciliatory bribe. The Heller commission leads to a few more, but Roark loses many prospective clients by refusing to copy established styles. In the end, he runs out of money, closes his office, and sets out for the quarry.

In broad terms, there is nothing unusual about most of these events. Aspiring architects work as draftsmen for established architects. They often seek the mentorship of someone they admire; but if they have no choice, they work for anyone who will hire them. They sometimes get jobs through acquaintances. As in many professions, they often establish their own practices by taking with them one or more clients of their last employer's.

Those aspects of Roark's (and Cameron's) career that involve an unusual integrity are also based on real life. In researching *The Fountainhead*, Ayn Rand read biographies of Louis Sullivan and Frank Lloyd Wright, the pioneers of modern architecture. She noted about Sullivan: "Ousted by inability to conform to the prevailing mode, the majority" and "Lack of social ability to get jobs. Arrogance with customers. Refusal to comply with their tastes." And about Wright: "Apprenticeship in architects' offices. Originality and insubordination" and "Attempt to bribe [him] into submission to prevailing styles and commercial success—on the very basis of the originality of his talent."[24]

Roark's struggle in Part One of *The Fountainhead* is the story of Louis Sullivan, of Frank Lloyd Wright, and of all the other great independent creators in history. Such men have been expelled, fired, denied jobs and commissions, offered bribes to conform, and been reduced to poverty—for the same reason that all these things happen to Roark.

Now consider Keating. On the day that Roark is expelled from school, Keating graduates at the head of his class—and is offered a job in Guy Francon's Firm. Thereafter, Keating works to secure Francon's patronage, while enacting little schemes in order to advance. He schemes to have the favored draftsman fired, so that he can take over his position, and then to make the chief designer resign, so that he can take over *his.* He tries to establish a

romantic relationship with Francon's daughter. And he attempts to blackmail Francon's partner into retirement—which causes the man to die of a stroke.

Keating's course is even less unusual than Roark's. Untold numbers of real-life opportunists reach early success through patronage rather than professional excellence and innovation. This type of man will scheme to outmaneuver his rivals. And the strategy works because many successful men of a certain age desire a protégé.

In characterization and style, Part One of *The Fountainhead* is anything but naturalistic.[25] But in regard strictly to the broad selection of events, *this part* of the novel follows a predominantly naturalistic method. The events are chosen by reference not to a central conflict, but to observed characteristic patterns relating to architectural careers, innovators, and opportunists.

Observe that there is little sustained existential conflict in this part. Roark's conflicts with Cameron and Keating are psychological and do not impact his career. The conflicts which do—those with the Dean, Francon, Snyte, and various actual or prospective clients—involve people with walk-on parts in Roark's life and are generally confined to some particular episode. Similarly, Keating is not in conflict with Francon, who knows what kind of man Keating is: a cruder variant of himself, and thus safe and comfortable.

Given the absence of a central conflict, the career steps of Roark and Keating do not constitute the logically connected events of a plot. For instance, Roark does not take a job with Cameron *because* he has been expelled from Stanton; he would have sought that job had he graduated with honors (though it might have occurred a year later). Roark simply takes the cleanest jobs and commissions he can get, and Keating looks out for the next chance to advance his career. In the case of neither man does one step follow inevitably from another.

When Roark goes to work for Francon, he tells Keating, "I'm selling myself, and I'll play the game that way—for the time being" (88). He does not mean that taking the job is a breach of his integrity, merely that he is acting conventionally: he is a draftsman accepting a job offer from a prominent architect.

But when Roark goes to the quarry, he does *not* act conventionally.

The great innovators of history have struggled as Roark struggles—but they have not taken workmen's jobs. They have preferred a more genteel, middle-class form of poverty. Roark does not. When a friend tells him, "You can get a nice clean job," he answers, "I would have to think on a nice clean job. I don't want to

think. Not their way" (198). So he takes the larger-than-life action of seeking the lowest job society can offer him. (And the complete believability of his action is a testament to the fact that, as a *character*, Roark has never been a naturalistic portrait.)

In going to the quarry, Roark ends the "naturalistic" part of *The Fountainhead* and sets the stage for the romantic plot drama that is to follow. As Dominique tells him later in the novel, "Anyone else would have taken a job in an architect's office." Roark answers, "And then you'd have no desire at all to destroy me" (273).

The "naturalism" of Part One of *The Fountainhead* is not a breach of artistic integration but serves the full development of the novel's plot-theme. Observe that both Dominique and Wynand, Roark's key antagonists, have very unusual characterizations. They are particularly far removed from "people as they are." Yet their special premises have been formed precisely in confrontation with things as they are—with the conventional and mediocre. In the context of the full novel, the nature of Roark's initial struggle grounds the psychologies of Dominique and Wynand. It provides a realism that prevents the rest of the novel from becoming a fantasy semi-detached from reality. Having seen Roark's struggle against things as they are, we can see *why* Dominique and Wynand would think that idealism has no chance.

Ayn Rand is not a naturalist. When she uses the naturalistic method, she does so ultimately by reference to her own kind of standard: her plot-theme, or core combination.

Yet Ayn Rand recognizes that a method other than her own is possible, unlike the critics who complain that *The Fountainhead* does not present things as they are. Never having been taught any method but the naturalist one, they do not identify Ayn Rand's own method, or criticize her application of it. They simply complain that she is not a good naturalist.

The irony is that, when she wanted to be, she was.

THE FOUNTAINHEAD AND AYN RAND'S VALUES

Ayn Rand identified the theme of *The Fountainhead* as "individualism versus collectivism, not in politics, but in man's soul; the psychological motivations and the basic premises that produce the character of an individualist or a collectivist."[26]

The theme of a novel, Ayn Rand writes, "sets the writer's standard of selection, directing the innumerable choices he has to make and serving as the integrator of the novel."[27] The plot-theme, she says, is "the link between the theme and the events"—"the first step of the translation of an abstract theme into a story, without

which the construction of a plot would be impossible."[28] A plot requires a central conflict situation, and once this has been decided, *it* becomes the operative standard of selection.[29] But insofar as the plot-theme *corresponds* to the theme, and thus is an appropriate means of translating it into a story, the theme remains the ultimate, abstract integrator of the totality.

The conflict strands in the central situation of *The Fountainhead* do correspond to the theme. An innovative, independent architect fights a (psychologically) collectivist society; an idealistic heroine is torn between her passionate love for the hero and her withdrawal from values, which she considers doomed by the forces of collectivism; a brilliant man with the soul of an individualist, who seeks to rule the collective, loves and is loved by the hero. The actions that follow by logic from this plot-theme will necessarily dramatize the theme of "individualism versus collectivism, not in politics, but in man's soul."

Early in her career, Ayn Rand wrote in a letter, "That one word—individualism—is to be the theme song, the goal, the only aim of all my writing."[30] The issue of individualism versus collectivism is central to all of her novels. So the theme of *The Fountainhead* is without doubt expressive of Ayn Rand's values.[31] However, the novel's plot-theme, and thus the actions that follow from it, *is more richly expressive of Ayn Rand's values than is the theme.*

Take the conflict strand "an innovative, independent architect fights a (psychologically) collectivist society." Here, the single word "architect" represents Ayn Rand's choice of the hero's profession, a choice which has enormous consequences for the novel. Everything from the main events to the smallest details involves the practice of architecture.

From all the possibilities, Ayn Rand chose architecture for two reasons, she once said. First, since her youth she had wanted to write a story glorifying the American skyscraper "as a symbol of achievement." Second, no profession better shows "the creative element in man" than one which combines "art, science in the sense of engineering, and business."[32]

The ideas that skyscrapers symbolize human achievement, and that engineering and business best show man's creative element, are distinctive of Ayn Rand. They spring from her rejection of the conventional mind-body dichotomy, the belief in an opposition between man's higher, spiritual aspirations and his low, material existence. Ayn Rand champions mind-body union. This is why she makes her innovative, independent hero an architect, rather than (as a conventional writer would have done) a starving poet.

Similarly, she made the heroes of *Anthem* and *Atlas Shrugged* scientist-inventors. These heroes also are individualists who fight a "thematic" battle against a collectivist society. But as in *The Fountainhead*, their specific professions express important values of Ayn Rand's *beyond* the thematic advocacy of individualism.

The next plot-theme strand is "an idealistic heroine is torn between her passionate love for the hero and her withdrawal from values, which she considers doomed by the forces of collectivism." Besides corresponding to the theme, this strand sets up a conflict between the hero and the heroine. In Ayn Rand's words, the Roark-Dominique romance is "sex through antagonism," which "of all forms of romance . . . is the most powerful."[33] This value-judgment of Ayn Rand's is not directly relevant to the theme, but it is contained in the plot-theme and, therefore, expressed in the novel's events.

Ayn Rand holds that "the essence of femininity is hero worship—the desire to look up to man." This does not mean that a woman will worship any man; on the contrary, "the higher her view of masculinity, the more severely demanding her standards." Also, hero worship places demands on the woman: she "has to be worthy of it and of the hero she worships."[34]

As a test of strength, a conflict between the hero and heroine of a story dramatizes the essence of sex. The hero proves himself worthy of the heroine's worship because he bests her; she proves herself worthy of worshiping him because she makes his feat difficult. This is the sexual—and extra-thematic—meaning of the Roark-Dominique romance, and of the John Galt-Dagny Taggart romance in *Atlas Shrugged.* The issue is captured in the way Dagny smiles at Galt: "it was the dangerous smile of an adversary, but her eyes were coldly brilliant and veiled at once, like the eyes of an adversary who fully intends to fight, but hopes to lose."[35] Similarly, Dominique is speaking as a woman when she tells Roark both that "I'm going to fight you—and I'm going to destroy you" and "I'm going to pray that you can't be destroyed" (272).

Ayn Rand's favorite character in Fritz Lang's movie *Siegfried* was Brunhild, the Valkyrie who challenges her suitors to physical tests of strength. Brunhild, Ayn Rand commented, should have been the story's heroine, instead of the "little clinging vine" (Kriemhild), whom the hero loves. As it is, she said, the story is "anti-sex."[36] But in her own stories, Ayn Rand does not make the test of strength between hero and heroine physical—except in actual sex scenes.[37] The conflicts are primarily intellectual. In both the Roark-Dominique and Galt-Dagny romances, the heroine is honestly mistaken on an issue of philosophy, whereas the hero

wins in the end because he holds the correct view. Her way of casting these conflicts reflects Ayn Rand's view of heroism as fundamentally intellectual and not primarily an issue of performing physical feats. And this in turn reflects her view of reason as the essence of human nature.

Dominique meets Roark when he is a worker in a granite quarry. Galt is a track worker in the tunnels of the railroad of which Dagny is vice president. The hero of *Anthem* is a street sweeper. All these men belong at the pinnacle of any rational social hierarchy, yet they are thrown (at least temporarily) to the very bottom. This device is thematic: the hero is an outcast in a collectivist society *because* he is a brilliant individualist. However, casting the hero down to the lowest echelon of society adds drama not merely to the thematic conflict, but also to the hero's conflict with the heroine—who (except in *Anthem*) comes from the highest echelon.

When Dominique meets Roark in the quarry, she is for the first time glad of her position as the chatelaine of the countryside. "She thought suddenly that the man below was only a common worker, owned by the owner of this place, and she was almost the owner of this place" (205). Yet Dominique knows that this man is more than a common worker, and that it is he who "stood looking up at her; it was not a glance, but an act of ownership" (205). Her thrill comes from knowing that, in the test of strength that is inevitable between them, he can best her—even though, in social position, he starts with the severest handicap.

In itself, the theme of individualism versus collectivism has nothing to do with the issue of "sex through antagonism." But the plot-theme *combination* of a hero-versus-society conflict and an antagonistic romance offers Ayn Rand unique opportunities to express her sexual values.

The third plot-theme strand *of The Fountainhead* is "a brilliant man with the soul of an individualist, who seeks to rule the collective, loves and is loved by the hero." The implied conflict between Roark and Wynand corresponds to the theme; the bond of love between them expresses extra-thematic values. Ayn Rand defined romantic love as the love felt for someone who is irreplaceable in one's own life: the loved one is a unique individual who, if lost, would leave a permanent void in the lover's soul.[38] In Ayn Rand's view, love of this nature does not necessarily involve a sexual component; it can exist between members of the same sex, without any implication of homosexuality. Ayn Rand was attracted to the idea of such an emotional bond—in effect, romantic love without the aspect of sex—between two men. She depicts such relationships, in *Atlas Shrugged*, between Hank Rearden and Francisco d'Anconia, and between Francisco and Galt. And the

love between Roark and Wynand is on the same order. As Roark tells Wynand, “You have been the one encounter in my life that can never be repeated” (654).

Leonard Peikoff has pointed to the love between the Marquis of Posa and King Philip II of Spain in Schiller’s *Don Carlos* as a parallel to the Roark-Wynand relationship.[39] The parallel is real, but as one would expect, Ayn Rand’s *use* of love between two men is distinctive. Unlike Schiller, she makes it an element of a romantic triangle that involves the heroine. In *The Fountainhead*, Wynand is married to Dominique when he meets Roark. The main heroes of *Atlas Shrugged* all love Dagny and at some stage have a sexual relationship with her.

Further, in the typical Ayn Rand triangle, there is at least an indication that the two men feel more strongly for each other than for the heroine. And just as Dagny fears that Galt will sacrifice himself and let Francisco have her,[40] so Dominique fears that Roark will sacrifice himself and leave her to Wynand (620). But neither man does in the end make this sacrifice.

While these triangles are not specified in the plot-themes of the two novels, the plot-theme conflict strands hint strongly at their possibility and thus facilitate a richer expression of Ayn Rand’s values than does the theme as such.

The plot-theme of *The Fountainhead*, and consequently the events, expresses not only a broad range of the author’s values, but also their metaphysical presuppositions. Ayn Rand’s admiration for the profession of architecture presupposes her view of mind-body union. The intellectuality of her protagonists and their conflicts presupposes her view of man as a rational being. And to touch on an aspect we have not yet mentioned, the fact that the *main* personal conflicts of the novel are between good characters, not good and evil, presupposes Ayn Rand’s view that evil is ultimately impotent.

These extra-thematic values and metaphysical views are what really matter in the novel.

“Fundamentally,” Ayn Rand says, “what is important is not the message a writer projects *explicitly*, but the values and view of life he projects *implicitly*.”[41]

Art is the means of presenting not a didactic theme, but a concretization of metaphysics by means of “a selective re-creation of reality.”

> By a selective re-creation, art isolates and integrates those aspects of reality which represent man’s fundamental view of himself and of existence. Out of the countless number of concretes—of single, disorganized and (seemingly) contradictory attributes, actions and entities—an artist isolates the

> things which he regards as metaphysically essential and integrates them into a single new concrete that represents an embodied abstraction.[42]

But observe that an artist cannot first select a bunch of disconnected concretes and then glue them together somehow. If he is to create a single new concrete (an embodied abstraction) from the multiplicity of concretes he regards as metaphysically essential, he cannot treat selection and integration as distinct processes. He needs a standard of selection that is simultaneously his concrete *integrator.* For instance, the naturalist selects on the basis of an observed characteristic pattern, and that same pattern constitutes his unity. The classicist selects on the basis of established conventions about which things go together and form a proper whole.

In and of themselves, the methods of naturalism and classicism carry a profound metaphysical message. The motto of both schools is: What other men have joined together, let no artist put asunder. By the nature of his standard of selection, the naturalist or classicist can present the values he observes in other men, or those of stale convention, but no values that are distinctly his own. This implies the passive acceptance of human values as givens beyond individual choice or judgment—i.e., determinism.

In practice, a classicist or naturalist cannot remain fully true to his method, i.e., completely detached from his own personal values.[43] One can tell Racine from Corneille or Sinclair Lewis from Tolstoy. As one small example, Lewis's portrayal of Elmer Gantry's career is tinged with a moral indignation that would be foreign to Tolstoy. But the point is that Lewis's moralism is extraneous to his basic method of creation (in fact, it contradicts his method). The same goes for all his other individualizing touches: they are incidental to the essence of his work.

In a romantic artwork, the artist's own values are *not* incidental. The essential attribute of romanticism, in Ayn Rand's words, is "the independent, creative projection of an individual writer's values."[44] (This applies not only to writers, but to romantic artists in all the arts.[45])

Before we look more closely at the *method* of romanticism, observe that the projection of an individual artist's values carries a profound metaphysical message in and of itself. It implies that the individual is capable of choosing his own values—and that this fact is essential to his nature. Thus Ayn Rand defined romanticism as "a category of art based on the recognition of the principle that man possesses the faculty of volition."[46]

Romanticism has an objective basis: man does in fact possess volition, and his choice of values is the central issue of his life. It is sometimes asked: what is the value of a school of art

which projects *individual* values, when most of those values are based on philosophical error? After all, the range of values projected by romantic artists is enormous. The values of Ayn Rand and Joseph Conrad, of Victor Hugo and Terence Rattigan, of Edmond Rostand and Dostoevsky and Ibsen and Schiller and Oscar Wilde—these values are not only wildly different, but often incompatible. They cannot all be objectively valid. But neither are the values of men in real life. Men's actual values differ wildly, and are often incompatible. What they do have in common is that they are chosen by each individual—who is defined by his choice. "Man," in Ayn Rand's formulation, "is a being of self-made soul."[47]

In this sense, romanticism is the school of art that really does present things as they are.

We have said that a romantic artist's values are not incidental to his work. Let us now be more precise: a romantic artwork is *stylized.*

To "stylize" is to condense an object to essential characteristics, relative to a specific value-perspective.[48] The object, and the value-perspective, involved may be simple or complex: a single reed depicted in a delicate drawing, or the story of *The Fountainhead*; an appreciation of a certain kind of graceful elegance, or all of Ayn Rand's important values and their metaphysical presuppositions. But regardless of complexity, *every* feature or quality of the stylized object exhibits the essence of the stylizing value-perspective.

This perspective is an *abstraction* (or a set of abstractions) drawn from observed concretes. For instance, an abstraction of graceful elegance might be drawn from the curve of a swan's neck, the leap of a ballerina, the posture of an English gentleman, the swaying of a reed in the wind. In abstracting, only the essential characteristic(s) uniting these concretes is retained, while their concrete differences are disregarded. Some of the concrete matter being disregarded will be closely related to the quality of "graceful elegance," such as the height of the gentleman or the slenderness of the reed, but most of the disregarded matter is irrelevant to the abstraction being drawn: the texture of the swan's feathers, the length of the ballerina's nose, the color of the gentleman's coat. These concretes are wholly accidental.

Now suppose an artist wants to paint a painting with no such accidental concretes: every feature or quality of his subject matter is to exhibit the essence of "graceful elegance." He cannot succeed by making this abstraction his direct standard of selection. If he tried, what would come to his mind is: a swan's neck, a leaping ballerina, an English gentleman—with all their concrete features and differences. Even if he focused only on the features

most intimately connected with the abstract characteristic of "graceful elegance," he would be left with an assortment of rather disembodied concrete characteristics like a certain male-figure height or a certain reed thickness. And in order to combine (some of) these in an intelligible artwork—say, in a painting of a gentleman duck-hunter hiding in reeds—the artist would have to fill in a lot of accidental concretes (e.g., a shotgun).

To achieve a stylized object—one purged of the accidental—an artist cannot first select the concretes of his work and *then* combine them. Like the naturalist and classicist, the stylizing romanticist needs a standard of selection that is also his (concrete) integrator. He needs a core combination.[49]

Suppose Ayn Rand had tried to write *The Fountainhead* without a plot-theme, guided only by her theme. The central value-perspective would be unchanged: pro-individualism and anti-collectivism. But without the core-combination idea of an architect's struggle, it is unlikely that Ayn Rand would have thought of any feature of the actual novel. Instead, she might have thought of the communists she met in Soviet Russia; a brave young student who stood up to them and was sent to Siberia; her own struggle in Hollywood to sell her unconventional story ideas; some Broadway social climber she met when her first play was produced. These concretes might be perfectly good concretizations of the theme—but they range all over the map and would not integrate into a stylized object. The theme of *The Fountainhead* is too abstract a standard of selection to yield the elements of a concrete unity.

The plot-theme changes the situation. Take the main strand: "an innovative, independent architect fights a (psychologically) collectivist society." This standard of selection expresses the same value-perspective as does the novel's abstract theme—yet it is *concrete.* As a consequence, further concretes selected by this standard simultaneously exhibit the essence of "pro-individualism and anti-collectivism" *and* relate to a single architect's career struggle. The result is an object—Roark's struggle—condensed to essential characteristics.

Not all themes are too abstract to yield a (kind of) concrete unity. In fact, a naturalistic theme, like "a typical smarmy American evangelist," *is* a particular unity of concretes: an observed characteristic pattern. Or take "the impact of the Civil War on Southern society." This theme immediately suggests essential character types—former slave owners, black sharecroppers, carpetbaggers, Ku Klux Klanners—who interrelate in characteristic patterns. In other words, "the impact of the Civil War on Southern society" could easily be a naturalistic theme, yielding a concrete unity of the naturalistic kind. But the

characteristics of such a unity would be essential only relative to the purely cognitive abstraction of the given patterns, not to a value-perspective.

However, suppose we supplied this theme with a plot-theme: "the romantic conflict of a woman who loves a man representing the old order, and is loved by another man, representing the new."[50] This standard of selection is also concrete—yet it provides a specific authorial *value-perspective*: the view that the ideals of the old South were noble but are now obsolete, and that acting on them is heroic but ultimately foolish. Further concretes selected by the standard of this plot-theme will relate to a single woman's romantic conflict *and* will be essential relative to the governing value-perspective. The result is an object—the story of Scarlett O'Hara in *Gone With the Wind*—condensed to essential characteristics.

The core combination is *the means of stylization.* It is an engine for selecting concretes that exhibit the essence of a certain value-perspective *and* combine into a self-sufficient concrete unity, making it unnecessary to flesh out the selection with accidental material.

The value-perspective of a stylized work is always richer than that of the theme alone. As an abstract integrator, a theme cannot be a set of disparate abstractions, like "individualism versus collectivism, architecture as a heroic profession, mind-body union, sex through antagonism, and man as a rational being." But these values and metaphysical views can all be carried by the *concrete* integrator—as they are by the plot-theme of *The Fountainhead*—since a single concrete (of some complexity) may express a wide variety of abstractions. And the principle here is the same as for the thematic value-perspective: on their own, these abstractions would not yield a concrete unity. As expressed in the core combination, they do.

The abstractions expressed in the core combination should integrate into a coherent viewpoint; a romantic artwork should project the values and view of life of an intelligible *personality.* In the broadest sense of the word, this total ethical-metaphysical viewpoint can be considered a romantic art work's "theme." But this kind of theme cannot be condensed into a retainable statement (which is an essential reason why it needs to be concretized in a work of art[51]) and thus cannot function as a *conscious* standard of selection or integrator.[52]

The core-combination device an artist uses must be appropriate to the art form he works in. As we have seen, an architectural core combination differs in nature from a plot-theme.[53] But to be the means of stylization, any core combination must be a *structural* device.

The central idea for the Heller House is the standard for selecting the features that translate that idea into a functioning structure of habitation. A plot-theme is the standard for selecting the events that logically proceed from that central conflict and constitute a plot *structure.*

Each element of a plot serves a structural function mandated, directly or indirectly, by the plot-theme. In *The Fountainhead*, Roark's dynamiting Cortlandt is the lead-in to the climactic resolution of the plot-theme conflict strands. At the very end, Dominique's rising to meet Roark on top of the Wynand Building rounds out the totality of the novel by briefly concretizing the most important consequences of the climax.[54]

Note that the structural function of these elements is not just to provide a generic "resolution" or "triumphant conclusion," but to resolve the *particular* conflicts of the plot-theme and round out the novel's *particular* climax. And it is their highly particular function that determines the *form* of these elements. In Louis Sullivan's famous words, "form follows function."[55]

For instance, the crux of Roark's conflicts with society, Dominique, Wynand, and Toohey is the unbreached integrity of his architectural designs. It is therefore appropriate that the climax turns on his ultimate act of upholding this integrity, in regard to some specific building. In other words, the Cortlandt explosion represents form following function. But suppose Ayn Rand had resolved her conflict strands by having Roark's antagonists die in a flu epidemic. Here form would *not* follow function—not the function of resolving *these* particular conflicts.

The form of such a climax would be not only *functionally* accidental, but also *abstractly* inessential relative to the novel's governing value-perspective. A flu epidemic as such has nothing to do with individualism versus collectivism, the nobility of architecture as an expression of man's creativity, mind-body union, or any of the other abstractions carried by the plot-theme of *The Fountainhead.* By contrast, the Cortlandt explosion has been cut from the same cloth as the conflicts it resolves—a cloth impregnated with the right kind of abstract essentiality—and so naturally exhibits the essence of "individualism versus collectivism," "architecture as expressing man's creativity," "mind-body union."

Or suppose Ayn Rand had decided to round out her novel by having Roark and Dominique climb a mountain in Peru. *Something* about the form of this ending would fit its function: Roark and Dominique would be shown united as a couple; and reaching a mountaintop can be an ecstatic experience, sweeping aside any emotional residue from past conflict. But most of the form in this example would be completely accidental to the

function. This ending would *not* be cut from the same cloth as the plot-theme and its other developments, nor exhibit the essence of any relevant abstractions.

In the actual ending, Roark stands on top of the Wynand Building, the greatest structure in New York, which he has been commissioned to build "as a monument to that spirit which is yours" (692). This is form following function—the function of concretizing Roark's total victory in the particular battle he fights throughout the novel: the battle to erect his own kind of buildings against the opposition of a collectivist society. Consequently, this rounding out of Roark's battle exhibits the same essence as does the battle itself: "pro-individualism," "the nobility of architecture," "mind-body union."

As Dominique rises toward Roark, she "saw him standing above her, on the top platform" (694). This, too, is form following function—the function of rounding out the Roark-Dominique relationship, which began in the stone quarry when Dominique "looked down" and Roark "stood looking up at her." He has won their test of strength; and when she is now looking up at him, and rising to him, this final note exhibits the same essence as does their whole relationship: "femininity as hero worship—the desire to look up to man."

In stylized art, there is an inherent harmony between functionality and abstract essentiality. Within a structure created by a core combination, the form of each element will naturally exhibit the essence of the core combination's value-perspective—*if* the form is determined by the given element's function within that particular structure. And this is the key to the creative process of stylization, which involves a tricky dual purpose: concrete unity and abstract essentiality. The harmony of functionality and abstract essentiality allows the artist to focus on the former, with the latter following as a matter of course. If a romantic artist were asked how he achieved his seemingly impossible goal—a single concrete whose every feature exhibits the essence of his values—he might answer with Louis Sullivan that "the function *created* or organized its form."[56]

Now, if an artist is to create a stylized object, there can be no *external* limits to his freedom of selection. If the function is to "organize its form," the allowable forms of an artist's values cannot be prescribed prior to the creative process. This is why a classicist cannot stylize.

Classicism deals, ostensibly, with grand value-abstractions—"harmony," "nobility," "statesmanship"—but its field of selection is limited to conventional exemplars of these abstractions. If a classicist chooses the theme "the martyrdom of integrity," he will think of: Socrates, Jesus, Galileo. What about an

architect who is put on trial for protecting the integrity of his work? The classicist would politely ask which obscure Greek myth is being alluded to.

His limited repertoire of conventional concretes does not allow the classicist to create a unity of essentials. For instance, in *The Death of Socrates*, Jacques Louis David combines the concretes of Socrates and Jesus under the theme "the martyrdom of integrity": he paints Socrates about to drink hemlock—surrounded by twelve disciples. But while the presence of twelve disciples is evocative of the Last Supper and the Passion, it is completely inessential to the abstraction of "martyred integrity." Yet what is David to do, except create on some such pattern? He cannot work with a core combination whose functional requirements determine the forms of his concretes, since all the allowable forms of his values are given to him by convention. (A classicist who tried to stay true to a core combination would be forced to cheat on his classicist standards, as happened to Corneille with *Le Cid*.)

By the nature of his method, the stylizing romanticist rejects any external limits to his selectivity other than the nature of the elements of reality. He follows Victor Hugo's advice:

> We must draw our inspiration from the original sources [nature]. It is the same sap, distributed through the soil, that produces all the trees of the forest, so different in bearing power, in fruit, in foliage. It is the same nature that fertilizes and nourishes the most diverse geniuses.[57]

To which the classicist will answer (in Hugo's summation): "But the graces; but good taste! Don't you know that art should correct nature? that we must *ennoble* art? that we must *select*?"[58]

We can see here the essence of two vastly different mind-sets. The romanticist draws his normative abstractions—and, as needed, the concretes which illustrate them—from reality. But for the classicist, there are no normative abstractions beyond those of convention, and these in turn subsume only conventional concretes. Consequently, the classicist cannot even grasp that what the romanticist does is precisely *select*—and "correct nature" and "ennoble art"—on a level he himself could never dream of equaling.

That a naturalist does not think abstractly about human values is obvious. The interesting point is that, appearances to the contrary notwithstanding, neither does a classicist.

Only the romanticist holds his values as true abstractions—romanticism, Ayn Rand says, is "the *conceptual* school of art" ("Introduction to the Twenty-fifth Anniversary Edition," v)—and

then, with the help of his core combination, he presents them in a stylized object.

Ayn Rand writes:

> I see the novelist as a combination of prospector and jeweler. The novelist must discover the potential, the gold mine, of man's soul, must extract the gold and then fashion as magnificent a crown as his ability and vision permit.
>
> Just as men of ambition for material values do not rummage through city dumps, but venture out into lonely mountains in search of gold—so men of ambition for intellectual values do not sit in their backyards, but venture out in quest of the noblest, the purest, the costliest elements.[59]

Ayn Rand found the gold mine of man's soul. *The Fountainhead* is the crown she fashioned.

THE FOUNTAINHEAD AND *CHANTECLER*

Like Howard Roark, the hero of Edmond Rostand's play *Chantecler* dedicates himself above all to the integrity of his work, battles social forces hostile to any individual quest for the ideal, and loves a female who wants him to give up his calling.

Unlike Roark, Chantecler is a barnyard cock.

Rostand's dramatic fable takes place on a farm and in the surrounding countryside. Chantecler is the ruler of the barnyard. But his exalted calling is his crowing, which heralds—and, he secretly believes, *causes*—the sunrise.

Like most of Rostand's heroes, Chantecler is essentially a poet. The mere fact that his profession has nothing to do with science, engineering, or business does not imply a mind-body dichotomy. But such a dichotomy *is* reflected in the clash between Chantecler's ideal calling and material reality: he does not in fact cause the sunrise.

The mind-body dichotomy is as central a concern to Rostand as individualism is to Ayn Rand. The dichotomy runs through all of his plays and poetry and was expressed even in his ideas for interior decoration. During the writing of *Chantecler*, Rostand was building his dream house in the French countryside—and wanted to face his library doors with false book covers representing the planned but unwritten works of other authors (i.e., noble but unfulfilled aspirations).[60]

Rostand views the mind-body dichotomy as a tragic fact of human existence, and he values above all else man's unbending integrity in pursuing spiritual values regardless of their clash with

material reality. There is always such a clash in Rostand's plays; an ideal *in harmony* with the material world would have been regarded by him as insufficiently spiritual to be of dramatic interest.[61] This is why he would not make one of his heroes an architect like Howard Roark.

The theme of *Chantecler* is a simple statement of Rostand's central value: "An individual must stay loyal to his ideal calling in defiance of all inimical forces—even if his ideal clashes with material reality." The two strands of the plot-theme correspond to the theme: "An idealistic barnyard cock, who secretly thinks his crowing makes the sun rise, confronts the forces of self-doubt, ridicule and envy," and: "The hero's beloved, a pheasant hen, is jealous of his dedication to the dawn and schemes to become his only love."

This plot-theme is more richly expressive of Rostand's values than is the theme.

First of all, the hero is a cock, which fact expresses Rostand's patriotism: the cock is a symbol of France. Also, the cockiness appropriate to a cock—the bold, brash, swashbuckling self-confidence—is both characteristically French and distinctive of a Rostand hero. (Ayn Rand's protagonists are less self-consciously heroic.)

Next, observe the *non*intellectual nature of Chantecler's conflict with his beloved. The Pheasant Hen is not a passionate idealist like Dominique, but is conventionally feminine, even frivolous. She wants Chantecler to abandon his ideal calling because she craves his undivided affection, an attitude that is meant to be typical of her sex. As Chantecler puts it, the Pheasant Hen is "A woman,—ever jealous of the Dream!"[62]

Ayn Rand, who knew just as well as Rostand did that most women are contemptuous of ideas (as are most men), would not have made such a woman a heroine. By choosing the Pheasant Hen as an appropriate love interest for his hero, Rostand expresses a lower regard than does Ayn Rand for the importance of reason and the intellect in love affairs—and, therefore, in human life. In other words, he expresses extra-thematic sexual values and their metaphysical presuppositions.

The main plot-theme strand of *Chantecler* specifies three forces inimical to the hero's ideal calling: self-doubt, ridicule, and envy.

Chantecler's *self-doubt* manifests itself on occasion throughout the play: he sometimes feels unworthy of his glorious mission; he fears the loss of an inspiration whose nature he does not understand; too much introspection of his technique makes him unable to perform. Probably autobiographical on the author's part, these self-doubts are logical consequences of the belief in a mind-

body split. A man will not feel worthy of his ideals if he thinks they are unreachable, or in control of his inspiration if he thinks it comes from a realm opposed to the material world he can grasp by sense perception and reason. Thus, Chantecler's self-doubts reflect concerns derivative of the author's broader metaphysical outlook. (By contrast, when Roark sees that he has "been wasting too much paper lately and doing awful stuff" [601], he feels no self-doubt about his inspiration, but simply concludes that he is overworked and needs a rest.)

The force of *ridicule* is represented in *Chantecler* above all by the Blackbird—"the professional cynic," as Ayn Rand once described the type, "whose sole motive is to sneer at everything; specifically, at *any kind of values*."[63] Chantecler, who worships the ideal, is the main object of the Blackbird's scorn.

The dog Patou warns of the effects of the Blackbird's mocking. The black-dressed Blackbird is like "An undertaker's man, who buries Faith."[64] Because of him, "Whoever speaks of stars today must lower his voice."[65] Patou is proven right when Chantecler attends the Guinea Hen's fashionable salon and learns that he is widely resented in the barnyard. Chantecler defiantly reveals his secret belief that he raises the sun, and he is met with gales of laughter and scorn.

Underlying such ridicule is *envy*—a motive clearly stated by the animals who join in a conspiracy to murder Chantecler. "I hate the Cock because I am so plain," says a Chicken. "I hate him," says the Duck, "he has no web between his toes, / And so he traces stars where'er he goes." And the Capon (a castrated cockerel) gives the dry remark, "I do not like the Cock."[66]

The Blackbird of *The Fountainhead* is Ellsworth Toohey, who is driven by envy and hatred of all values, and who uses ridicule in order to destroy. Toohey says:

> Laughter is an instrument of human joy. Learn to use it as a weapon of destruction. Turn it into a sneer. It's simple. Tell them to laugh at everything. Tell them that a sense of humor is an unlimited virtue. Don't let anything remain sacred in a man's soul—and his soul won't be sacred to him. Kill reverence and you've killed the hero in man. (636)

Like Chantecler, Roark is resented not just by a single public commentator, but by a broad segment of society. One of the first things we learn about him is that "People turned to look at Howard Roark as he passed. Some remained staring after him with sudden resentment. They could give no reason for it: it was an instinct his presence awakened in most people" (16–17).

Rostand and Ayn Rand present this kind of feeling not as an end in itself, but in order to stress, by contrast, an issue which in Ayn Rand's words "is involved in every line of *The Fountainhead*: '*man-worship.*'"

> The man-worshipers, in my sense of the term, are those who see man's highest potential and strive to actualize it. The man-haters are those who regard man as a helpless, depraved, contemptible creature—and struggle never to let him discover otherwise. (viii–x)

Rostand and Ayn Rand are the only writers who understand this issue and have made it a central motif of a work of fiction. Both *The Fountainhead* and *Chantecler* are stressed portraits of a hero who *does* actualize the highest human potential.

This extra-thematic value-projection is prepared for in the plot-themes of the two works.

The main strand of each plot-theme pits an individual pursuing his ideal calling against a general opposition—"a (psychologically) collectivist society" or "the forces of ridicule and envy"—to be concretized along the way. The individualized conflicts are relegated to adjunct strands. This is not an ideal way to construct a plot-theme, and it is another reason, in addition to sheer complexity, why *The Fountainhead* technically has a less than ideal plot. *Chantecler*, a much simpler story, has a similarly loose progression of events.

However, these technical deficiencies are *virtues*, given the purpose of the two authors.

Observe that Roark and Chantecler are so focused on their work that they barely notice their opposition. Roark does blow up Cortlandt Homes (Ayn Rand always gives her hero the plot's central action), but otherwise he ignores his enemies and goes on with his career. Chantecler fights a duel with a vicious gamecock (it would not be a Rostand play without a duel), but otherwise he goes on with his crowing. Even in their conflicts with the good characters—Dominique, Wynand, and the Pheasant Hen—Roark and Chantecler assume a curiously passive role. It is the other characters who take most of the dramatic actions—in response not so much to particular acts of the heroes, as to their very *existence*. The heroes, on their part, simply go on being what they are.

Their detachment from interpersonal conflicts does not make for the best plot progression. But it is necessary for the projection of man-worship. In a stressed portrait of someone who actualizes the highest human potential, the hero cannot be too concerned with other men but must be fully occupied with his ideal calling. There lies his true exaltation.

Ayn Rand and Edmond Rostand share crucial values and have some opposing ones, but their artistic *method* is identical. Both project their values partly through the theme of their works, but much more richly through the plot-theme; and thus they stamp their own, uniquely individual personality all over their artistic creation.

The "local colour" of a drama—says Hugo, speaking of an individual writer's values—

> should not be on the surface of the drama, but in its substance, in the very heart of the work, whence it spreads of itself, naturally, evenly, and, so to speak, into every corner of the drama, as the sap ascends from the root to the tree's topmost leaf.[67]

So it is in *The Fountainhead*—and in *Chantecler*.

FALSE ROMANTICISM

In the "Preface to *Cromwell*," Victor Hugo warns against "false romanticism, which has the presumption to show itself at the feet of the true."

> For modern genius [romanticism] already has its shadow, its copy, its parasite, its *classic*, which forms itself upon it, smears itself with its colours, assumes its livery, picks up its crumbs, and, like the sorcerer's pupil, puts in play, with words retained by the memory, elements of theatrical action of which it has not the secret.[68]

It is the fate of all great romantic art to be copied. In her research journals for *The Fountainhead*, Ayn Rand notes about Frank Lloyd Wright, "He fought against the cheap imitators of his work, who copied his forms without understanding his principle, who made a new 'style' and formula out of his forms."[69] In *The Fountainhead*, Ayn Rand mentions "the men who had been safe in copying the Parthenon," but who now chose "to walk Cameron's path and make it lead them to a new Parthenon, an easier Parthenon in the shape of a packing crate of glass and concrete" (474).

Similarly, Ayn Rand has been copied by artists who paint naked men on cliffs, hair waving against the sky (after the opening scene of *The Fountainhead*), or write novels where the rebellious young hero confronts the dean of his school.

Unable to create and work from original core combinations that reflect *their own* values, such false romanticists can only copy

concretes. Most of them represent nothing more than individual amateurishness and have no significance. But sometimes their efforts come to dominate an artistic field. Hollywood thrillers now consist exclusively of old, endlessly rearranged inventions from an earlier tradition of romantic popular literature.[70] As Ayn Rand notes in her journals, much of modern architecture is "modernism in set mass-forms, a modernism as stiff and frozen and unoriginal as the old traditions."[71] The phenomenon of modernism as a new Parthenon is also evident in the second-handed mannerisms of modern painting, like those of cubism (although here there are no romantic leftovers).

This is the opposite of the romantic method—and of the method of Howard Roark. As Cameron tells Roark,

> What you're doing—it's yours, not mine, I can only teach you to do it better. I can give you the means, but the aim—the aim's your own. You won't be a little disciple putting up anemic little things in early Jacobean or late Cameron. (76)

He won't be, because there is nothing in his art that is not selected by a standard of his own creation.

CONCLUSION

In the climactic speech of *The Fountainhead*, Howard Roark states the essence of the novel's theme when he says that man

> can survive in only one of two ways—by the independent work of his own mind or as a parasite fed by the minds of others. The creator originates. The parasite borrows. The creator faces nature alone. The parasite faces nature through an intermediary. (679)

In the novel, Roark represents the creator, who faces nature alone. And he does so primarily by virtue of his method of artistic creation—the *same method* by which *The Fountainhead* has been conceived and written. Thus, on a level deeper than its specific content, *The Fountainhead* itself is the demonstration of its own thesis.

In the "Preface to *Cromwell*," Hugo warns artists to "beware especially of copying anything whatsoever."

> It were better to be a bramble or a thistle, fed by the same earth as the cedar and the palm, than the fungus or the lichen of those noble trees. The

> bramble lives, the fungus vegetates. Moreover, however great the cedar and the palm may be, it is not with the sap one sucks from them that one can become great one's self. A giant's parasite will be at best a dwarf. The oak, colossus that it is, can produce and sustain nothing more than the mistletoe.[72]

For a brief period, a school of art flourished that heeded Hugo's admonition. Then romanticism was killed as a leading movement by the rise of naturalism and the plague of false romanticism.[73]

To use a metaphor from *The Fountainhead* (which Ayn Rand apparently adapted from the "Preface to *Cromwell*"), "The palm tree had broken through; the fungus came to feed on it, to deform it, to hide it, to pull it back into the common jungle" (474).

As a young woman recently arrived in America from Russia, Ayn Rand one day asked an elderly lady librarian if she had a novel with a good plot and a serious idea. The lady looked at her kindly and said, "I know exactly what you mean. They don't write them anymore." Ayn Rand thought, "I will."[74]

In 1943, she published *The Fountainhead.*

The palm tree had broken through once again.[75]

NOTES

---

1. Later in the novel, Roark says, "I'm never concerned with my clients, only with their architectural requirements. I consider these as part of my building's theme and problem, as my building's material—just as I consider bricks and steel." (578)

2. To be precise, the description would be the verbal summation of a somewhat more specific visual-structural idea.

3. Ayn Rand, "The Metaphysical Versus the Man-Made," *Philosophy: Who Needs It* (New York: Signet, 1984), 25.

4. The kind of modern architecture created by Howard Roark, and in real life by Frank Lloyd Wright, can legitimately be called romantic. The first designs of this school date from the beginning of the romantic era in the late eighteenth century, when some French architects "rejected any imitation of the past" and, as in the case of Claude-Nicholas Ledoux, "wanted the creative mind to depend upon its own thinking, and exhorted the artist to dare in order to overcome the past." (Emil Kaufmann, *Three Revolutionary Architects, Boulée, Ledoux, and Lequeu* [Philadelphia: Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, New Series 42.3, 1952], 434, 479.) A few of these architects' designs are eerily proto-Roarkian, like Ledoux's House of the Surveyors of the Loue or Etienne-Louis Boulée's Entrance to a Cemetery.

5. Victor Hugo, “Preface to *Cromwell*,” in Charles W. Eliot, ed., *Prefaces and Prologues to Famous Books* (New York: P F Collier & Son Company, 1910), 385.

6. Hugo, “Preface to *Cromwell*,” 377.

7. Hugo, “Preface to *Cromwell*,” 382–83.

8. Hugo, “Preface to *Cromwell*,” 378.

9. Herbert Grierson, quoted in Mario Praz, *The Romantic Agony* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970), 7.

10. Hugo, “Preface to *Cromwell*,” 379.

11. Ayn Rand, “Basic Principles of Literature,” *The Romantic Manifesto: A Philosophy of Literature*, revised edition (New York: Signet, 1975), 82. This sentence is italicized in the original.

12. Rand, “Basic Principles of Literature,” 85.

13. Hugo, “Preface to *Cromwell*,” 379.

14. Robert Mayhew, ed., *Ayn Rand Answers: The Best of Her Q & A* (New York: New American Library, 2005), 189.

15. Ayn Rand discusses the plot-theme of *We the Living* in Ayn Rand, *The Art of Fiction: A Guide for Writers and Readers*, ed. Tore Boeckmann (New York: Plume, 2000), 38.

16. In *The Art of Fiction*, 58, Ayn Rand cautions young writers not to “check yourself against your moral code” when imagining events. Such checking, she implies, properly comes later.

17. Sinclair Lewis, *Elmer Gantry* (New York: Signet, 1967), 17.

18. Lewis, *Elmer Gantry*, 224.

19. See Ayn Rand’s remarks on the method behind another of Lewis’s character portraits, Babbitt, in “The Psycho-Epistemology of Art,” *Romantic Manifesto*, 21.

20. See Jeff Britting, *Ayn Rand* (New York: Overlook Duckworth, 2004), 48.

21. Ayn Rand notes the presence of naturalistic elements in *The Fountainhead* but does not mention any influence from Sinclair Lewis, in Mayhew, *Ayn Rand Answers*, 200. Robert Mayhew discusses the similar styles of satire in *The Fountainhead* and *Elmer Gantry* in “Humor in *The Fountainhead*,” in the present collection, 209.

22. Mark Schorer, “Afterword,” in Lewis, *Elmer Gantry*, 419.

23. Schorer, “Afterword,” 422.

24. David Harriman, ed., *Journals of Ayn Rand* (New York: Dutton, 1997), 118.

25. In her lecture course on literature, Ayn Rand used this part of *The Fountainhead* to illustrate romantic characterization and style, as opposed to the naturalism exemplified by Sinclair Lewis’s *Arrowsmith*. See *Art of Fiction*, 59–83, 112–14, 127–28.

26. Ayn Rand, *For the New Intellectual* (New York: Signet, 1963), 68. The word “versus” is italicized in the original.

27. Rand, “Basic Principles of Literature,” 81.

28. Rand, “Basic Principles of Literature,” 85.

29. Ayn Rand makes this point in *Art of Fiction*, 31.

30. Michael S. Berliner, ed., *Letters of Ayn Rand* (New York: Dutton, 1995), 33.

31. As formulated by Ayn Rand, the theme of *The Fountainhead* could technically express a pro-collectivist, anti-individualist value-

perspective. But a collectivist using this theme would probably choose slightly different wording, e.g., he might speak of "atomistic individualism." This kind of issue is mentioned in *Art of Fiction*, 17.

32. Biographical interviews (Ayn Rand Archives).

33. Berliner, *Letters of Ayn Rand*, 430.

34. Ayn Rand, "About a Woman President," *The Voice of Reason: Essays in Objectivist Thought*, ed. Leonard Peikoff (New York: New American Library, 1988), 268.

35. Ayn Rand, *Atlas Shrugged* (New York: Random House, 1957), 760.

36. Unpublished note headlined "Siegfried" and dated March 31, 1967, in the Ayn Rand Archives.

37. The first sexual encounter of Roark and Dominique is the obvious example. But see also the sex scene between Hank Rearden and Dagny Taggart: she knows that "her defiance was submission, that the purpose of all of her violent strength was only to make his victory the greater." Rand, *Atlas Shrugged*, 251.

38. Leonard Peikoff, "Eight Great Plays as Literature and as Philosophy," 1993, lecture 4, "Don Carlos," question period.

39. Peikoff, "Eight Great Plays," lecture 4, "Don Carlos," question period. I base my treatment of the larger issue of love between men on Peikoff's discussion of this literary parallel.

40. Rand, *Atlas Shrugged*, 796–98.

41. Rand, *Art of Fiction*, 15.

42. Rand, "Psycho-Epistemology of Art," 19–20.

43. See Mayhew, *Ayn Rand Answers*, 200.

44. Ayn Rand, "What Is Romanticism?" *Romantic Manifesto*, 111.

45. I discuss romantic painting in my unpublished essay "Caspar David Friedrich and Visual Romanticism."

46. Rand, "What Is Romanticism?" 99.

47. Rand, *Atlas Shrugged*, 1020.

48. See Ayn Rand, "Art and Cognition," *Romantic Manifesto*, particularly pages 67, 72. She comments on the stylized aspect of romantic art in Mayhew, *Ayn Rand Answers*, 224–25.

49. While a core combination is a necessary means to the stylized, creative projection of an individual artist's values, it is not a *sufficient* means if considered as a purely formal esthetic feature. There are mixed cases where a core combination does not engage with and carry the artist's personal values, but instead is used for a fundamentally classicist or naturalistic end. For instance, certain dramas of the classical tradition, like *Oedipus Rex* and *Le Cid*, have brilliant plot-themes—which engage with and carry *conventional* values. And in some very artistic naturalist short stories, like Guy de Maupassant's "The Necklace," the core-combination device of an O. Henry-like "twist" ending gives poignancy to what is in essence an observed characteristic pattern. By contrast, the twist-at-the-end ideas of O. Henry himself *do* engage with the author's values, and his stories are romantic.

50. These formulations of the theme and plot-theme of *Gone With the Wind* are from Rand, "Basic Principles of Literature," 86.

51. See Leonard Peikoff, *Objectivism: The Philosophy of Ayn Rand* (New York: Dutton, 1991), 414–19.

52. It does function as a subconscious standard. See Ayn Rand, "Art and Sense of Life," *Romantic Manifesto*, 34–44.

53. I discuss how plot constitutes a value-expressive structure in "What Might Be and Ought to Be: Aristotle's *Poetics* and *The Fountainhead*," in the present collection, 155. Plot-theme is not the only form of core combination possible in fiction, although it is by far the most important. I mention twist endings in a preceding endnote. For an indication of yet another device, see my discussions of Ayn Rand's *Anthem* and Ibsen's *Peer Gynt* in Tore Boeckmann, "*Anthem* as a Psychological Fantasy," in Robert Mayhew, ed., *Essays on Ayn Rand's "Anthem"* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2005). I discuss visual core combinations in my unpublished essay "Caspar David Friedrich and Visual Romanticism." But much more needs to be said (and discovered) about the nature of the different core-combination devices in the various arts.

54. By contrast, the events of a naturalistic story are selected because they fit the reality-based pattern being presented, not in order to serve any structural need of the story as such. A classical column and its features serve no structural purpose (in a modern building). While a classical building can stand, and a naturalistic novel can have a loosely coherent story, structural concerns are not essential to selecting the concretes of such works.

55. Louis H. Sullivan, *The Autobiography of an Idea* (New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1956), 258.

56. Sullivan, *Autobiography*, 290. This process is not automatic but requires creative genius at every step. Ayn Rand once described the challenge of finding the right climax for *The Fountainhead* as "a real mind-breaker." Harriman, *Journals of Ayn Rand*, 165.

57. Hugo, "Preface to *Cromwell*," 384.

58. Hugo, "Preface to *Cromwell*," 363–64.

59. Ayn Rand, "The Goal of My Writing," *Romantic Manifesto*, 165–66.

60. Sue Lloyd, *The Man Who Was Cyrano* (Bloomington, Indiana: Unlimited Publishing, 2002), 235.

61. Unique among Rostand's heroes is Jesus, who appears in *The Woman of Samaria.* Rostand being a Christian, his Jesus suffers from no mind-body dichotomy, and interestingly, the play is completely plotless.

62. Edmond Rostand, *Plays of Edmond Rostand, Volume Two*, translated by Henderson Daingerfield Norman (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1921), 351.

63. Harriman, *Journals of Ayn Rand*, 707.

64. Rostand, *Plays*, 236.

65. Rostand, *Plays*, 237.

66. Rostand, *Plays*, 259–60.

67. Hugo, "Preface to *Cromwell*," 387.

68. Hugo, "Preface to *Cromwell*," 405, some emphases removed.

69. Harriman, *Journals of Ayn Rand*, 148.

70. In order to impose some structure on such hashes, Hollywood has developed its own set of pseudo-classicist rules about "character arcs" and "second-act turning points."

71. Harriman, *Journals of Ayn Rand*, 108.

72. Hugo, "Preface to *Cromwell*," 384–85.

73. See Rand, "What Is Romanticism?" especially 118–19.

74. Biographical interviews (Ayn Rand Archives).

75. I am grateful to the Ayn Rand Institute for a grant that supported the writing of this essay, to Michael Berliner of the Ayn Rand Archives for providing helpful information, and to Robert Mayhew and Gregory Salmieri for making astute comments on various drafts.