

Spring 2019

"Could I annoy you for a drink?" : Social management and alcoholism in Fitzgerald's *The Great Gatsby* and *Tender is the night*

Lucy Anderson Granroth
Eastern Washington University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dc.ewu.edu/theses>



Part of the [American Literature Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Granroth, Lucy Anderson, ""Could I annoy you for a drink?" : Social management and alcoholism in Fitzgerald's *The Great Gatsby* and *Tender is the night*" (2019). *EWU Masters Thesis Collection*. 554.
<https://dc.ewu.edu/theses/554>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Research and Creative Works at EWU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in EWU Masters Thesis Collection by an authorized administrator of EWU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact jotto@ewu.edu.

“Could I Annoy You for a Drink?”: Social Management and Alcoholism in Fitzgerald’s
The Great Gatsby and *Tender is the Night*

A Thesis

Presented to

Eastern Washington University

Cheney, Washington

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree

Master of Arts in Literature and Writing

By

Lucy Anderson Granroth

Spring 2019

THESIS OF Lucy Anderson Granroth APPROVED BY

_____ DATE _____

DR. ANTHONY FLINN, GRADUATE COMMITTEE CHAIR

_____ DATE _____

DR. BETH TORGERSON, GRADUATE COMMITTEE MEMBER

_____ DATE _____

MS. JACLYN PARROTT, MLIS, MDiv, GRADUATE COMMITTEE MEMBER

MASTER'S THESIS

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a master's degree at Eastern Washington University, I agree that the JFK Library shall make copies freely available for inspection. I further agree that the copying of this project in whole or in part is allowable only for scholarly purposes. It is understood, however, that any copying or publication of this thesis for commercial purposes, or for financial gain, shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Signature _____

Date _____

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	
Alcoholism as a Part of Habitus.....	1
Chapter 1—	
Unsuccessful Social Power	24
Chapter 2—	
Alcoholism as a Social Authority	41
Conclusion	
Defeat of Power by the Authority of Alcoholism.....	61
Works Cited	65

Introduction:

Alcoholism as a Part of Habitus

Abe North, one of a number of prolific alcoholics in F. Scott Fitzgerald's *Tender is the Night*, asks the title question, "Could I annoy you for a drink?" of his friend, Dick Diver, while the man is trying to play a game of Scrabble. Because North identifies Diver as a social manager, North politely and obediently asks him for direction. Recognizing that North is already under the influence, Diver explains that he can have a drink if he can spell the word "alcohol" correctly. Instead of attempting the request, North laughs, pours himself a glass and sits. By doing so, North asserts the authority of his alcoholism, sitting down with his friend but not joining in his game.

Composed during Prohibition, Fitzgerald's works contain examples of the authority of alcoholism. *The Great Gatsby* was published in 1925, right at the height of the Prohibition era, while *Tender is the Night* was published in 1934, one year after Prohibition ended. Fitzgerald created characters that lived and struggled with the effects of alcoholism, whether it is their own or a struggle in the life of a loved one. Jay Gatsby and Dick Diver are two notable examples of characters struggling with the effects of alcoholism within Fitzgerald's works. The men are powerful within each of their lives; they have powerful positions, powerful demeanors, and powerful connections in society. They are also both social managers, a term created from Pierre Bourdieu's "Habitus." A social manager are those who encourage their subjects towards their own ideal social interactions by exerting power. Social management can be either a power or an authority; both attempt to manage others' values and subsequently, their actions and ambitions. Because our ambitions and actions are affected by being under the rule of power or

authority, submitting to either requires a loss of our agency and the submittal to the social manager. A powerful social manager is a social manager which constructs its position through acts that threaten the loss of significant structures, meaningful structures that are substantially important to our comfort. However, neither Gatsby nor Diver can retain authority, which we fundamentally respect once it is recognized. Jay Gatsby, who only occasionally and carefully drinks alcohol, is unsuccessful in retaining his romantic subject, Daisy. Daisy is a social alcoholic, who does not function comfortably without the authority of her alcoholism. Like Gatsby, Dick Diver is similarly unsuccessful in keeping his subjects, his family, together. Because of his own alcoholism, Diver cannot attain a level of authority in his own life or within his own family and function as a successful social manager. Prohibition was similarly a powerful social management construction that was ultimately unsuccessful in retaining its values as societies' values, making the historical framework of this time period a seamless example of why social power is unsuccessful when faced with the task of managing the authority of alcoholism. By framing Fitzgerald's fictional characters, Jay and Daisy from *The Great Gatsby* and Dick and Nicole Diver from *Tender is the Night*, within their specific time period, I hope to explain the intricacies of social management that his characters experienced.

Writers publishing during Prohibition did not neglect to realize how the authority of alcoholism and the significant structures it establishes in the life of its subjects and therefore include this circumstance in their writing. Many included how the significance of the authority of alcoholism often results in negative consequences despite this significance and comfort it creates within its subject. These American writers recognized "the [ability] of drink to influence behavior and shape destiny" (Celucci and Larsen 65).

A common theme of the alcoholic in literature is his habitual return to the drink; despite other significant structures in the alcoholic's life, the authority of alcoholism reveals that his alcoholism is the most significant. The "pattern that emerges" in an alcoholic's life is the "heavy price exacted of the individual drinker and the community in which he or she drinks" (Celucci and Larsen 66). Although alcoholism is an authority that is not to say that its effects create valuable outcomes. When a writer utilizes this pattern to create fiction, the "depiction of drinking became more convincing" (Eble 43). *Daisy and Diver* are convincing depictions of subjects of alcoholism written during Prohibition by Fitzgerald.

Many scholars have related alcoholism in novels by early 20th-century American authors to a biographical rather than cultural perspective. They explain that because an author was an alcoholic, the story is embedded with the authority of his or her alcoholism. Many of these scholars, such as Roth, denote the authors' alcoholism as a muse, referring to alcohol as the "milk of wonder" that inspires writers' creative thinking (3). Fitzgerald, Hemingway and Faulkner are the American authors most commonly written about in terms of their alcoholism affecting their writing. Faulkner's novels frequently feature heavy imbibing and Hemingway may be the most prolific historical sous in existence. Presuming that a person's struggle with alcoholism is the sole source of their pages being embedded in the authority of alcoholism is incorrect, however. All books written during American Prohibition, regardless of author, portray the social authority of alcoholism witnessed at this moment of history. Here, I instead approach alcoholism as a cultural phenomenon seen throughout America and not only within the margins of creative writers. I do not argue that Fitzgerald's works include the authority of

alcoholism because of biographical reasons but historical and cultural reasons. I argue that any novel written during the period of Prohibition, regardless of whether that author imbibed or not, features alcohol as a social authority and use Fitzgerald's works to explain this argument.

Bourdieu establishes that everything is made up of structuring structures. Habitus is the structures that create our identity. Habitus makes up a person's state of being and how they perceive the world. The structures that we recognize create our perception of the world because it creates our values, morals, ambitions, etc. Every person recognizes different structures – our habitus therefore shapes our personality. Structures naturally evolve – language evolves, science evolves, morals and social values evolve. To adhere to a structure is to further solidify its place in your habitus. While American alcoholic authors may have been within victim of the structure of alcoholism, every American living in the early 19th-century recognized the structure of alcoholism in American culture.

The authority of alcoholism to its subjects is an example of social management, which Bourdieu refers to as “social domination” (“Structures, Habitus, Practice”). Explaining social domination in the form of social management has as its objective to “reveal... the hidden forms of domination that are consciously and unconsciously reproduced in everyday life” (Sulkunen 105). A powerful social manager is an example of this domination. We are always involved in an act of hierarchical social domination, whether we are having social management exerted on us or respecting our self-motivating factors formed by our significant structures. Because social factors are required to be “meaningful” to the individual, as reasonable individuals we desire the motivations of a

social manager explained to us (Sulkunen 104). These motivations, when accepted, become our significant structures, a part of Habitus, “structured structures presupposed to determine structuring structures” (53). Structures are the building blocks that make up a person’s personality or are pieces of a societal construction; language is a structure, civility is a structure, our educational system is a structure. There are also structures inside of structures. Different departments structure a single university, for example. Structures are created through necessity and evolution of human progress. As language develops, its structures naturally adjust. As humans learn of technological and medical advances, the structure of medicine will adjust. All of our recognized structures create our unique Habitus: “the basis of perception and appreciate for all subsequent experiences” (Bourdieu 54). Habitus constructs how we perceive and appreciate the world; it is our outlook on the world, perception of morals and of what is valuable to us in order to feel comfortable. Because we see the world through the lens of our unique Habitus, our Habitus therefore informs our morals, actions, values, and who or what we respect as a social manager. Social management is a larger structure, either a power or an authority, which uses the significant structures of its subjects as a way to manipulate them. A significant object or act is important to those who are committed to the object or to performing the act; it is inherently vital to our comfort. Significant structures encompass everything we hold dear to ourselves: people, objects, places, values, freedoms, etc., that allow us to feel happy and comfortable. Significant structures are inherent to explaining social management because managed subjects are not necessarily logical. Reasonable individuals “attach meanings to practices that are not always subjectively correct” (Sulkunen 104). Individuals retain diverse significant structures and,

therefore, respond differently to dissimilar types of social management. Bourdieu's work "takes seriously this notion of [objectivity]" and recognizes the individual as a reasonable yet unique subject (Sulkunen 104). Therefore, a structure is not a structure is not a structure. Each one of us has our own Habitus, and when the structure of alcoholism is included within a subject's Habitus, it acts as an authority and the most respected social manager; a powerful social manager stands no chance.

According to Bourdieu, a social manager uses manipulation tactics to persuade us that our significant structures can be lost if we do not submit amiably to the power and abide by the created social rules. Social rules "are mutually agreed upon rules among the [reasonable] members of a society" (Olen 4). According to Kant and Hegel, humans are always inherently striving towards being rational individuals who are reasonable and want to understand the world around them (Donogan 9). Humans do not want to be confused and being a member of a society helps avoid confusion. The beneficial part of adhering to societal values is that if we, as members of society, act in a specific, conducive manner, others in the society will as well, creating a comfortable environment that allows us to retain our significant structures. A social manager instills in others the belief that certain behaviors emphasize correct values and will allow us to retain the most significant structures. Whether we are willing to adhere to these values emphasizes whether the social manager is a power or an authority. Social management, the pursuit of regulating and dictating another's values and therefore his actions, naturally has a "punitive nature" to it, meaning that the managers require adherence to their social values under the threat of loss of significant structures (Tresler 2); A powerful social manager,

such as Diver and Gatsby, is respected by its subjects because of the significant structures the manager creates and stabilizes within our lives.

Social management is similar to moral management, a “complex dialectic between self-control and ecstatic self-loss” because it is an exchange which requires one to control oneself according to the values of a manager other than the self (Tressler 1). In both moral and social management, the exchange is dialectic because when the management is successful, the discussion between the manager and the subject is a resolved in a reasonable argument between two opposing sides. The Online Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy defines “dialectics”:

“Dialectics” is a term used to describe a method of philosophical argument that involves some sort of contradictory process between opposing sides. In what is perhaps the most classic version of “dialectics”, the ancient Greek philosopher, Plato for instance, presented his philosophical argument as a back-and-forth dialogue or debate, generally between the character of Socrates, on one side, and some person or group of people to whom Socrates was [speaking] on the other. (Maybe).

While dialectics inherently involves an argument, it is not irrational. The subject and the moral manager contradict each other but continue a dialogue and debate. Whether moral or social, we naturally oppose being managed, making the two forces contradictory, until we realize that self-control in the form of adhering to the manager’s values results in retaining our significant structures. Moral management entails self-loss because a moral manager regulates its subjects’ moral actions, requiring the subject to lose a certain amount of agency; the subjects must control themselves according to the

values of the moral manager in order to retain significant structures. Thus we also suffer the loss of any choice that resides outside the boundaries of the moral manager. However, ecstasy results from recognizing that morals create more sense of the world and helping us retain our significant structures. Because reasonable humans are always striving towards rationality, anything that results in greater rationality creates ecstasy. However, a social manager does not require ecstasy because it does not necessarily increase rationality. We listen to and adhere to a social manager if it benefits us, allowing us to retain our significant structures, but the ecstasy is lost because of the inherent domination of the social manager. Any time that we gain further clarity and insight into the world around us, ecstasy is felt. The more structures and the further developed those structures become, the more clarity is felt and thus our ecstasy grows. These structures are then authorities in our lives, which allow us to make choices, decisions, and goals. Although we typically want to apply the concept of social authority to that which we perceive is beneficial, we are subjective individuals that have unique structuring structures, and therefore social authorities, in our lives. A structure that seems appalling to one person could be significant to another, there are no structures that are inherently correct or inherently incorrect.

While it may seem that that authority of alcoholism is oxymoronic because of the implications that come with the affliction, what constitutes a significant structure and social authority is not so black and white. When we recognize something as a significant structure, which creates clarity and ecstasy in our lives, we submit to that structure and accept it as part of our Habitus. Social management in the form of alcoholism is therefore a social authority when learned and accepted as a structure. While others that lack the

ailment may not understand how something that is typically viewed as morally wrong or to create negative consequences cannot be an authority, I argue that those that cannot grasp the concept of alcoholism's authority do not feel the clarity or ecstasy that social alcoholics feel about alcoholism as a defining social authority.

Society is a focused example of a social manager. To be a subject of society, make use of the structure of capitalism by shopping at Target, pay our taxes, live in a neighborhood, and all these mundane structuring structures of our lives, requires us as subjects to adhere to certain values. A successfully managed subject of society will not run into traffic on a whim; a person who does this frequently would be removed from society, placed into either a hospital or jail. This person, no longer a subject of society's social management and following its values, then loses the freedom to live in a house and shop at Target. Adhering to social management requires us to control ourselves, to align with the values of our managers in order to enjoy the benefits of society. If our desires conflict with the desire of the social manager, we lose either the agency to do we desire or our place in society— we cannot have both agency and social security. Therefore, the theory of social management is implicit to psychology because for one to be reasonable and respect significant structures, one has to recognize that to abide by the morals that surround the common ideologies is important to their society. The subject recognizes that a social manager is simple in a “contest for position, a distinction of others as a possessor of taste – and of power” (Sulkunen 106). While moral management stabilizes the world around us, allowing us to make more sense of it, social managers try to stabilize our actions towards other subjects within society. Moral management allows you a place in society – social management attempts to determine where that place is in the social

hierarchy. Moral management is the larger structure of management – social management resides in its borders, specifically managing the social interactions and exchanges of its subjects. Social managers can be either a power, such as Gatsby and Diver, or an authority, such as alcoholism.

While the words “authority” and “power” are sometimes used interchangeably and therefore often incorrectly, to define an idea, act, or person in charge, the definitions of the terms are different when it comes to societal values and social management. The terms therefore must be defined in relation to each other but are nevertheless different management structures. According to Anthony Finn in *Approaching Authority*, a person who is a successful power exerts control over its targets through surveillance and a dominating, insistent tone. Power “is inherently illegitimate: its subject audience is offered certain progressively unpleasant alternatives in order to compel a particular response” (Flinn 23). Michel Foucault explains in his “Panopticism” that discipline is maintained in modern societies through threat and force. A threat inherently involves the possibility of a loss. But we do not fear losing something that we do not care about, only that which is significant. Power is exerted in such a controlling manner that those being exerted upon are constantly scrutinizing its appeals. To call a tyrant an authority would be incorrect; a tyrant is instead powerful and exerts his power through control and manipulation. If there is a lack of authority in a position of social management, “hierarchies are imposed and maintained by force,” implying they are maintained through the exertion of power (Flinn 19). Powerful social managers encourage their managed populace to stray from what they have deemed appropriate interactions for its given subjects. As reasonable individuals, we follow the desires and directions of the powerful

manager because of what is lost or damaged when the power is disobeyed. Reason enacts a loss of agency when the reasonable individuals are being morally managed by a powerful figure. Reasonable individuals innately respond to authority; however, power must be exercised and instilled through fear, with war being the most obvious example of a power structure (Galbraith xiii). Typically, humans idealize power as being as important to attain in life as success. In fact, Galbraith asserts that many define being powerful as being successful, and vice versa (1). Power is seen as a “moral leader” but that this is an error because it seems to be “giving morality a bad name” (Galbraith’2). Success and morality do not necessarily go hand-in-hand. Corruption is at power’s core and to parallel its definition to authority, which is legitimate. Power itself is illegitimate and a powerful social manager hopes to appeal illegitimate actions to its subjects. Therefore seeing “power as a moral leader is... to give morality a bad name” (Galbraith 2). Morality is what a person or society places as their fundamental beliefs, the ideal path to success and achievement of being a good person. If power is inherently illegitimate, then a moral power is an oxymoron; a person who plays the role of a powerful social manager does not the best interests of the individual or society at its core.

Related to Flinn’s idea that a lack of authority in a position of management leads to power maintained by force, Galbraith asserts that in order for power to be enforced, it must win submission of its subjects “by the ability to impose an alternative to the preferences of the individual or group that is sufficiently unpleasant or painful so that these preferences are abandoned” (4). Punishment is inherent if one does not adhere to a powerful manager; one abandons pursuits if they lead to sufficient punishment and instead must listen to the power for direction. This system of punitive repercussions is not

the only way power exerts control, however. A powerful manager may also sway its subjects with a reward system. The power may promise to fulfil desires or wishes of its subjects if the subjects agree to its terms and to respect its values. This type of power is called “compensatory power” (Galbraith 5). Significant structures play an important role in compensatory power. We learn that that which is significant to us will be taken away or somehow disturbed if the power is not adhered to. We are aware of the power being exerted on us – we avoid the actions that would see them punished and instead adhere to actions that will lead to an apparent reward. These “good” morals or actions, sanctioned by the powerful manager, guarantee a place within the given society. Therefore, power is conditioned – we learn to achieve the correct acts through these boundaries created by the power. We, as reasonable individuals, enjoy that which is significant to us and therefore allow power to be exerted on us in order to maintain these significant features of our lives. One of the assertions that must be questioned when writing on power and authority is the claim of how they are individually informed and created. If power is inherently illegitimate, then why do individuals and groups seek power instead of authority? The reasons for seeking power are as illegitimate as the enforcement of its desires; the group’s subjective values in the form of some apparent unrightfully earned gain are the root of the desire to be a power. Powerful managers “seek power in order to advance their own interests” including but not limited to “pecuniary interests” (Galbraith 8). A politician who genuinely hopes to better their city and better the lives of the people living in it is not seeking power; however, a politician who owns businesses and knows running for office would provide exposure (and thus profit) for those businesses is attempting to gain power.

Flinn reflects the definition of authority that comes from Robert Sennett, a theorist who uses the word power to define what a social authority is. Flinn interrogates this definition, explaining that because power and authority are oppositional, one cannot be within the definition of another. Sennett's definition of authority "points out that this belief is an implicit, unspoken contract between authority and subject" (Flinn 28). In applying these terms to social alcoholism, alcoholism played the role of authority in its subjects' lives as "any act of thinking invokes an authority of some kind, a system of beliefs, whether abstractedly conceived, instinctively felt, or invested in a human or institution" (Flinn 19). Authority is often established early in life and is learned through nurture and recurrence. An ideology, person, rule, etc. that has authoritative qualities has credibility; those that adhere to it trust it in its reliability. While authority comes from a learned respect – a series of acts that inspire the individual to adhere innately to its authority. It is so respected that it is not questioned; if a subject is successfully submitting to an authority, the subject does not even realize there is a choice of life without the authority; "authority, by definition, must go unexamined by those subject to it" (Flinn 19). However, if power is involved then the authority figure would hold the subjects "self-regard on a leash," which conflicts with the idea that authority is innate because "subordination and submission...express an exertion of power, not authority" (Flinn 28; 108). Therefore, Sennett is actually speaking on power when he defines an "authority figure." A social manager, by this explanation, exerts its ideal values through the belief of its reasonable subject in consequences for actions deemed immoral. The consequences involve the loss of significant structures. Significant structures are related to power because we do not fear losing something that is not significant to us. A powerful social

manager by definition must therefore solidify what is significant to its subjects as well as well as explain the loss of these significant structures if the power is not amiably adhered to. However, in order for the power to know what is significant to its subjects, it must observe them carefully, resulting in surveillance being mandatory for a power to be exerted properly.

As Foucault points out, power is also maintained through surveillance; the person who is having power exerted on them must be watched at all times and must also be aware of that the surveilling is being accomplished. Through both surveillance and manipulation of significant structures, the automatic functioning of power is done by “inducing the inmate in a state of conscious and permanent visibility” (Foucault 201). While an authority does not need to keep a watchful eye on its population, a powerful figure has to retain permanent visibility in order to be adhered to by its subjects. Foucault’s “Panopticism” explains the relation of power to the of managed subjects. The panopticon is a “marvelous machine” that by design allows the subjects to be under constant surveillance by their powerful keeper (201). Inherent to the design is the subjects’ constant awareness of being surveilled. In this design, a circular tower surrounds circular cells that the subjects are kept in, the power can observe all of its subjects at once. Therefore, the “inmates” are kept in “a state of permanent visibility that assures automatic functioning of power” (Foucault 201). Because of the concentric circles formation, with the subjects surrounding and facing the “tower” of the keeper, the keeper can keep watch over all of its society at once. Foucault describes the device as the “opposite of a dungeon” (200). Both a dungeon and a panopticon hold prisoners or “subjects.” Yet, while a prisoner in a dungeon has already been found guilty of a crime

and thus shunned from society, a panopticon's subject is under constant surveillance lest they commit a crime; consequently, subjects can therefore lose their unique significant structures more immediately. When within the panopticon, the subjects cannot avoid the eye of their keeper and its power, and therefore must adjust their behavior to the keeper's demands in order to keep their position in the panopticon and not be punished in a "constant, profound, and significant" manner (Foucault 203). The subjects, inmates of power, cannot act outside the moral values of the panopticon or will lose his or her place, ensuring the keeper be kept in its state of power. The panopticon's keeper is not only visible but invisible: the subjects are aware that they are being watched and that disrupting their keeper's values will remove them from society but do not know who the watcher is; they are kept in a constant state of confusion. The middle of the circle is the keeper, in a tower, but with no discernable eyes – watching but unable to be watched, "visible but unverifiable" (Foucault 201). The unverifiable nature of the power expresses its illegitimacy – in contrast to a truthful manager with nothing to hide, which will be explained as authority in my further chapter – an authority is not worried about transparency because its subjects trust it.

However, in contrast to power, authority is treated as though it is innate; authority is not questioned but adhered to because it is the most reasonable decision in order to be comfortable and retain our significant structures. About authority: "Three related conditions presupposed and support authority's presence: a shared set of assumptions and values, which grants the individual membership in a community; a coherent set of means to interpret experience; and a generally held belief that the individual in some way participates in the shape authority takes...." (Flinn 19). Authority must be undeniably

sensed by its subjects in order for it to exist. The acknowledgment of the undeniable respect to the authority allows us to be a member of the community; being a part of this community is a significant structure to us. Those of us within the group see the world through a similar lens – the lens of the authority. To the stoic, unquestionable Christian, religion is an example of an authority. The morals of the Bible are a significant structure in his and every true Christian's life. Without the authority of the Christian religion in its subjects' lives, the values of the Bible would not be a significant structure to the subjects. Biblical values become instinctive because of this authority. Authority creates a "common perception and value" because its existence is "presupposed" (Guillory; qtd. in Flinn 18). Those that adhere to a similar authority similarly respect it as an uncontested moral manager.

While I recognize that any authority is learned and accepted to its subjects, I also acknowledge that an individual subject may not realize how faithful they are to the authority because to respect it feels innate and inherent to the subject; i.e. to respect the authority is so natural that the subject may not recognize that a decision to respect it is even being made, making its authority "presupposed." Authority, whether in the form of alcoholism or stoic Christianity is a learned manager; that is, a person is not born with morals or values and thus is not born with any inherent moral or social managers. We must be exposed to the structure of management and then acquire the respect needed to adhere to a manager in order for its authority to be learned as a significant structure. Authority "is present only where it is felt" (Flinn 16). To get a "feel" of an authority means to decide that to adhere to the authority is reasonable and the belief that the authority constructs, reveals, and helps retain one's significant structures to its subjects.

While Flinn realizes the innate respect to an authority by its subjects, Werkmeister helpfully defines what does not constitute authority. He explains that authority “does not imply legally grounded power” (Werkmeister 94). Instead, authority is “recognized as unchallengeable” because when we acknowledge an authority we respect its “the language, customs, institutions, and dominant world view of that society”: its significant structures (Werkmeister 96-97). Authority is more instinctive than laws in that authority does not need justification. The respect of the authority is accepted once it is learned and does not need a reason why, except that adhering to the authority’s values will create and allow us to retain our significant structures. An authority is recognized to have “a function and limits” to its subjects (Werkmeister 97). Authority acts as a structure and to create significant structure, in the Bourdieu tradition of Habitus where structuring structures create further structuring structures. However, because of our ability to make choices, an authority has its limits; a subject feels an authority so strongly that it always will choose its structure, however, if the choice is available. An authority has the upper hand in all of its reasonable subjects’ decision-making; we will not consider a challenge because of our authority’s important relationship with our subjects’ significant structures. However, because of how natural the authority is in the subjects’ lives, the subject may not realize the decisions they are making to respect the authority are actually optional. Because the subject naturally respects the authority, powerful management cannot be exerted successfully. I will explain powerful social management during the time period of American Prohibition specifically and connect that explication to the social authority of alcoholism experienced by Gatsby and Diver.

The alcoholism experienced by Fitzgerald's characters and described here is not the addiction known as the disease of alcoholism. What I focus on here instead is *social alcoholism*. While a social drinker is a person who drinks in a social situation because those around him are imbibing, a social alcoholic will feel comfortable only in a social situation while intoxicated. An example of a social drinker is the narrator, Nick Carraway, who starts *The Great Gatsby* as a non-drinker but becomes a social drinker when around others, such as his cousin, Daisy, who are drinking. However, a social alcoholic is different. The object of all people is to be comfortable – a social alcoholic is uncomfortable in social situations without the comfort of their alcoholism. There may be multiple factors that contribute to the social alcoholic's discomfort without their alcoholism – anxiety, low self-esteem, grief, etc. – but the main factor that defines a social alcoholic is the discomfort and unhappiness they experience when sober in a social situation. The social alcoholism is intrinsic to the person's identity, their Habitus. The structure of their social life is not stable without including the structure of their social alcoholism. Their alcoholism is an avoidance strategy – the social alcoholic can avoid anxiety or low self-esteem by becoming intoxicated. The intoxication is a part of the alcoholic's identity; his friends would not know him sober. To them, the alcoholic is only their true selves while intoxicated. For example, whenever friends arrive, Daisy first orders or serves them drinks before doing anything else. Her husband, Tom, similarly always imbibes whenever around friends or acquaintances. While another term, such as "social alcohol use" could be applied to describe the actions of social alcoholics, using the term "social alcoholism" carries the weight needed to describe the necessity of alcohol within a social alcoholic's life. A social alcoholic does not function in a social

setting without their alcoholism; “social alcohol use” does not properly explain the feeling experienced by those that are social alcoholics and instead refers to a social drinker like Nick. When I refer to alcoholism within their paper, I am referring to the social definition rather than the medical definition of the term. Social alcoholism was experienced by many within the American public during Prohibition.

Framing works within their respective time periods in order to reveal qualities of the character and work is referred to as New Historicism. New Historicism examines literature by placing the work within its respective time period. This placement is done through the use of cultural artifacts: articles, art, music, etc. to create a cultural framework, hoping the context this historical lens provides will reveal qualities of the literature that were previously unseen. Because both Gatsby and Diver were social managers during American Prohibition, it is imperative to understanding Prohibition and the effect it had on society and society’s morals in order to explain the dynamic of power and authority in each character’s life and society. Fitzgerald chose to set his novels within Prohibition for a specific reason. To better understand Fitzgerald’s two novels, examples of social management, both power and authority must be seen in both non-fiction and fictional examples in order to establish the connection between a person’s relationship with alcoholism during Prohibition and that person’s ability to be a successful social manager. It is important to show non-fiction, contemporary examples to demonstrate that the cultural phenomenon of alcoholism’s authority is seen not only within a facet of fictional accounts of the world but also was true to the historical time period. My New Historicism approach to Fitzgerald, who lived, wrote, and drank during Prohibition, will use alcoholism as the medium through which to expose a character or writer’s association

with social management. By including nonfiction as well as fiction, there will be the application of the anecdotes or true stories from the time-period, which will therefore frame the fictional works within Prohibition. The New Historicist treats texts as “elaborate ciphers and seeks to fix the meaning of fictional characters and actions in their reference to specific historical persons and events” (Montrose 220). Written works are therefore not only literature but cultural artifacts. Two cultural artifacts that I will focus on are the non-fiction writings of Mabel Walker Willebrandt’s “Will You Help Keep the Law?” and Lois Long’s articles for the *New Yorker*, respectively. Non-fiction examples of writing that includes themes of power, such as Willebrandt, and authority, Long, will frame moral management within the time period of Prohibition, exposing why alcoholism during Prohibition led to the inability to be a successful power. Willebrandt, the Assistant U.S. Attorney General during Prohibition, wrote books as well as articles in ladies’ magazines exalting the virtuous world that Prohibition could create while Long reviewed speakeasies for *The New Yorker* under the pseudonym “Lipstick” during the same time period. Each woman was attempting to exert control through being a social manager, but this paper will argue that Long retained authority due to her alcoholism and the alcoholic populace that clung to her writings.

The first inklings of Prohibition started decades before the bill was ratified to the U.S. Constitution. Around 1840, American society was significantly involved in the temperance movement; the society had decided that “the drunk was a moral sinner who could stop drinking if he so desired” (Ewing and Rouse 46). In his theory of morality, Olen states that each person has a choice of whether to follow society’s moral rules. Because these drunks were not choosing to abstain from alcohol, alcohol would have to

be taken from them. Taverns and saloons and other gathering places were considered places of immoral behavior. Society members were critical of the American populace (themselves) for allowing such places to exist. Although this criticism of society being at fault for why the problem of alcoholism existed, “do not assume that alcoholics gained any social or moral acceptance; the one and only solution [is] the enactment of National Prohibition which [will]...alleviate his moral weakness” (Ewing and Rouse 47). Society at large did not trust that the alcoholic could abstain from alcohol if it was within their grasp; therefore, the weakness of their character was used as an excuse to ban imbibing altogether at a national level in the United States when Prohibition became law. Being seen as a sober individual was not significant to the imbibers; the government hopes there was enough significance in the structure of membership within society. Power was enacted on a grand scale in 1920 when the 18th amendment, the Prohibition of the consumption and sale of alcohol officially went into effect.

Picken asserts that anytime Prohibition is the time-period that a novel is set in, it “becomes a governing concept ordering the narrative” (441). The authority of alcoholism in the life of characters who are struggling to follow the power of the law creates unique situations and struggles in these novels. When novels were being published during and about Prohibition, it registered in that national consciousness and these works often made “light of Prohibition’s obvious failures to legislate morality” (Picken 442). Works created during Prohibition showed how “gender, class and race identities evolve when confronted with the powerful, unseen influences driving Prohibition” (443). Alcoholism was viewed at the national level as a moral problem but many novels, including *The Great Gatsby* and *Tender is the Night*, expose the inability of the government to be an authority

concerning alcoholism; the alcoholism is the authority in its subjects' lives, and the government's power being exerted on its people is not enough to thwart alcohol consumption completely. Alcoholism affects the major characters of both *The Great Gatsby* and *Tender is the Night* both directly and indirectly. Studying alcoholic characters in American literature can help educate students about the social qualities and symptoms the addiction (Cellucci and Larsen 64). One of these symptoms is that those who socialize with alcoholics or are victims of the disease itself witness "disastrous consequences" of the addiction that "are unforeseen by these characters" and describe "the power of drink to influence behavior and shape destiny" (Cellucci and Larsen 65). By applying Bourdieu's concepts of power and authority to social alcoholism, I will argue that alcoholism is not a power but a learned authority in its subjects' lives. Adhering to the authority of alcoholism changes the character's behavior and destiny, as seen in the collapse of Diver and Daisy running away from Long Island and her problems.

Instances of social managers are exemplified in Fitzgerald's works, written and set during American Prohibition. Fitzgerald's socially powerful characters of Gatsby and Diver are strong, masculine, charismatic types that other characters listen to and admire. In their respective novels, each man also has a woman in his life who is struggling with her own problems, which the men hope to help them solve or recover from. My first chapter, "Unsuccessful Social Power," will focus on the nonfiction example of Willebrandt to frame the systems of power that were in place during Prohibition as well as outline the powerful natures of Gatsby and Diver. However, while the men are social powers, they never attain social authority because of the struggles in their lives involving

alcoholism. To its subjects, alcoholism is an authority because it is innate to their character – the subject is only their true selves when under the influence. My second chapter will focus on alcoholism more specifically, clarifying the social definition of the ailment. Using Long’s writings from *The New Yorker* as well as excerpts from Fitzgerald, I will subsequently explain why alcoholism acted as an authority during Prohibition. I will explain why his social power is extinguished when met by the authority of alcoholism. My second chapter, “Alcoholism as a Social Authority,” will explain that because authority is inherently stronger than power, alcoholism successfully kept its subjects in a way powerful social manager during Prohibition could not. I argue that during Prohibition a social power could not successfully manage its subject if the manager or the subject was an alcoholic and therefore adhered to the authority of alcoholism.

Before explaining the concept of alcoholism as an authority, I must explain the positions of Gatsby and Diver as powers. The following chapter will explain the details of power using Willebrandt’s governing words written from her powerful management position as an example of the climate of social management during prohibition. Gatsby and Diver’s exigency of their subjects to adhere to their power will then be explained using examples from each of their respective novels. After establishing the men as powers, my subsequent chapter will explain how alcoholism is an authority in its subjects’ lives.

Chapter One:
Unsuccessful Social Power

Power is found at the head of hierarchies that control their subjects. Using Bourdieu's hierarchy of social management and applying it to Prohibition, I will exemplify how power is formed, how it is enacted on its citizens, and why it ultimately fails to meet its objectives when the authority of alcoholism is involved. Similarly, Fitzgerald's *Gatsby* and *Diver*, each in a position of power, orchestrate actions and values for their subjects to follow for selfish reasons but fail in each of their respective goals. Explaining the powerful social management seen within Willebrandt's nonfiction essay from *Ladies Home Journal* will further place the definition of a power in the specific historical moment of Prohibition.

In the early 20th century, the United States' government believed it had its subjects', its citizens, best interests in mind when constructing and passing Prohibition. It also had a hope that a sober population, adjusted to being told what to do by its government, would be easier to control. Formal, state-instituted management was exerted on all citizens of the United States after the "twentieth century found the anti-saloon and anti-alcohol forces gaining increased power and support" (Ewing and Rouse 49). Temperance groups apparently witnessed men drinking away their checks on payday, leaving their wives and children living without the proper amenities. While the 1880 Prohibition Act was smoothly defeated, only 34 years later, in 1914, the first steps for a Prohibition amendment to the constitution was ratified – the idea of a lazy drunk who beat his wife was established in society's mind through propaganda and political campaigns in a swift manner once the anti-saloon leagues gained traction (Ewing and Rouse 50). However, before Prohibition could be voted on, what the amendment

involved had to be sufficiently explained to an immigrant population, many of whom were from European countries with much imbibing in their cultural histories. Political cartoons, magazine public service announcements, and other propaganda devices were used in order to increase support for the Prohibition movement. World War I political posters encouraged American citizens to spend their extra pennies on the war effort, not on booze (Hill 27). By linking sobriety with the war effort, Prohibition was framed as a patriotic cause – it was not only immoral to drink but un-American. Newly arrived Immigrants were harassed for maintaining the ideals of their respective home countries and not adhering to what was deemed to be American – sobriety. Among these ideals was the significant structure of being accepted as an American. Appearing American was a significant structure to immigrants because it was the way to maintain a position at a company, earn respect from your American neighbors, and convince those neighbors that you are committed to American values. Prohibition forced an immigrant population to either oust themselves as still being an “other” through continuing to imbibe or, alternately, allowed them a place in society by adhering to societal pressure to maintain sobriety. Although immigrant populations were “isolated by language, custom, and religion,” sobriety could unite them (Timberlake 18). Manipulation of significant structures is used by a power to exert its wishes: being an American is significant to the immigrant populations that worked so hard to be on its soil, losing that identity may negate all of the work exerted to get to the country.

Another propaganda device was involving women in politics and hoping their collective knowledge of and passion for Prohibition would encourage the men in their lives to vote in favor of the 18th Amendment. Involving women in politics did not stop

after the approval; women were encouraged to continue to involve themselves in the political atmosphere of the US following their right to vote with the ratification of the 19th Amendment in 1920. One of the first women to have an outspoken voice in U.S. politics was Willebrandt, the Assistant U.S. Attorney General from 1921-1929 (Hill 61). Once Prohibition was established and subsequently flummoxed the country with organized crime and bootleggers, Americans had to be convinced that they had made the right decision in ratifying the 19th amendment. While initially hesitant of national Prohibition, Willebrandt was a steadfast supporter of Prohibition once the law took effect. While Assistant U.S. Attorney General during Prohibition, Willebrandt wrote a book, *The Inside of Prohibition*, which explains the details of the strict enforcement of the 19th amendment. While imbibers would be punished severely, those who made and distributed intoxicating liquors would be met with the full extent of the law and be given the harshest sentences available. In her book, Willebrandt explains to the public that the government realizes the extent to which rum-running and boot-legging was happening on American shores and soil and that she will do everything within her power to limit these nefarious transactions. It would not be easy, however; Willebrandt asserted that “My own conviction was - and still is - that prohibition can and will be enforced whenever and wherever there is the will and determination to enforce it, plus the full and proper use of legal authority, manpower and available equipment” (*The Inside of Prohibition*). Within her position, she not only enforced Prohibition but instigated the arrest and conviction of corrupt officials and police officers as well as “coordinated complex operations to bring down important violators” (Hill 142). Willebrandt took her job seriously despite the high levels of corruption in government agencies that were supposed to protect Prohibition.

Willebrandt's essay "Will You Help Keep the Law?" is evidence of the powers that were seen in American society during Prohibition. Willebrandt's article explains to my readers who exactly were the people within positions of power in the government while their stories were being played out as well as emphasizes the role and lack of respect for women in positions of social management. When examining the writing from a New Historicism perspective, Willebrandt's article articulates the power dynamics that existed in the U.S. during Prohibition. According to Hickling, New Historicism, examining texts within its respective time period's society, "engage[s] in the emphasis on power relations operating within the society of its time" (54) Willebrandt's writing is a part of American history. Fitzgerald's characters existed in the same time that Willebrandt was working for the government and writing books, articles, and essays. Cultural artifacts from their time period frame why Gatsby and Diver are powerful rather than authoritative. Hickling explains that using cultural artifacts to define phenomena of a time period "examines the ways in which a cultural product (especially a literary text) interacts with and participates in its historical context, especially with reference to power relations operating within the society of its time" (54) Fitzgerald's characters were both created and lived during Prohibition and had significant relationships with alcohol – acknowledging this historical setting is imperative, therefore, to understanding how Gatsby and Diver were powerful managers. Hickling asserts that New Historicism allows literary texts to not only be explored but for power relationships specifically to be revealed.

Within American society, Willebrandt established herself as a powerful social manager in the American government – she frequently lectured at Universities and wrote

articles for magazines. In these speeches and essays “she pleaded with citizens to obey the law and cooperate with enforcement” (Hill 142). In 1924 Willebrandt wrote an article for the *Good Housekeeping* encouraging women to support their husband’s sobriety and to not give up on the idea of a dry United States. “Will You Help Keep the Law?” her article asked the women of America. Willebrandt establishes early in the essay that good people follow the law and that having and following laws is the only thing that separates man from beast. She describes how “man’s power to overcome natural forces had been acquired by obedience to their laws.” Humans have become reasonable individuals and formed a reasonable society by overcoming natural forces that hope to make us fight neck-and-neck for mates and food. Laws and the adherence to laws is what grounds us in civilization. Willebrandt is connecting drinking to animalistic qualities – humans have evolved past being beasts-in-the-field and therefore should also evolve from drinking alcohol. When the article was published, Willebrandt was in an important position within the federal government and uses this position to be a powerful voice supporting the 19th amendment. She explains that Prohibition is a great “moral reform” in the United States and that any act which contradicts Prohibition is an “allied offense against society” (“Will You Help Keep the Law?” 235). Willebrandt is placing herself as a social manager when she attempts to persuade others to her position of respecting Prohibition. She uses language that attempts to guilt women into submission to the law when she asserts that while most of them have not had to deal with criminals as directly as she has, that does not mean they can ignore the problem. “The country’s sincerity, integrity, and honor are jeopardized” by those disobeying Prohibition, Willebrandt claims in the essay, hoping to instill fear of a morally-desolate future for American in the

readers' minds (73). Through using rhetorical tactics of guilt and the threat of an unstable, immoral, lawless America, Willebrandt establishes herself as a social power. If her morals, the morals of Prohibition, are not strictly adhered to, there will be punishment for all. She explains that "loyal respect [of the law] is the part of all fair-minded citizens," urging women to discourage drinking to their spouses, sons, etc. and do their part in sustaining the practice of Prohibition (236). Willebrandt is asserting that to sit idly by while others imbibe is to be unreasonable – a reasonable, patriotic American woman speaks up when others break the law. Willebrandt again utilizes scare-tactics in order to promote her morals – to imbibe alcohol or allow others to imbibe implies that you are not fair-minded and thus unreasonable.

Power implies that the person or group exerting the power has as its ultimate endeavor some kind of selfish goal. The United States' goal was to squash out alcohol from its public, create a sober populace that is controlled by their allegiance to their government instead of their allegiance to have a good time at the bottom of a bottle on the weekend. But what was Willebrandt's goal in identifying herself as an individual power within the echelon of the government? As the first female Assistant U.S. Attorney General, Willebrandt had to prove herself as capable at the job as a man. While a man in her position already has the benefit of his masculinity, Willebrandt instead had the cultural disadvantage of being a woman. A male Assistant U.S. Attorney General's appeal to his populace may have appeared in *The New York Times* or a nationally-respected periodical read by the majority of its literate populace; Willebrandt instead had her essay published in *Good Housekeeping* – she was banished from the traditional podium of the Assistant U.S. Attorney General to instead speak at the metaphorical

auxiliary meeting of the important men's wives, mothers and sisters. Willebrandt recognized her diminished capacity for speaking to her citizens and therefore maintained a powerful tone in any speech or essay she was allowed to publish or orate. The language of the article is fearful and articulate – it does not hold back in explaining the guilt the women of America should feel that they have allowed the men in their lives to continue to imbibe despite the laws against it. Willebrandt wants to instill fear in the women because she is fearful herself – fearful of being seen as weak in her position. If Willebrandt had written to her fellow women in a relatable, gossipy manner then she would surely be ostracized for not maintaining the powerful conduct expected of her position. Willebrandt had two powerful goals when writing “Will You Help Keep the Law?”: to commit women to helping her maintain sobriety in men, but to also prove to the men who did read the article, probably her peers, that she is in no way faulting in her position of power and speaks to women from this position instead of their friend, confidante, or sister. Willebrandt may very well have believed in the strengths of Prohibition but lacks the clarity needed to prove this position because of her need to establish herself in a role she has already earned, limiting her ability to express powerful social management practices.

Fitzgerald's Jay Gatsby, a powerful social manager, is a frequent subject of conversation in New York society after moving into a mansion on Long Island. Gatsby, a secretive man with a mysterious past and money with ambiguous origins, moved into the mansion in a strategic manner – it was no coincidence that his home is across the water from the home of the object of his affection, Daisy. On her dock shines a green light, warning boats of its obstruction but signaling a different meaning to Gatsby, who

observes the light as if he is watching the woman herself. Gatsby retains power in many forms; he is connected to the rich and influential in New York City as well as the Midwest, his money allows him to choose whatever possessions and create any event he desires, but he is also a social power because of the way he interacts with these who could be seen as his “subjects,” gossip society that admires him. The subject that Gatsby exerts the most social management on is whom he is trying to control: Daisy. The controlling nature of the management exposes Gatsby’s powerful, rather than authoritative, nature. Daisy also has another social manager in her life that is more innate to her than Gatsby’s persuasion: alcoholism. The authoritative nature of alcoholism in Daisy’s life, combined with Gatsby’s powerfully controlling demeanor, prevents the couple from being together. Gatsby is a social power because he is morally culpable for his actions; he makes an “informed choice” to attempt to control the outcome of Daisy’s life which allows him to be “morally blameworthy,” according to Moore (646). Gatsby can therefore be assigned moral culpability because of powerful social management because of his own awareness of his manipulative tactics to win back Daisy.

While Gatsby is morally culpable for his power, what his manipulative tactics are that creates that culpability have not yet been explained. What exactly are the roles and responsibilities of Gatsby’s power within *The Great Gatsby*? The novel opens in the spring of 1922, two years into Prohibition being enacted on American citizens. Gatsby is a social manager, a power, in the society of upper-class Long Island. Gatsby’s name itself evokes a turn of the head and a nod of acknowledgment from the citizens of the high society that frequents Long Island. The man is not as recognizable as his name and his home. However, his power is unquestionable. Social managers persuade their subjects to

act according to their values, and Gatsby's values involve earning income from bootlegging and other nefarious acts involving alcohol; his powerful managing consequently encourages drinking amongst his subjects. Gatsby provides the party (and therefore his subjects) with alcohol, and if the power says that drinking is okay, it must be, despite the law against it. While Gatsby is wealthy and perceived as successful, his attempt to be a powerful social manager stems not from these characteristics but from a different form of capital – cultural capital. In this struggle for power, “individual actors are motivated by unconscious desires for profit maximization” (Radimska 395). The type of profit that Gatsby hopes to accumulate is the authority to manage Daisy's social interactions, life, and persona. The subjects of the party respect that Gatsby has cultural capital – he is cool, he is popular, and his parties are the place to be. By earning cultural capital and therefore becoming a social manager in the form of encouraging drinking and remaining “cool,” Gatsby hopes to earn the capital of becoming Daisy's social manager as well. The process of earning capital through powerful social management is manipulative, creating moral culpability in Gatsby for the outcome of his actions.

The acknowledgement of Gatsby's social power is a topic of discussion amongst even Long Island's newest residents. When Nick Carraway moves into his small cottage, he already knows one of his neighbor's is a Mr. Gatsby but does not mention the names of any other owners of the mansions that line his street. Nick simply states to the reader that “it was Gatsby's mansion,” as if that should be explanation enough if we, too, are “in the know” (*The Great Gatsby* 5). When Nick visits Daisy, his cousin, he mentions that although he lives on Long Island, he does not know any of the citizens. However, Daisy's friend, Jordan, expresses that that fact must be incorrect as Nick “must know [of]

Gatsby,” implying that everyone who is anyone knows of the man (*The Great Gatsby* 11). Being “in the know” is important to high society – gossip is as much a part of a meal as bread and butter. Gatsby’s subjects believe that being aware of Gatsby and his parties are significant, explaining that knowing the man and attending his parties are one of the structures of Gatsby’s power – to not acknowledge Gatsby as rich and powerful ostracizes one to the outer realms of gossip and high New York society. Gatsby has retained cultural capital through the significance of his parties and persona. In fact, Gatsby’s parties are his panopticon – where he can watch his subjects and they can be aware of being watched, however many of the guests do not know the man himself, but simply that he is the keeper of the Panopticon.

Nick observes his neighbor’s parties because they are hard to ignore – Gatsby’s car flits back and forth to the city, shuttling guests to and fro, who then swim in his pool, drink his booze, and dance to the musicians he’s hired. However, when Nick finally attends one of these parties at the request of Gatsby himself, a request which perplexes him, guests look at him “in such an amazed way” when he is asked to be introduced to their host “and denied...vehemently any knowledge” of Gatsby (*The Great Gatsby* 42). Gatsby’s home, while full of subjects for him to watch, has managed to become a panopticon. He keeps himself unverifiable in the style of the keeper of the panopticon – to see but be unseen. Rumors, however, spread through this party and other’s; one guest tells Nick that “somebody told me they thought [Gatsby] killed a man once” (*The Great Gatsby* 44). Gatsby’s power comes partly from the confusion of his origins – he is mysteriously rich and his power comes from perplexing origins. No one knows a lot

about the man who they admire for allowing them to drink intoxicating beverages in his mansion.

Mysterious origins of wealth appeared in the 1920s in the form of gangsters, organized street criminals who moved and sold liquor during Prohibition. The new social character that appeared during Prohibition, the gangster, was the part of “1920s culture [that] linked both business and crime” (Brauer 51). For the first time in American history, a criminal was not inherently frowned upon. In fact, to some Americans, such as alcoholics and social imbibers, the gangster was the hero who brought liquor to the masses. Jay Gatsby was one of these heroes to his neighbors when he purchases, sells, supplies, and gives away liquor at grand parties at his Long Island mansion, giving him tremendous social power. His power is visible in the way these party goers exalt his apparent virtues and whisper about his reverential qualities. A power inherently has its own interests at the heart of the pursuit of its subjects’ adherence to its values. Gatsby, as a power, adheres to this definition. While his parties seem friendly and neighborly, they are actually strategically planned to initiate Gatsby’s own selfish desire, mentioned previously in this paper, which is to gain Daisy as his partner. The attendees of these parties are sufficiently blinded by the lavish revelries and intoxicating beverages to not wonder why this man that no one actually knows invites all of high society to his frequent parties. In fact, when Nick does finally meet Gatsby, he treats the man like another guest, unaware that he is speaking to the man himself. Nick notes immediately that he seemed to be “picking his words with care” (*The Great Gatsby* 48). Gatsby knows his objective is to be reunited with Daisy and never falters from the socially powerful position that attempts to resolve this desire. Nick, a smart man, recognizes that oddity of this and

explains to the reader that “young men didn’t... drift coolly out of nowhere and buy a palace on Long Island Sound” (*The Great Gatsby* 49). Nick is aware that Gatsby must have some kind of motive in his desire for social power, but he does not understand what that motivation is until Jordan informs him of Daisy’s past with Gatsby.

Gatsby’s social power allows him to assert that his subjects do his bidding. Aware that Nick is Daisy’s cousin, Gatsby enlists Jordan to inform Nick of his history with Daisy and to create a tête-à-tête for Gatsby and Daisy at Nick’s cottage. Jordan recalls the story of Daisy and Gatsby at Nick’s insistence – how he was an officer in the military who fell in love with Daisy before he left for Europe and World War I. The two never reacquainted, but Gatsby never forgot his Southern belle. Following the story, Nick concedes to Jordan what a coincidence it is that Gatsby bought a house across the bay from Daisy. “But it wasn’t a coincidence at all” Jordan explains, “Gatsby bought that house so that Daisy would be just across the bay” (*The Great Gatsby* 78). The green light from her dock is the cell into which Gatsby, her keeper, gazes and observes his favorite subject. A power must surveil those he exerts power on, and Gatsby strategically chose the placement of his Panopticon because it allows him to be the keeper of Daisy.

While Gatsby is the powerful social manager of the collective posh society of New York and Long Island, his main subject is Daisy. Daisy, confused and unsure of what to do with herself, cannot find the words to commit herself to Gatsby, despite his powerful efforts to sway her to his position. Daisy feels the immense pull of Gatsby’s social power but is determined to not reveal their affair to her husband nevertheless. The two men begin to argue after Tom, Daisy’s husband, suspects them of their affair. Daisy interrupts Gatsby before he can inform her husband properly, terrified of the outcome

once their secret is out in the open. "Please don't!" Daisy pleads at Gatsby in the moment he begins the confession (*The Great Gatsby* 130). However, as her social manager, he speaks for her anyway, explaining to Tom that "your wife doesn't love you" (*The Great Gatsby* 130). A social authority would not need to speak for his subjects. However, the powerful Gatsby has not convinced Daisy to be his partner and has to speak for her instead of commanding her to speak on her behalf.

Despite Daisy abstaining from telling Gatsby that she will leave Tom for him, he takes it upon himself to speak for her, to create actions and values that she must follow if she's to be his subject. "Daisy's leaving you," he tells Tom (*The Great Gatsby* 133). The situation is hardly resolved; Daisy never speaks up either way. Because significant structures are key to a social power convincing its subject to follow his values then Gatsby must hope Daisy will realize she will lose something of significance if she is no longer his subject. Daisy will lose a possible future with the man she is loved since she was a teenager. She will lose the daydream of Gatsby returning to her life, arms open, forever in love with her. If Daisy shuns Gatsby now, she loses him forever and will have no comforting fantasy to return to on the days she and Tom fight. Her fingers shake as she realizes all of this and the cigarette between her lips stays unlit as she throws it to the ground and tells Gatsby, "You want too much!" (*The Great Gatsby* 132). Having Gatsby in her life is not enough of a significant structure to allow Daisy to break up her marriage; Gatsby's power has not fully grasped Daisy as his subject despite his best efforts. The resolution comes only from the lack of Daisy acknowledging Gatsby as her social power by never committing to his rules for her. His power had evaporated – their relationship was simply not a significant enough structure to Daisy. An authority cannot be usurped

by a power and Gatsby had not anticipated for Daisy to have an authority. My further chapter will explain what a social manager to Daisy is and what this manager's authority stems from: alcoholism.

Similar to Jay Gatsby, Fitzgerald's Dick Diver in *Tender is the Night* is a charismatic and powerful man. Diver is powerful for many reasons – he is a psychiatrist with patients, a husband with a wife and family, a wealthy man with access to the world's best wine, food, and hotels. He is also a social power throughout much of his life because the significant structures he creates for his subjects. Before succumbing to the ailment of alcoholism, Diver manages the problems in the lives of his subjects. An example of one of his social subjects is the young actress, Rosemary. Rosemary is informed by a woman, Mrs. McKisco, whom she meets on the beach that there is a narrative going on at the resort but that “we're not in it. We're the gallery” (*Tender is the Night* 14). McKisco and her group are there simply to observe the plot that is unfolding before them and explains to Rosemary that the chief character and “hero” of the resort's plot is “one man my husband had been particularly nice to”: Dick Diver (*Tender is the Night* 14). The reader is informed that Diver is important to those around him; Mrs. McKisco and her group view themselves as the gallery, the subjects, observing their social manager act out before them. Dick's position as a social power is most obvious when something goes wrong in his subjects' lives and they look to him for help. When Rosemary finds the dead man in the bed of her hotel room, she immediately calls for Dick to “come and see!” (*Tender is the Night* 125). Diver, unhesitant, springs into action, removing the dead man from the young actress's bed and shielding her from the shameful scandal that would surely follow upon this gossip's release as “No power on earth could keep the smear off Rosemary” if

the body is discovered in her room (*Tender is the Night* 126). He orders Nicole to help him clean up the evidence – he is the voice of reason amongst his hysterical subjects. The significant structure of Diver's social power is his ability to rescue and help his subjects and to be level-headed under pressure. Without his social power in their lives, his subjects would have to deal with disastrous circumstances on their own. Our definition of social management requires that the subject experiences self-loss and self-control. Rosemary experiences self-loss in the form of character development when she exchanges the self-control of independently managing her own problems and what she would learn from those experiences for the structure of Dick's power, the benefit of his level-headed assistance.

Diver met his wife, Nicole, within his position of social management: she was his psychiatric patient. A male psychiatric doctor who would marry a patient can be assumed to enjoy retaining greater social power than his partner, as he is seen as the reasonable one and she as the ill one in the relationship. Dick is not his wife's partner but her social manager, the one whom was trusted by her father to know what is best for her. When the novel opens, Nicole seemingly happily adheres to being a subject of her husband, enjoying the ability to call on Diver to make decisions for her, to help with any problem that needs solving, to come to her aid when she is feeling unreasonable. Nicole does not have to be an adult in the full meaning of the word but can instead throw money at Dick so he can solve problems. Nicole experiences self-control in the form of acceptance of this of loss of agency but benefits from the significant structure of Dick's assistance. The self-control experienced by Nicole is not ecstatic in the form of moral management, however. While the significant structures of Nicole's life - her marriage, her family, her

freedom from her father – all rely on Dick’s powerful management, Nicole also experiences self-loss because there are times that a desired action is kept from her by Dick. Nicole must accept Dick’s decisions in order to remain in the significant structure of a “happy” marriage and retaining her family life; this acceptance is not ecstatic but simply expected by Nicole. In Paris, Nicole hopes to have a glass of brandy when out with Dick but is told “You can’t have a brandy” by her husband (213). Nicole cannot escape the eye of the keeper of her Panopticon – Diver will always be watching from his tower above her and therefore dictating her behavior. Displeased by his refusal, Nicole asks why she cannot have the drink desires. However, Dick shuts down the question and simply states, “let’s not get into that” (213). Nicole does not get her drink and the pair continues with their day, with Dick explaining as they walk away that he sees the two as they are: man and child. What he really means by this analogy is manager and subject.

The Divers’ positions as a social manager and its subject are explained to be a significant structure in the lives of their friends. The Divers are the heroes for the subjects to compare themselves to: Dick is handsome and charismatic; Nicole is beautiful and admirable. The power of The Divers as a couple is described to be “more important to their friends” than the reality of the couple’s relationship (240). While Diver keeps an eye on his subjects in his tower of the panopticon, his life is not similarly penetrated. The idea of Diver as a social power, a man to admire, is more important than the reality of his personal struggles, such as the authority of alcoholism that is a more apparent problem later in the novel. Rosemary frequently admires Dick to the reader, describing how his place at their table in a restaurant “made the group into so bright a unit that [she] felt an impatient disregard for all who were not at their table” (*Tender is the Night* 62). Dick’s

presence creates the significant structure of security and comfort of a place in society to his subjects; while they had been in Paris for two nights, Rosemary feels as though they have been “under a beach umbrella” the whole time (*Tender is the Night* 62). Dick’s presence allows his subjects to be more care-free. Dick enjoys the role of power and even seeks out subjects when he has none near. On the ship waiting for Rosemary, he sees a mother and daughter who are unaccompanied by a man and feels “an overwhelming desire to help” (*Tender is the Night* 231). He perceives the women as miserable and decides to take on the role of their power – to be admired and create comfort in his subject’s lives. The subject experiences self-loss because Dick begins to make decisions – he orders the wine and decides on the course of the evening. However, the group of women soon experience the comfort that comes with this self-loss accompanied by social management as “they thought only that [Dick] was a windfall from heaven” (*Tender is the Night* 231). Dick’s power created the significant structure of comfort to the women and they were willing to exchange self-loss for this structure.

Despite their tumultuous relationship, Diver’s intention is to remain in his marriage with Nicole. However, he is unable to remain in this position because of the authority in his own life: social alcoholism. Diver, while a power, loses his family to another man because of his inability to recognize his alcoholism and come to terms with it. The following chapter will explicate social authority and define exactly why a power cannot be successful if alcoholism exists as an authority in the manager or the subjects’ lives.

Chapter Two:

Alcoholism as a Social Authority

As a result of the intense social management of alcoholism during American Prohibition, many American writers, including Fitzgerald, created characters that reveal alcoholism's authority. The instances I explain in this chapter emphasize the authority of alcoholism and how an alcoholic will always adhere to the values of alcoholism by explaining this authority within the lives of Fitzgerald's Daisy Buchanan and Dick Diver. First, however, I will define the social definition of alcoholism more conclusively. Then, I will use the cultural artifact of Long's column for *The New Yorker* as an example of the social authority of alcoholism during Prohibition. Long's authority in her writings for *The New Yorker* during Prohibition frames the authority of alcoholism in its historical time period to the fictional characters of Daisy and Diver. Finally, I will conclude that although Gatsby and Diver were powerful social managers, they are ultimately unsuccessful in their respective goals because of the authority of alcoholism.

Prohibition, historically in effect from 1920-1933, is an example of state-sanctified and legally binding powerful management to all Americans. Prohibition was a "disastrous experiment because cultural influences in American society encourage drinking" (Donaldson 314). Drinking serves as a rite of passage into adulthood in America; this rite did not stop simply because some American voters and the government decided that it should. Traditionally in American culture, liquor is discovered at the same moment that the opposite sex becomes interesting and available to court; Alcohol and courtship go hand-in-hand in American dating culture. Similar to courtship, alcohol helps form bonds between social relationships as well. Friends have spent countless evenings

becoming more intimate over a bottle of whiskey or a keg of beer. Family events, such as weddings, funerals, BBQs, Baptisms, engagements, etc., also traditionally have a toast, at the very least. Men and their sons have consumed many hours and beers together over campfires or sports games. In defiance of the power of the U.S. government and to experience the significant structures of these events involving alcoholism, many young Americans during Prohibition decided to “assert their independence by defying the law” (Donaldson 2). A social power is adhered to only if a significant structure is threatened as a result of that adherence but “the folklore of those who grew up during Prohibition was that drinking was romantic,” and thus should be practiced despite the laws forbidding it, making it a social authority (Donaldson 6). Young Americans believed that the independence and confidence, as well as the American social structures, that came with imbibing was more significant than adhering to the law, which in this instance is only a social power. Prohibition was an obvious catastrophe that also “fail[ed] to legislate morality” (Picken 442). The Eighteenth Amendment not only failed to stop the selling and consumption of alcohol, it also failed to create enough fear of losing significant structures to its subjects to be a successful social power. This attempt at the “legislation of morality” and social values was beginning to be seen as “ineffectual and possibly unethical” (Ewing and Rouse 28). Social, moral, and legal, chaos was created by bootleggers and gangsters as well as successful speakeasys in American cities and rumrunners off the coasts of oceans. Social power has a limit, and that limit is met when it is approached by the significance of a social authority.

The social authority of alcoholism can be felt in the pages of works created by American writers during Prohibition. Regardless of the subject matter of the writing,

literature written during American Prohibition “plac[es] the novel as one set in and responding to the milieu propagated by the Eighteenth Amendment” and recognizing this placement consequently situates the novels in the specific context of the period’s “moral, social and political decay” (Picken 441). The American authors who wrote during Prohibition and their characters who experience their stories during that decade of history are all affected by the moral decay happening around them through the realization that laws are not always an authority, as was once believed. Americans suffered the mental consequences of this realization by returning to their social authority, alcoholism. Malcom Crowley, quoted by Eble, explained when writing about Prohibition that “we have been living through an age of emotional breakdown” (40). After realizing that gangs and bootleggers were successfully making millions of dollars and committing violent crimes in major cities, Americans grasped the moral failings of their country. Americans were witnessing the failures of social power on a grand scale and instead clung to the social authority that many knew best, alcoholism.

Another sign of America’s youth defying the power of Prohibition and discovering the authority of alcohol was the appearance of the flapper, a type of New Woman who used the moral decay happening in America to create new standards for women concerning appearances, attitude, and obligations. Because drinking during Prohibition was already an act of defiance, many women took it a step further and decided to include themselves in the subculture; in fact, “the youthful drinking culture that arose during Prohibition deviated from previous generations of public drinking in its surprising inclusion of women” (Picken 454). Women who identified as flappers took their progression further through dress and behavior, wearing shorter skirts and hairstyles

than the typical American woman prior to the 1920s; they danced at nightclubs with men and drank alcohol in speakeasies until late into the night. Among the most noteworthy of these flappers was Lois Long. Long is noted in history as a woman who recognized and arguably exploited the failings of Prohibition's social power. According to Zeitz's *Flapper*, "she smoked; she drank; she stayed out all night" as a writer for the *New Yorker* in its earliest issues (89). Long reviewed speakeasies for the *New Yorker* under the pseudonym "Lipstick" as the "magazine's resident flapper journalist;" She enjoyed "drinking, dining, and dancing on the magazine's dime" (Zeitz 89). However, even a journalist had to be careful where, with whom, and what he or she drank while out and about the city during Prohibition. Long strategically visited clubs that were new, therefore not yet closed by law-enforcement, or well-established (placing money into corrupt officials' pockets) enough to avoid any problems. Long later explained that she and her friends stuck to brandy because "we were told a bootlegger couldn't fake the smell and taste of cognac" (Zeitz 90). Knowing these insider tips and explaining them to her readers revealed her social authority to her readers, American society. Long wrote a weekly column under various titles for *The New Yorker* from 1925-1928, often strolling into the office at 3:00 or 4:00 in the morning to complete her work fresh from a lengthy jaunt around town. Long glided from one watering hole to the next for her column – explaining everything from the decorations, the attitudes of wait staff, the quality of the food, and, of course, whom of New York society was dining with or near her. Long, while not overtly described as an alcoholic in any literature, is nonetheless within the description of a social alcoholic because of the frequency of her imbibing within her life and its relation to her work. According to *The New Yorker* lore, she once appeared at the

office in the morning, having been recently alerted that her column was due at noon, vomited in the trash can a few times, and still completed her assignment by the deadline (Zeitiz 100). Long described the authority of alcoholism to her loyal readers. Her column frequently laughed at police officials who hoped to close down the clubs of the city. The public was simultaneously fascinated with her admittance of loyalty to alcoholism and to the “new species of woman who seemed wholly in command of her life and fortune” (Zeitiz 100). One column began with the assertion that Long would write about alcohol and solely alcohol in the column because “it is high time that somebody approached this subject in a specific, constructive way” (Zeitiz 101). Here, Long is presenting herself as a social authority and as a physical representation of alcoholism, explaining that she will “teach the young to drink,” therefore creating fewer “embarrassing incidents of young men falling asleep under the nearest potted palm” (Zeitiz 101). She also provided instructions on how to make her favorite cocktails; where to buy the best shakers, shot glasses and other mixology accoutrements; as well as what to keep in a well-stocked home bar. Long, as “Lipstick” was the American social authority on alcoholism at a time when the social power of Prohibition was losing its battle.

Long, wanting to keep her nose out of any substantial trouble, typically referred to speakeasies as “tea houses” in her various *New Yorker* columns. For example, in “The Talk of the Town,” she mentions raids on the clubs she frequented throughout her columns – describing how simply muttering the word “cops” at the Three Hundred Club “sent shivers down the hostess’s back” (“The Talk of the Town” 16 Jan. 1926). She explains almost haughtily that the reason for the precarious attitude of the hostess is because the last time the club was raided, the staff had to scatter in order to avoid court

summons. Long describes a “waiter... who escaped summons by joining the orchestra for the time being” (“The Talk of the Town” 19 Dec. 1925). In the same column, she laughs at the irony of law enforcement shutting down clubs around the first of the year that “didn’t even have the decency to change their location or cut a new entrance through to the street” when they sent her invitations to the re-openings only weeks later. In September 1925, Long lamented to her readers that her favorite barroom has been closed because of a “good old-fashioned raid” (“Tables for Two”). The raids conducted by the police and government agents to enforce Prohibition was their attempt to remain in the keep position of the Panopticon of American society – to see and be seen. By conducting raids, Americans drinkers saw the powerful social manager of the law first-hand while the government created a record of those arrested. However, while Long hated the idea of a good nightclub shutting down, she was never arrested herself. During the mentioned raid, while waiters, bartenders, and male customers were arrested and detained around her, Long and some other young women were led to a door that opened into an alleyway so they could flee unabated. Long’s ability to account the whereabouts and details of American drinking society and get away with it further established her authority as a social manager. Long’s account of drinking unabashedly around New York City in the 1920s during Prohibition is evidence of a culture and a social manager that did not respect its lawmakers’ powerful social management. Long’s writing, when viewed as a cultural artifact, exemplifies the authority of alcoholism and respect the alcoholic shows to its social authority.

Another reason that Prohibition was unsuccessful was American society’s refusal to recognize the alcoholic as a person subject to a social authority. During American

Prohibition, alcoholism was not treated as a disease but as a moral weakness; according to the social definition of alcoholism, which I am applying to the theory in this paper, alcoholics are reasonable individuals who choose to imbibe heavily because of alcoholism's learned authority. Because morality is formed from a choice and a loss of agency to the moral manager according to our social definition of morality, alcoholics are reasonable according to society's contemporary values. Therefore, "society had no sympathy for him" (Ewing and Rouse 50). This lack of sympathy for the alcoholic is one of the reasons that it affects his or her life and the lives of those around them so tremendously.

It is not a secret that Fitzgerald struggled with alcoholism himself. It is commonly accepted that Fitzgerald's struggled with negative repercussions in his health, social, and familial life because of his frequent imbibing. Fitzgerald's life "was a story of medical problems, mental disturbance, defiantly irrational behavior, and character disintegration brought on by drinking" (Roth 3). Jeffrey Meyers's biography *Scott Fitzgerald* details the extent of Fitzgerald's drinking throughout his life. His early years at Yale are marked by summers "dedicated to drinking" that fueled his decision to be commissioned into the military rather than pursue his degree (33). Fitzgerald's drinking, while at first jovial and high-spirited in his youth, became problematic. Fitzgerald and his wife, Zelda, lived extravagant lifestyles marked by a catalogue of "infantile pleasures;" "alcohol fueled most these uninhibited episodes" which turned his drinking to a "malicious" endeavor (Meyers 69). A preoccupation with time spent drinking over other endeavors is a characteristic frequently attributed to alcoholism. Scott and Zelda's daughter, Scottie, describes a childhood that featured her father found hunched at his desk, typing or

writing away at his work instead of playing or spending time with her. While she stressed in an interview with Meyers that while she appreciated her father's dedication to his craft, "there was often a faint [the] faint aroma of gin in the air to dispel too romantic a picture" (77). Problems arose throughout his life due to his alcoholism, with many of his friends from Paris later noting that while they were sympathetic to the man, they "could not tolerate his alcoholism" (Meyers 141). The authority of alcoholism in Fitzgerald's life is recognize but does not necessarily mean that he intended to write literature with the purpose of exposing this idea. It also does not mean that I intend to argue that Fitzgerald's alleged alcoholism fueled his writing alcoholic characters; because all writing created during Prohibition was in some way responding to this newly realized authority in America.

Fitzgerald's alleged alcoholism is interesting to note because it demonstrates the frequency of the struggle with alcoholism during Prohibition. Fitzgerald's thoughts in "The Crack Up" create a cultural artifact that demonstrates the social stigma that alcoholics felt. It is now accepted as a collective fact that a large number of authors, particularly American authors, are alcoholics, but the power of Prohibition created a specific type of social authority in alcoholism within characters' lives; "for Fitzgerald and other writers of his generation, drinking was an attractive symbol of the 20s; it expressed autonomy, social dissent, and identification with an artistic subculture" (Celucci and Laren 69). Because Fitzgerald wrote and drank during Prohibition, he is included in the group that was heavily aware of the authority that alcoholism could provide in a subject's life. While I argue that Fitzgerald's characters struggled with the authority of alcoholism, it does not have as its objective to argue that Fitzgerald was also subject to the authority

of alcoholism himself. I cannot successfully argue that Fitzgerald intended to expose his alcoholism through his works because according to those that knew him best, he refused to acknowledge that he had a problem with drinking. It would be an error to claim that because Fitzgerald was allegedly an alcoholic, that he would reveal this in his writing through alcoholic characters as “he did not easily or fully accept the fact” that he was an alcoholic (Eble 43). Although he admitted late in his short life that he was “cracking up” in a series of articles for *Esquire* aptly titled “The Crack Up,” he never recognized alcoholism as a specific reason for the problem. In fact, he writes in the essay that only a “prejudiced enemy” would attribute his cracking up to drink (Banerjee 48). Therefore, I do not hope to make myself an enemy here by arguing that Fitzgerald purposely informed his characters with alcoholism because he recognized the authority of ailment himself; he apparently did not.

Fitzgerald’s literary and contemporary peer, Ernest Hemingway, was also allegedly an alcoholic. The men knew each other in life and spent time together in Paris, careful to imbibe in a country that would not throw them in jail for enjoying their booze. Hemingway’s short story, “Hill Like White Elephants” was similarly written during Prohibition like the Fitzgerald works mentioned here. The story describes the social addiction of alcoholism seen within its characters (Lanier 274). Hemingway frames the entire short story around the characters ordering and imbibing alcohol, specifically, absinthe. The couple in the story drinks heavily because of an equally heavy topic on their shoulders. The narrative implies that heavy imbibing is a regular occurrence in the pair’s life. The unnamed “girl,” pregnant and unhappy, points out to her partner that the only thing couple enjoys doing together is drinking, showing the social authority of

alcoholism within its subjects' lives (Lanier 274). Alcoholism is a fluent language to the American couple. The descriptions of the activity of imbibing explains the authority of alcoholism in its subjects' lives; it is itself a hobby, an act that can be done throughout the day. While the man wants to move on with their lives and continue to flit around Europe enjoying their booze-filled activities, the woman isn't so sure that her pregnancy should be terminated (Lanier 286). When sitting at the train station, the first words between the pair are "What should we drink?" (Lanier 288). Despite the heavy topic between the two, alcohol is the first thing on their minds because of its authority. The woman in "Hills Like White Elephants" sadly tells her partner that "everything tastes like absinthe," which, implies that everything is bitter and unsatisfactory because absinthe is a bitter, strong alcohol that has been individually made illegal in more than one European country (Lanier 286). It is known to get its drinker not only drunk but significantly under-the-influence and inebriated. Referring to alcoholism, the word is not explicitly used, but the woman does explain that "all we do is look at things and drink" (Lanier 286). The authority of alcoholism is felt in both of their lives; the man wants to continue his lackadaisical lifestyle while the woman doesn't have the strength to put her absolute desire, to keep their child, into words. Is it because she is anxious about the man's reaction or because in an inhibitive nature, she wishes to continue the nature of flitting about and drinking? Hemingway's story is another example of a cultural artifact created during Prohibition that exemplifies the qualities of the authority of alcoholism to its subjects.

Fitzgerald's own works also heavily explicate the authority of alcoholism in its subjects' lives during Prohibition; "*The Great Gatsby* is one of those works in which

alcoholism is not a central player yet to a great extent shapes the destinies of all major characters” (Celucci and Larsen 70). While Gatsby himself is not an alcoholic, he is a bootlegger and frequently throws loud, crazy parties for the high society of Long Island and New York City. Alcohol is felt in almost every page of the book – from Nick noting the drunken partygoers on the lawn, to the drunken bash with Myrtle’s fiends in the city, to Tom and Daisy’s constant drinking throughout the novel – the pages of the novel are almost wet with liquor; “it is remarkable how carefully those scenes are chosen to make room for and also protect the presence of alcohol” (Roth 4). While the drama of the book focuses on Gatsby’s desire to be with Daisy, the scenes in which that story unfolds always revolve around alcohol. Alcoholism is clearly present in Daisy and Tom’s lives but not explicitly noted by Nick or any other character. In fact, characters are more often pointed out when they are non-drinkers. Gatsby is explained to be an infrequent drinker in several passages; Jordan describes Daisy as a former non-drinker to Nick in her anecdote on how Gatsby and Daisy became acquainted. Nick is also identified as a non-drinker: “I have been drunk just twice in my life,” he explains to the reader while attending Myrtle’s party, “and the second time was that afternoon” (*The Great Gatsby* 29). Both Nick and Gatsby are rational men who are “sober amongst much insobriety” (Eble 39). In fact, they are the only two characters who deny a drink when offered at some point in the novel. While Gatsby may believe his sobriety helps retain his power, sobriety cannot win against the authority of alcoholism.

While alcoholism is never explicitly mentioned in *The Great Gatsby*, I argue here that it is nonetheless the central social manager within the lives of Daisy and her husband, Tom. Within minutes of Nick’s first visit to the couple’s new mansion in West Egg, a

tray of drinks appears before him, which Tom and Daisy raise and drink merrily. Nick describes how Tom downs the liquor “as if it were a drop in the bottom of a glass” (*The Great Gatsby* 25). Later in the novel, during the arranged meeting between Gatsby and Daisy at Nick’s cottage, the trio quickly abandons the tea and lemon cakes served to them by Nick’s Finnish maid in favor of exploring Gatsby’s mansion. Here, Gatsby produces “some Chartreuse he took from the wall” for the trio, specifically, Daisy, to drink (*The Great Gatsby* 91). Daisy, apparently intoxicated, throws Gatsby’s shirts about his room and then crumbles into the pile. “They’re such beautiful shirts” she explains to Nick and Gatsby, sobbing into the pile (*The Great Gatsby* 92). Gatsby, hoping to make Daisy happy as her hopeful social manager, instructs one of his servants to play the piano for his guests. Daisy is assuaged by Gatsby’s social power but only because she is already under the authority of alcoholism through her intoxication. The authority of alcoholism was, ironically, gained by Daisy through the loss of Gatsby’s social management earlier in her life. Jordan explains early in the novel that she never saw Daisy drink until the evening of her bridal dinner, when she received a letter, allegedly from Gatsby. “Never had a drink before, but oh how I enjoy it,” Daisy declared to her bridesmaid (*The Great Gatsby* 76). Daisy got soused for the first time after realizing that marrying Tom meant that she was giving up on Gatsby and their potential life together forever. The fantasy was a significant structure for her and so it could be argued that she replaced one significant structure with another; she replaced the power of her fantasy life with Gatsby with the authority of alcoholism. She no longer could adhere to Gatsby’s social management and so she found another, more significant manager.

The authority of alcoholism in Daisy's life is most apparent during the climatic summer day that her husband and lover quarreled, and Myrtle met the end of her life. Nick arrives at the Buchanan's mansion that afternoon to Daisy asking Tom to "make us a cold drink" (*The Great Gatsby* 116). Her imbibing continues throughout the rest of the day. She and Tom take down their drinks in "greedy swallows" while Nick and Jordan must sit and listen to their bickering. When it is decided that the party will continue in the city, Daisy quickly asks her guests, "Shall we take anything to drink?" (*The Great Gatsby* 120). A bottle whiskey is wrapped in a cold, wet towel and taken into the car. After arriving at the hotel downtown, Gatsby and Tom get into the aforementioned fight as described in Chapter One. Gatsby insists that Daisy will leave her husband for him while Daisy herself remains mum. Daisy's silence on the matter confirms that she is staying with her husband; she stoically follows Tom's command to drive home with Gatsby while he follows in his own car.

It is implied at the end of the novel that Daisy has made her decision to stay with her husband but is the decision Daisy makes specifically choosing Tom over Gatsby? I argue that Daisy is not actually choosing Tom but choosing the alcoholic lifestyle that accompanies staying in her marriage. Gatsby would allow her a party lifestyle as her social manager, sure, but he would never fully understand the authority of alcohol the way that Tom does, as an alcoholic himself. Following the realization of Daisy's adherence to the authority of alcoholism in the hotel and the party dispersing, Gatsby hopefully continues to position himself as a social power. After the accident that takes Myrtle's life, he quickly takes the rein of the car, driving rapidly to his garage and parking the car discreetly within. When discussing the accident with Nick, Gatsby

focuses solely on Daisy. “I think she took it pretty well,” he explains and tells Nick that although Daisy was driving when the accident occurs, “of course I’ll say that I was” (*The Great Gatsby* 143). And, although Nick encourages him not, Gatsby intends to wait outside her mansion until her bedroom light goes out. When returning home, Nick notices Daisy and Tom through the window, sitting in the kitchen together, a plate of chicken and two bottles of ale between them. Daisy had returned to her authority and would not see Gatsby again. Gatsby waits anyways, “watching over nothing,” Nick notes as he walks away (*The Great Gatsby* 145). While Daisy may have loved Gatsby, alcoholism was more significant to her; “alcoholism, allowed to run its course, robs its victims of all dignity” (Donaldson 7). While leaving your husband may not be the most respectable decision, there is always dignity in allowing yourself to make the decision to submit to what you desire. It would be difficult to get divorced and be with Gatsby, but if that was ultimately what was the most significant structure to Daisy, then it would be dignified for her to make that decision. However, alcohol robs her of the dignity of that choice; its authority means that Daisy will choose its significance over the significance of any other structures in her life.

While I am describing morality in terms of the power of Gatsby and Diver as well as the authority of alcoholism, I am not creating assertions of strong moral culpability or poor moral character. Are Daisy and Gatsby bad people for leaving the scene of Myrtle’s accident? While what they did was clearly against the law, I stress the importance of choice in morality in the definition used in this paper. While they were breaking the law by leaving the accident, they were not morally culpable for her death because they did not choose to kill her, it was, as state, an accident. Power comes from being a moral manager,

even if those morals are turned on their head in the case of the criminal Gatsby. Many subjects do not have the agency to make the choice of being moral or not; their social relationships and life would suffer greatly if they lacked the membership in society and the significant structures that comes with following their moral management. However, Gatsby and the other wealthy characters in Fitzgerald's novel are not normal people who must follow normal morals – their wealth and connections give them different responsibilities regarding morals. Moral culpability requires “an informed choice,” (Moore 2). One chooses whether to adhere to a moral manager or not. Moore applies morality directly to Fitzgerald's characters in reference to the death of Myrtle at the end of the novel. Agency is an important factor in morality in this instance – the characters here have the wealth and ability to disappear from the scene, hide the car, and leave New York the next morning. These are informed decisions regarding their morality; they are leaving the scene of the accident because of the legal culpability they retain. However, Moore argues that because the death of Myrtle was an accident and not an informed decision by Daisy or another character, it was not itself an immoral act. Moral culpability “requires an informed choice in order to hold someone morally blameworthy for nonfeasance which proximately causes a crime” (Moore 646). Gatsby holds himself to be an esteemed power in Daisy's eyes and Daisy adheres to the authority of alcoholism in her life, but neither managements are affected by the auto accident at the end of the novel, Gatsby still is unsuccessful in retaining Daisy and Daisy dashes off with Tom the following morning, leaving Long Island and Gatsby behind.

Dick Diver begins his marriage by being a social manager to his wife, a former patient. A successful psychiatrist in Switzerland, Diver nonetheless suffers the

consequences of being a “chronic alcoholic” after the ailment begins to take its place as a dominant authority in his life (Roth 7). *Tender is the Night* “shows [the reader] the process of collapse until Diver has nothing left in his life; his marriage and his friendships are all destroyed” (Bui 29). While Diver may have at one point held power in his family and social circles’ lives, alcoholism disrupted this ability. Diver is a man who is obsessed with “fantasy” (Bui 33). Diver fantasizes about his patient and then marries her; he fantasizes about Rosemary and then sleeps with her; he fantasizes about alcohol and then imbibes. While Diver is powerful, he is not independent; he depends on the fantasies of what could be in order to get him through life. He also depends on his wife’s family’s money to fund his life in Europe as well as his drinking and frivolities. While he “wishes to be nothing but a good psychiatrist and husband,” he becomes drunk “more and more often” until he is “no longer a serious man” (Bui 33; *Tender is the Night* 261). The stability of his life becomes cracked because of the authority of his alcoholism.

Once he becomes a subject of the authority of alcoholism, Diver begins to make questionable decisions. For example, Diver hopes his fantasy life does not simply remain fantasy in the novel. He seeks out Rosemary years after meeting her in order to see if they still have a spark. Of course, Diver is drunk when they meet and experiences seeing her for the first time in years through the haze of alcohol; he saw her “as if a drink were acting on him, warming the line of his stomach, throwing a flush up into his brain” (*Tender is the Night* 231). Good things are transcribed through the best thing, his alcoholism. Before the two make their way to his cabin room, Diver restrains himself from adding her drinks to his “account” that he holds at the bar, eluding that Diver has been intoxicated since getting on the cruise liner together. While he is a social “life of the

party” character at the beginning of the novel, his attitude while drunk has turned sour once deeply enveloped in his alcoholism. When visiting a friend in Rome, Dick no longer has a fun-loving demeanor after downing a bottle of Italian mousseaux but instead becomes “pale and somewhat noisy” (*Tender is the Night* 248). He continues to drink and, the reader can infer, embarrass himself: losing his dance partner by tripping too often, following a woman into the ladies’ room, and dropping boxes of cigars off the bar, as a few examples. His friend, probably similarly embarrassed, abandons him to be alone in the crowded, foreign bar. The complete loss of Dick’s power is portrayed in the following scenes, where Dick ends up in an Italian jail after a drunken fight with a taxi driver. For the first time in the novel, Dick needs to ask someone else for help. The authority of alcoholism has created the loss of power in Diver’s life.

The most obvious example of Diver’s loss of power in his social circle is his inability to impress. Diver and Nicole see Rosemary and her friends on a boat offshore while swimming. When discussing their meeting five years ago, Rosemary exalts Diver’s former ability to make her feel some “happy kind of way” (*Tender is the Night* 313). Nicole overhears this exchange and notes to herself that “with a drink or so [Dick] would have done his stunts on the swinging rings for her, implying that she knows the attractive between the pair and how Diver’s behavior changes after imbibing. Dick hopes to impress Rosemary but water-skiing but notices that he is getting out of breath quicker than he used to. After failing to complete a successful stand on the skis, Dick retreats to the buffet to grab a drink (*Tender is the Night* 316). While “Dick cannot recognize his coming downfall... Nicole can” (Bui 31). Nicole has just witnessed the disintegration of

a man and realizes that everything he does annoys her now –he no longer holds power over her.

There may be many factors which caused Diver to turn to drink and commit himself to the authority of alcohol, but the ailment is alone the reason for his inability to be a successful power, resulting in his moral “bankruptcy.” Yuhan argues that there are many factors involved in Dick’s “bankruptcy”: his relationship with his father, his devotion to his work instead of his family, his devotion to be a social butterfly in when in groups, as well as his moral bankruptcy in having affairs (68). However, while Yuhan focuses on the decline of Dick Diver in, he does not identify alcohol as a factor. Yuhan hopes to explain why Diver is unsuccessful and unhappy at the end of *Tender is the Night* despite being a burgeoning psychologist but ignores the profound effect that alcohol had on the man’s character and persona. According to Yuhan, there are various reasons for Diver’s descent, such as Diver’s father dying, his focus on his career over his family, and his moral bankruptcy. However, it is significant to note that Yuhan fails to mention the recurrent theme of alcoholism in Diver’s life; for example, the novel opens with Diver walking from cabana to cabana on a French beach, encouraging the beach-goers to socialize and drink with one another. While Yuhan mentions many reasons for Diver’s emotional, social, and professional bankruptcy, he never focuses on what I argue here is the ultimate reason for his demise: his alcoholism. However, while I acknowledge that these are factors that resulted in negative consequences for Diver, they are not the reasons for his inability to be a successful power. The negative consequences he or she experiences are certainly part of the reason that he experiences the authority of

alcoholism. Diver unequivocally is unsuccessful at the end of *Tender is the Night* because of the authority of alcoholism in his life.

While Fitzgerald decided to set *Tender is the Night* in Europe, that does not deter from the role of Prohibition in the characters' lives. American society and characters in novels set during Prohibition alike were affected by the "political and social climate of America" and decide to leave the country as a result (Schwarz 180). Many American families who could afford it, such as the Divers, moved to Europe during Prohibition. Fitzgerald and Hemingway both famously spent time in Paris during the 1920s. As demonstrated within both *Tender is the Night* and in the earlier example of Hemingway's American couple at the train station, Europe "be[came] a place for the American characters to break free from the constraints of America," (Schwarz 188). Dick Diver's story takes place almost exclusively in Europe, with only a few scenes within Diver's home state of New York. Diver and his family live in Switzerland and France during Prohibition but are affected by the authority of alcoholism instilled in them from being American, nonetheless. Diver and his family are separated by an ocean from the rest of their relatives. While Nicole and her father have a tumultuous relationship, Diver greatly admires his own father. However, he chooses to practice psychiatry in Switzerland. The reason for the family's ex-patriotism is never explicitly explained. However, I assert that Dick's motivation to live in Europe is his desire to adhere to the values of his moral manager, his alcoholism. Despite the family not living in America, they are nevertheless affected by American Prohibition. Both Diver's and the American government's powerful social management was not enough to keep their values in place. Prohibition was abolished in 1933 and Diver's wife leaves him and takes his children with her. Diver

remains in Europe until the collapse of his marriage and his position as a powerful social manager. Now morally bankrupt and socially irrelevant, Diver returns to New York as Prohibition ends. The reader learns of his position from Nicole, already in a new marriage and perhaps under the eye of a new social manager.

Conclusion:

Defeat of Power by the Authority of Alcoholism

According to Bourdieu, every one of us has a unique Habitus – a collection of structures that shapes our personality and how we perceive and experience the world. Our structural managers, both moral and social, create what entails each person's significant structures – those structures that are meaningful and create comfort. While a moral manager, such as a faithful person's religion, is always an authority, a social manager can be either a power, which is earned through force, or an authority, which is earned through trust. Social managers attempt to persuade their subjects towards their own values with self-interest in mind. While we all have social managers, each of our recognized managers are different. Social managers expect a certain set of values of its respective society – to respect those values allows us to be included within a specific society. When we do not recognize a social manager, that social manager loses their power and social status. The social authority of alcoholism trumps any social power because an authority inherently is acknowledged and respected to a greater extent than a power. When a person experiences the social authority of alcoholism, they can no longer comply with powerful social management being exerted on them if it prevents their respect to their alcoholism. The social authority of alcoholism ultimately causes disastrous consequences in the lives of its subjects. Similarly, when a manager experiences their own alcoholism, they can no longer exert social management on their subjects. This respect is not only true for alcoholism but for all dynamics of power and authority; authority is always respected more deeply than a power.

Gatsby and Diver are ruined men at the end of their respective novels. Gatsby quite literally is ruined by death and Diver is described by Nicole at the of *Tender is the Night* as a hopeless drunk who has run away from his children and problems. While the men each had desires to be successful social managers, their powerful natures could ultimately not compete with the authority of alcoholism. Daisy has escaped from Gatsby to continue imbibing and respecting the authority of her alcoholism somewhere else where high society gathers. Nicole has remarried and Diver's children lose contact with their father because of his respect for the authority of his own alcoholism.

American Prohibition was unsuccessful because it attempted to be a social manager to a country that was not a collective society in terms of alcoholism. Social alcoholism pervaded American culture and life and therefore many Americans respected the authority of alcoholism. Prohibition ultimately failed because some American citizens recognized the social power of Prohibition while others instead respected the social authority of alcoholism. The social authority of alcoholism, once respected by a subject, becomes a significant structure that will not be obscured by any act of powerful social management. Because there was a collective ideal of respect to a power or authority that created an American society that was in agreement about alcoholism, Prohibition failed. The significant structure that is created by alcoholism will always be the most significant authority that will not be dissuaded by power. Daisy would not lose the authority of her social alcoholism in order to gain the social management and love of the powerful Gatsby; her desire to retain her comfortable alcoholism was greater than the desire to retain the significant structure of her affair and romance with Gatsby. Gatsby lost his position as a social manager within Daisy's life to alcoholism when he left for World

War I and there is no gaining it back. When controlled by the social authority of alcoholism, Diver similarly loses his ability to be a successful social manager. Although respected by his society before his alcoholism takes its full reign, once the authority of alcoholism is respected by Diver, he can no longer effectively orchestrate the social interactions and values of his society; in fact, as seen in Rome, his society now must come to his rescue instead.

What we can learn from Daisy and Diver's experiences is that the prohibition of an act or object which some of society views as immoral or distasteful will not be successful if an authority exists that is greater than the power of the act or object. The key to fixing the problem of a social authority is to create an act or object that creates more comfort to the subject than the significant structures the authority creates. The act of social power losing its battle to social authority can be seen in instances throughout history, but Prohibition effectively portrays the reasons that the social authority of alcoholism won overran and ultimately demolished the social power of Prohibition and of any social power.

A man who loses his own battle to the authority of alcoholism is the Diver's friend, Abe North. After enjoying his drinks around Europe, Diver's friend North drifts back to the United States. Diver does not hear from his friend again after he rescues North from the scandal that jeopardized Rosemary's career. Later, Diver hears his friend has died as a result of his alcoholism. While before North had asked Diver about his social actions, Diver had now lost all power over his friend and subject to the authority of alcohol. Not only has Diver lost his ability manager his subjects' social interactions but

his subjects' have lost the ability to adhere to a powerful social manager; the authority of alcoholism has conquered both manager and subject.

WORKS CITED

- Authority: A Philosophical Analysis*. Harris. University of Alabama Press, 1976.
- Brauer, Stephen. "Jay Gatsby and the Prohibition Gangster as Businessman." *The F. Scott Fitzgerald Review*, no. 2, 2003, pp. 51-71. *JSTOR*,
www.jstor.org/stable/41583051.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. "Structures, Habitus, Practice." *Critique of Theoretical Reason*.
 University of Denver, <http://portfolio.du.edu/downloadChildItem/72268>.
- Bui, Thi Huong Giang. "Hysterical Fantasy in F. Scott Fitzgerald's *Tender is the Night*." *Studies in Literature and Language*, vol. 5, no. 2, 2012, pp. 29-35. DOI:
 10.3968/j.sll.1923156320120502.688
- Cummiskey, David. *Kantian Consequentialism*. Oxford U. P., 1996.
- Donaldson, Scott. "Writers and Drinking in America." *The Sewanee Review*, vol. 98, no. 2, 1 Apr. 1990, pp. 312-24. *EbscoHost*,
<https://web.a.ebscohost.com/ehostdetail/detail?vid=3&sid=c6e7dfac-baaa-43d4b6c9-a5e9764b81d3%40sdc-vsessmgr06&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWWhvc3QtbGl2ZSZzY29wZT1zaXRl#AN=960120207&db=a9h>.
- Eble, Kenneth. "Touches of Disaster: Alcoholism and Mental Illness in Fitzgerald's Short Stories." *The Short Stories of F. Scott Fitzgerald: New Approaches in Criticism*, 1982, pp. 39-52.
- Ewing, John A. and Beatrice A. Rouse. *Drinking: Alcohol in American Society – Issues and Current Research*. Nelson-Hall, 1978.
- Fitzgerald, F. Scott. "The Crack Up." *Esquire Magazine*, 1936.

The Great Gatsby, Scribner's, 2004.

Tender is the Night. Scribner's, 1962.

Foucault, Michel. "Panopticism." *The Foucault Reader*. Pantheon Books, 1984.

Flinn, Anthony. *Approaching Authority: Transpersonal Gestures in the Poetry of Yeats, Eliot, Williams*. Bucknell U. P., 1997.

Gailbrath, John Kenneth. *The Anatomy of Power*. Houghton-Mifflin, 1983.

Hickling, Matt. "New Historicism," *Brock Education Journal*, vol. 26, no. 2, 2018,
journals.library.brocku.ca/brocked/index.php/home/issue/view/37.

Hill, Jeff. *Defining Moments: Prohibition*. Ominographics, Inc., 2004.

Lanier, Doris. "The Bittersweet Taste of Absinthe in Hemingway's 'Hills Like White Elephants.'" *Studies in Short Fiction*, vol. 26, no. 3, summer 1989, pp. 279-288.
EbscoHost,
<https://web.b.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=1&sid=7c0615bf6871-448a-a432-aff0f2b0909c%40sessionmgr102>

Long, Lois. "Tables for Two." *The New Yorker*, 12 Sept. 1925.

"Tables for Two." *The New Yorker*, 19 Dec. 1925.

"The Talk of the Town." *The New Yorker*, 16 Jan. 1926.

Maybe, Julie E. "Hegel's Dialectics." *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, 3 Jun 2016,
<https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/hegel-dialectics/>.

Meyers, Jeffrey. *Scott Fitzgerald: A Biography*. Harper Collins, 1992.

Montrose, Louis. "New Historicism." *Literary Theory*, third edition. Wiley & Sons, 2017.

"New Historicism" *Oxford Reference Library*, 2019.

<https://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/oi/authority.20110803100231563>

Moore, Brian Fintan. "Law and Literature: Assigning Moral Culpability in Fitzgerald's *The Great Gatsby*."

Olen, Jeffrey. *Moral Freedom*. Temple University Press, 1988.

Picken, Conor. "Drunk and Disorderly: Alcoholism in Faulkner's *Sanctuary*." *The Mississippi Quarterly*, vol. 67, no. 3, summer 2014, pp. 441-459. *EbscoHost*, ezproxy.library.ewu.edu/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/180219493?accountid=7305.

Radimska, Radka. "Pierre Bourdieu: Sociologist of Dominance and of the Dominated." *Czech Sociological Review*, vol. 38, no. 3, summer 2002, pp. 395-398. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/41131821.

Roth, Marty. "'The Milk of Wonder': Fitzgerald, Alcoholism, and *The Great Gatsby*." *Dionysos*, vol. 2, no. 2, 1990, pp. 3-10. *Shefflielf-Hallam University*, <https://teaching.shu.ac.uk/ds/sle/Dionysos.htm>.

Schwarz, Jeffrey. "The Saloon Must Go, and I Will Take it With Me': American Prohibition, Nationalism, and Expatriotism in *The Sun Also Rises*." *Studies in the Novel*, vol. 33, no. 2, summer 2001, pp. 180-200 *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/29533442.

Stern, Milton. "Literary Criticism, the Twenties, and the New Historicism." *The F. Scott Fitzgerald Review*, vol. 2, 2003, pp. 189-208.

Sulkunen, Pekka. "Society Made Visible: On the Cultural Sociology of Pierre Bourdieu." *Acta Sociologica*, vol. 25, no. 2, 1982, pp. 103-15. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/4194391

Timberlake, James H. *Prohibition and the Progressive Movement 1900-1920*. Harvard University Press, 1963.

Tressler, Beth. "Illegible Minds: Charlotte Brontë's Early Writings and the Psychology of Moral Management in *Jane Eyre* and *Villette*." *Studies in the Novel*, vol. 27, no. 1, Spr. 2015, pp. 1-19. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/43233927.

Willebrandt, Mabel Walker. *The Inside of Prohibition*, The Bobbs Merrill Co., 1929.

"Will You Help Keep the Law?" *Good Housekeeping*, Apr. 1924.

Yuhan, Zhu. "The Bankruptcy of a Promising Psychologist." *Studies in Literature and Language*, vol. 7, no. 1, 2013, pp. 68-75. *CS Canada*, <http://www.cscanada.net/index.php/sll/index>

Zeitz, Joshua. *Flapper*. Three Rivers Press, 2006.

VITA

LUCY ANDERSON GRANROTH

EDUCATION

Master of Arts in Literature and Writing student at Eastern Washington University

Cheney, WA, June 2019

Bachelor of Arts in English Literature at Finlandia University, Hancock, MI, May 2016

ACADEMIC EMPLOYMENT

Graduate Student Assistant, Eastern Washington University, Cheney, WA, 2017-2019

PRESENTATIONS AT PROFESSIONAL CONFERENCES

“Dueling Men: Propp’s Transference of Male Autonomy in Class Hierarchies.” Pacific and Modern Language Associate Conference, Western Washington University,

Bellingham, WA, October 2018.

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIP

Pacific and Modern Language Association, 2018-2019.