

# SKYSCRAPERS, SUPERMODELS, AND STRANGE ATTRACTORS

— Ayn Rand, Naomi Wolf, and the Third Wave Aesthos —

*Beauty—ah, Beauty is a compelling goddess to all artists, be it in the shape of a lovely woman or a building...* —from a speech by architect Guy Francon, in *The Fountainhead*

*There is no excellent beauty that hath not some strangeness in the proportion.* —Francis Bacon

**Author:**

Barry Vacker  
Southern Methodist University, Dallas  
(and now at Temple University, Philadelphia)  
barryvacker@mac.com

**Published in:**

*Feminist Interpretations of Ayn Rand*  
Eds, Mimi Gladstein and Chris Matthew Sciabarra  
Penn State Press, 1999.  
Philosophy Series: Re-reading the Canon

Both tall and slender and beheld as beautiful, the skyscraper and the supermodel are two of the most visible symbolic representations of "beauty" in modern industrial culture, both embodying the linear Newtonian aesthetic style of industrialism while simultaneously representing widely divergent symbolic and cultural meanings.

For Ayn Rand, the skyscraper represented the aesthetic culmination of the capitalist industrial worldview, symbolizing the triumph of reason, science, egoism, and, not least importantly, beauty. In the skyscraper, form and function come together as beauty not to merely symbolize integrity and truth, but to *be* truth. The "objective" beauty of the skyscrapers which make up the New York City skyline *is* the truth of industrial capitalism.

For Naomi Wolf, the supermodel represents the aesthetic culmination of the patriarchal capitalist industrial world view, symbolizing the triumph of image, deceit, greed, and, not least importantly, the beauty myth. In the supermodel, form deceives function in a beauty whose glittering allure not merely symbolizes deception and falsehood, but comes to *be* falsehood. The "subjective" beauty of the fashion and cosmetics industries, guided from the skyscrapers of Fifth Avenue and Madison Avenue, *is* the falsehood of industrial capitalism.

According to Rand, art was a "barometer" of culture, wherein the prevailing artistic practices provided insight into the state of the culture. Libertarian philosophy, with which Rand has become associated, has virtually ignored her aesthetic-cultural vision in a self-induced blindness expressed through endless arid visions of *homo economicus*.<sup>1</sup> Perhaps because of Rand's praise of egoism and capitalist industrialism, feminist scholars may tend to overlook the insights of Rand's cultural aesthetics. The cultural aesthetics presented by Rand in *The Fountainhead*,<sup>2</sup> while in certain respects a metaphor for industrial culture, are actually suggestive of a humane aesthetic that is in harmony with the new nonlinear worldview of the emerging Information Age, which futurist Alvin Toffler refers to as "The Third Wave."<sup>3</sup>

Libertarian philosophy has cast its gaze backward,<sup>4</sup> expressing its vision through ceaseless calls for a return to a glorious industrial past of "free markets" and *laissez-faire* capitalism, becoming little more than an apology for a fading Industrial Age. While libertarian philosophy has produced hardly any cultural vision for the Third Wave, Naomi Wolf, a leading feminist scholar on cultural aesthetics and author of the best-selling book *The Beauty Myth*,<sup>5</sup> explicitly calls for women to move beyond patriarchal industrialism and create a "Feminist Third Wave."<sup>6</sup> Wolf presents a polemical cultural critique of the female imagery presented in the mass media, focusing her criticisms on the role of ideal beauty and the supermodel. Wolf passionately exhorts women to turn away from the cultural image of the supermodel, a Platonic ideal designed to enslave women through superficial physical appearances which proscribe normative behavior. By contrast, in *The Fountainhead*, Rand presented a theme of artistic and spiritual integrity expressed through a plot revolving around Howard Roark, an atheistic architect whose aesthetic vision is expressed through buildings exhibiting revolutionary structure and form. Such structures produce a strange new beauty which explodes the classical and traditional aesthetic forms,<sup>7</sup> themselves premised in timeless Platonism, Newtonian linearity, and the Cartesian division between mind and matter.<sup>8</sup>

The cultural aesthetics depicted in *The Fountainhead* suggest a vision which can be embraced by feminist aestheticians, such as Wolf, in an effort to define and describe for the Third Wave a new "aesthos"—a set of beliefs and assumptions underlying science, ethics, and politics integrated in an aesthetic worldview.<sup>9</sup> The new sciences and social structures of the Third Wave seem to create a beautiful opportunity for feminism to break free from the shackles of a "Second Wave" industrial aesthos. The aesthos presented in *The Fountainhead* transcends Church and State, culture and gender, industry and nature, suggesting an organic aesthetic of much deeper complexity than the linearity of the Newtonian skyscraper and the symmetry of the Cosmopolitan supermodel. Rand's cultural aesthetic operates like a dialectical critique of the prevailing forms of aesthetic tradition which are central to the power of the existing social and moral order.<sup>10</sup> The classical forms of pure linearity and symmetry are

destroyed, as if Euclidean geometry met violent rupture on the turbulent edge of "order and chaos," where new structures emerge in the form of what scientists call "strange attractors"—unique and seemingly chaotic nonlinear patterns, shapes, and structures which are often strikingly beautiful. Through Roark's buildings, the natural world, and the faces and bodies of Roark and his lover Dominique, Rand depicted a lawful nature where final and formal nonlinear causality are integrated in the realization of an organic and kaleidic beauty, demanding new forms which may seem strange in their structure, yet attractive in their beauty. Such "strange attractors" are symbols for the highest and most demanding expression of human spirit and freedom—the formal realization of individuality.

This essay will contrast the cultural aesthetics of Ayn Rand with the radically different views of Naomi Wolf, placing them in the context of the emerging post-industrial era. *The Fountainhead* is a fictional novel set during the first half of the twentieth century, an era when the culture of industrialism fully developed in the United States; *The Beauty Myth* is a non-fiction polemic critiquing a highly visible component of the cultural aesthetic of industrial capitalism. While neither *The Fountainhead* nor *The Beauty Myth* present complete theories of beauty, they do present important aesthetic concepts regarding the cultural aesthetics of industrialism, with Rand's aesthetic vision, in particular, suggesting a relational organicity in harmony with the emerging Third Wave. Hopefully this essay will strike chords of resonance and discord in an attempt to break the symmetrical confines of much aesthetic thought, stimulating new ideas for the kaleidic aesthetics of a post-industrial epoch.<sup>11</sup>

## TRANSITION TO THE THIRD WAVE

*What seems like chaos is actually a massive realignment of power to accommodate the new civilization.*  
—Alvin Toffler

It is no coincidence that *The Fountainhead* was published in 1943, during the middle of World War II, and *Atlas Shrugged* in 1957, during the height of the Cold War; both wars were fought over the structure of the civil society in the industrial age. Industrialism promised the utopia of the rational, scientific, efficient, materially abundant social order, superior to the primitive feudal social orders characteristic of the Agricultural Age. World War II represented the culmination of the industrial war—large industrialized nation-states used technologies of factory machines and mass production to create war machines and mass death. The war was fought not over "industrialism," but rather over whether the structure of industrialism should be capitalist or socialist, be it communist international socialism or fascist national socialism. Both fascism and communism had similar visions of industrial order: a state-controlled top-down linear centralization of production, media, and society; mass political movements led by charismatic leaders; a heroic ruling class, be they proletarians or Aryans, who purge society of cultural enemies such as capitalist exploiters or inferior races; and, the imposition of collectivism on bourgeois individuals in the desire for a uniform mass social order. These aesthetic visions of industrial order were conveyed in the mass art of "socialist realism" or "fascist idealism." With fascism annihilated in World War II, the Cold War was fought over the other two visions of industrial order—international communism versus international capitalism.

On the Cold War military stage, masses of machines and men lined up on both sides of an Iron Curtain. On the Cold War media stage, masses of images and artists lined up behind an Aesthetic Curtain, drawn to reveal the battle between the socialist realism of communist propaganda and the "capitalist realism" of consumer advertising.<sup>12</sup> Two visions of an ideal cultural aesthetic engaged in battle—the alienated human united with self and society through the state in the centralized linear communist industrial order battled the material human contented with self and world through commodities in the capitalist industrial order. While Wolf is repulsed by the aesthetics of patriarchal capitalist industrialism, Rand is repulsed by ethics of communist industrialism, seeing in capitalist industrialism an aesthetic vision of beauty realized through reason, purpose, and egoism.<sup>13</sup>

*Atlas Shrugged* was published at the very moment the Industrial Age was first being eclipsed by the

Information Age, for 1957 was approximately the first year information-knowledge workers outnumbered industrial-manufacturing workers in the United States.<sup>14</sup> While *Atlas Shrugged* gazed back on the achievements of capitalism in the Industrial Age, its vision of the future projected inhumane socialistic collapse. While *The Fountainhead* gazed back on the dogma of classicism and the rise of modern architecture, its vision of the future projected aesthetic triumph. If *Atlas Shrugged* is a paean to industrial capitalism, symbolized by the heroic industrialist and the factory, then *The Fountainhead* can be considered a paean to post-industrial aestheticism, symbolized not only by the heroic architect and the skyscraper, but also the complex organic forms of strange attractors. *The Fountainhead* is an intuitive anticipation of a nonlinear post-industrial aesthetic, as if Rand the insightful philosopher, gazing back on the ethos of capitalist industrialism, was overwhelmed by Rand the intuitive artist, expressing the aesthos of post-industrialism.

### The Third Wave Aesthos

*The flowing life which comes from the sense of order in chaos...*

—Gordon L. Prescott, architect in *The Fountainhead*

There is a brief passage in *The Fountainhead* that contains a deep insight into culture and civilization, the importance of which can easily be overlooked. Through the words of Ellsworth Toohey, a socialist journalist and architecture critic, Rand suggested that each "soul" and each "civilization" had its own distinct "style." The style of the soul, an individual's inner spirit, was often expressed through the physical qualities and expressions of the face. Rand used the faces of her characters to great metaphorical effect, as they each symbolized certain worldviews. Rand also suggested that each civilization had its own style, which was expressed through some underlying fundamental principle. Even though Toohey was the arch-villain of the novel, Rand often used his speeches and writings to convey what she believed to be important truths about the world. Regarding the style of a civilization, Toohey mused:

Do you remember the famous philosopher who spoke of the style of a civilization? He called it "style." He said it was the nearest word he could find for it. He said that every civilization has its one basic principle, one single, supreme, determining conception, and every endeavor within that civilization is true, unconsciously and irrevocably to that one principle.<sup>15</sup>

While it may be somewhat reductionist to suggest that the ideas of a civilization can be condensed to one principle, Rand's suggestion does contain a powerful insight that lies at the heart of understanding different cultures and the conflicts between them. Simply put, each civilization has its own unique aesthos—a vision of science, ethics, and politics integrated in an aesthetic worldview. Perhaps better than anyone, futurist Alvin Toffler has grasped this fundamental insight. Interestingly, it was Alvin Toffler who conducted the infamous interview with Ayn Rand for *Playboy* magazine in 1964.<sup>16</sup>

Toffler coined the term "Third Wave" in his seminal historical synthesis which outlined the socio-cultural transformations that ripple across the planet as technological advances are implemented around the world, creating entirely new forms of civilization. In essence, Toffler outlined three broad "waves" which have shaped human civilizations—the First Wave was begun by the Agricultural Revolution, the Second Wave was begun by the Industrial Revolution, and the emerging Third Wave was begun by the Information Revolution. Toffler shows how the prevalent scientific, communication, and production technologies led to dramatic socio-cultural transformations precisely because the new forms of technology demanded new forms of art, science, media, social organization, family structure, economic production, currency, government, transportation, and a whole host of other lifestyle changes.

The First Wave had the plow as its key tool, speech as its key media, and the feudal village as its social structure; the Second Wave had the factory, the printing press, and the nation-state; and the Third Wave will have biotechnology, nanotechnology, the Internet, and new social structures. While the First

Wave sought to satisfy physical needs through food production and the Second Wave sought to satisfy physio-material needs through the abundance of mass production, the Third Wave will move up the hierarchy and satisfy cognitive needs with abundant information, knowledge, and experiences.

In the First Wave, with the invention of the plow approximately ten thousand years ago, hunter-gatherers began to socially organize around cultivated land. Over thousands of years, tribal families, city-states, and feudal societies emerged, as the prime imperative was the control of land capable of cultivation. Before the invention of paper, ink, and the written language, the poet was the key source for the transmission of knowledge across space and over time, with rhyme and meter serving to facilitate the memorization necessary for the transmittal and storage of knowledge.

The Second Wave began to visibly emerge in England in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries with the invention of the factory and steam engine, though it was spread by the first machine of true mass production, the printing press, which was invented in 1450. The source of socio-economic value was not pure labor as was associated with the plow, but the factory-machine, the product of mind and labor. While the Second Wave was fueled somewhat by liberal individualism, its guiding production principle was undifferentiated mass production created through machines and mass labor, targeted for mass markets, sold through mass merchandising, and managed through mass media. This massification of society is something overlooked by Rand's individualist analyses. The economic structures embodied capitalism and communism (or socialism), two systems geared toward mass production for masses of consumer-citizens, fleeing the farms for the factories and creating huge cities. Similarly, there emerged mass political movements, which took on two forms, liberal and socialist, both of which required mass nation-states. Of course, there is an obvious difference between totalitarian communism and market-oriented capitalism, as Rand made so eloquently clear; however, the point here is simply that both systems were geared toward Second Wave industrial mass production. Permeating the Second Wave was a misapplied Newtonianism, where factory and society served as linear deterministic clockwork machines, and uniform nuclear families could be produced by law and state in the crushing pursuit of uniform social order.

In the Third Wave, new forms for art, living, and social life will emerge to replace the technologically outmoded forms of the Second Wave. [See Table 1].

—TABLE 1—

**Some Points of Comparison for the Second and Third Waves**

	<i>Second Wave</i>	<i>Third Wave</i>
known as....	• Industrial Revolution	• Information Revolution
aesthos	• linearity, symmetry, hierarchy, stability, unity, order, etc.	• nonlinearity, asymmetry, turbulence, chaos, etc.
guiding social aesthetic	• uniform order	• strange attractors
prevailing ethic	• mass collectivism	• edgism, nonlinear individualism
communications media	• printing press/mass TV	• the Internet
source of economic value	• machine	• information-knowledge
economic production	• factory/assembly line	• nanotechnology, biotechnology
production principle	• mass production	• mass customization
politics	• mass politics—democracy and socialism	• the end of mass politics
social structure	• nation-state	• fractal and virtual megalopolis
social metaphors	• "the System"	• "Networks" and "Waves"
sciences	• Newtonian linearity	• nonlinearity, chaos theory
	• misguided Darwinism	• emergent and evolutionary
	• Euclidean geometry	• fractal geometry
	• simplicity	• complexity
	• pure order	• "the edge of order and chaos"

The essential source of social value will be in the production and organization of information, knowledge, ideas, and aesthetic experiences. Mass customization is quickly replacing industrial mass production, as emerging production technology allows both scale and individualization. Biotechnology and nanotechnology may render scarcity obsolete, requiring new economic models. Genetics will extend human life dramatically and alter reproductive behavior. In combination with the growing kaleidicity of aesthetic and sexual preferences, asymmetric family structures will emerge which seem just as scientifically "natural" as the Second Wave nuclear model.

The Second Wave traditional mass media are quickly being "demassified,"<sup>17</sup> as the personal computer is integrating all previous communication media into one machine linked to fluid and plastic

global networks. Linear mass broadcasting, with its passive audience, will eventually be obsolete, as computers and the embryonic Internet merge to create completely interactive and networked communication, economic, and banking systems. Computers will become as ubiquitous as the telephone or television and the Internet will work like electricity—one simply plugs in via air or wire. Spanning national borders, the Internet is already accelerating ideas and capital around the globe in a nonlinear horizontalization of power and knowledge and will eventually render the age of centralization, mass politics, nation-states, and "the system" extinct. Unlike the fears of critics mired in Second Wave ideology, people will not be isolated behind computer screens living sterile anti-social lives. Along with much more social mobility, community life will simply develop in a great variety of forms not limited by place, nation, or outmoded social norms.

The ethic of linear mass collectivism, which was necessary to insure conformity within the system of uniform social order, is slowly being challenged by an embryonic ethic which could be termed "edgism" or "nonlinear individualism." Whereas collectivism herds the masses to the center, nonlinear individualism is naturally emerging to work like a reciprocal feedback process as it embraces the asymmetric turbulence and individuality that exists on the *edges* of the social order. In breaking outmoded social norms, such individuals and organizations defy authority, ignore tradition, seek innovation, work outside the system, break unnecessary rules, overcome barriers, expand horizons, go "beyond the limit," and see virtue in living "on the edge." This ethic delights in kaleidic variation, cherishes organic experiences, and takes pleasure in continual processes rather than merely "fitting in" or pursuing linear final ends. Much to the chagrin of State and Church, this ethic seems to pursue neither pure stability nor purified salvation, preferring to create their own organic experiences and nonlinear social structures.

The emerging age will create an unrivaled potential for liberation and cultural variation, all of which are feared by those mired in Second Wave thought. It would seem that feminists should welcome both the emerging Third Wave and the new nonlinear sciences that are challenging the simple mechanistic linearity of Newtonianism with new models embracing emergent organicity. While Sciabarra has pointed out that Rand's philosophic system exhibits a deep systemic organicity indicative of a dialectical sensibility,<sup>18</sup> this essay will show that her cultural aesthetic anticipates the ideas of the new sciences.

Loosely categorized as "chaos theory" or "complexity theory," these nonlinear sciences are producing a radical new view of the processes of nature and will be the guiding scientific philosophy of the Third Wave.<sup>19</sup> Aided by the astounding leaps in computing power, the nonlinear sciences present a causal universe which obeys natural physical law, but produces complex and often unpredictable phenomena. Chaos theory, which could easily be called "structure" theory, does not challenge causality nor the possibility of knowledge, but suggests a complex nonlinear causality subsuming Newtonian linearity. Because of causal complexity, scientists are not omniscient in specific prediction, but can still better understand and generally predict overall systems and structures. Simple lawful systems emerge from complex and seemingly random phenomena, and from simple laws and phenomena can emerge complex organic systems so unpredictable they seem random. Nature, evolution, and emergent processes undergo structural transformation when the system borders on the "edge of order and chaos." "Fractals" are the form for seemingly chaotic or "strange attractors," that guide formal structuring of complex structures (or systems) through nonlinear causality and iteration, producing organic systems of self-similarity with open-ended variation. Fractals are replacing simple Euclideanism as the new geometry of nature, and are being discovered across the universe and the sciences, from the microscopic to the intergalactic to the social.<sup>20</sup> Chaos theory tells us that beautiful strange attractors underlie complex structures produced through nonlinear feedback systems of iteration and mutual communication.

These new sciences have implications for social structures in the Third Wave, with the obvious idea that central planning is not only impossible but also produces chaos in the very proportion it tries to impose order. With the devolution of the nation-state, social structures will reflect kaleidic variation in fractal networks, bound by local geography or the nature of the social exchange. Third Wave social structures, because of their basis in knowledge flow, will "attract" toward voluntary social arrangements, private arbitration, restitutive justice, structural plasticity, and fluid media networks requiring freedom

of expression. In their First and Second Wave stupor, Church and State will attempt violent suppression, but will eventually fail.

The Second Wave style or aesthos can be expressed in several broad concepts: linearity, determinism, symmetry, uniformity, centralization, hierarchy, stability, collectivism, unity, industry, and, above all, order. In contrast, the emerging Third Wave style or aesthos can be expressed in different concepts: nonlinearity, autonomy, asymmetry, diversity, decentralization, horizontalization, turbulence, edgism, individuality, information, and, above all, chaos. The Second Wave aesthos tends to produce social structures as centralized, ordered "systems." The Third Wave aesthos will tend to produce social structures as fluid "networks" or as turbulent "waves," fractal structures with no real "center" or permanent "system" that seem to be co-evolving with nonlinear individualism.

While Randians cast their gaze back upon the age of capitalist industrialism, and Wolf casts her scorn upon it, advanced societies sit astride the emergence of a new epoch as the Second Wave Industrial Age transforms into the Third Wave Information Age. Neither seems to realize that, as with the other Waves, the Third Wave will require radically different conceptions of value and social structure. The Second Wave social order of centralization, hierarchy, stability, unity, and mass politics will no longer be useful or desirable as social concepts, rendered unnatural by the new era. With the eventual end of nation-states, portended by the Third Wave, unpredictable forms of fractal-like anarchism are likely to emerge as the next utopias, sympathetic to Rand's libertarian separation of state from the realm of ideas, media, science, sexuality, religion, and economics. Rand herself simplistically denounced anarchism,<sup>21</sup> but her ideal of the industrial capitalist nation-state will not apply in the new Third Wave context. Despite her libertarian social views, Rand's political economy is more in harmony with the Second Wave. However, her aesthetics and theory of concepts suggest a complex beauty in harmony with Third Wave aesthetics, sciences, and social dynamics. And, while Wolf is right to call for a "Feminist Third Wave," it must be a Third Wave that is free from Second Wave ideology. To understand Wolf's clarion call, it is necessary to first understand her critique of the cultural aesthetics of capitalist industrialism, thus setting the stage for a transition to the cultural aesthetics of the Third Wave suggested by Rand in *The Fountainhead*.

## SUPERMODELS AND SLAVES OF BEAUTY

*...450 full-time American fashion models...constitute the elite corps deployed in a way that keeps 150 million women in line.*

—Naomi Wolf, in *The Beauty Myth*

*An economy that depends on slavery needs to promote images of slaves that 'justify' the institution of slavery.*

—Naomi Wolf, *The Beauty Myth*

Naomi Wolf's purpose in *The Beauty Myth* is to present "a new way to see" the ideal woman in capitalist industrial society, and thereby to free women from a cultural and aesthetic ideal necessarily imposed on women by men since the Industrial Revolution.<sup>22</sup> Wolf sees capitalist industrialism as creating and perpetuating a Platonic vision of beauty, where the unattainable ideal of formal beauty tyrannizes female moral purpose, proscribing not only appearance but also behavior, operating as a form of "social coercion" which protects patriarchal institutions of power.<sup>23</sup> According to Wolf, the mass media present a "beauty myth" where form deceives function, splitting women apart from their true selves and each other, leaving them as divided and powerless objects of aesthetic contemplation. Facing the false alternative of being sexual or serious,<sup>24</sup> women pursue cosmetic appearance as a substitute for cultural assertiveness in an endless quest for social approval according to aesthetic norms created by men who desire to possess the "virtuous beauty" of external appearance, not internal spirituality.<sup>25</sup> Permeating aesthetics, media, culture, work, economics, sexuality, dietary habits, and even law, the beauty myth is ultimately a fictive "totalitarian" tool of "social control" used by the male "power elite" to deceive, dominate, exploit, and enslave women in capitalist industrial society.



According to Wolf, the "beauty myth" has developed precisely in response to expanding female liberation in capitalist industrial societies. While the Industrial Age has helped liberate women from material constraints which previously limited their autonomy, fearful capitalist patriarchy has sought a new form of social control precisely because the material constraints have been dangerously loosened. This form of social control is the "beauty myth," responsible for all kinds of cultural phenomena, from the deeply disturbing—eating disorders, pornography, rape, gender discrimination, all kinds of plastic surgery—to the highly aesthetic—advertising, photography, high fashion. For Wolf, the highly aesthetic is responsible for the deeply disturbing.

Prior to the development of the visual technologies of mass production, first daguerreotypes and then photographs, women were exposed to few images of female beauty and those were mostly under the control of the Church. According to Wolf, industrial capitalism seized upon these tools of imagery to create a changeless "Platonic Ideal Woman," a modern religion complete with its own Rites of Beauty.<sup>26</sup> Created and perpetuated in the industrial mass media to replace the Feminine Mystique,<sup>27</sup> this beauty ideal is both inhuman, dividing women from their true selves and each other, and impossible, creating an enslaving and endless quest for unattainable beauty. Real women are censored from the cultural scene by a capitalist media dependent on the economics of advertising's high fashion beauty myth.<sup>28</sup> Thus, women have become powerless objects of aesthetic contemplation, competitively contemplated by women,<sup>29</sup> possessively contemplated by men.<sup>30</sup> Living an illusory freedom where aesthetic form deceives moral function, they face the false alternative of being sensual or serious.<sup>31</sup> Cosmetic beauty subtly proscribes cultural behavior,<sup>32</sup> undermining not only individuality, identity, and self-esteem but also preventing women from being truly liberated.<sup>33</sup> For Wolf, the beauty myth is social coercion in the form of a "culturally imposed physical standard" which expresses the power relations of patriarchal industrial capitalist society and strengthens male control "a hundredfold."<sup>34</sup> The beauty myth perpetuates an inhumane industrial social order where the most deeply affected are political prisoners in a prison camp. Wolf states:

Women must claim anorexia as political damage done to us by a social order that considers our destruction insignificant because of what we are—less. ... a disgrace that is not our own, but that of an inhumane social order. Anorexia is a prison camp. One fifth of well-educated American young women are inmates. ... To be anorexic or bulimic *is* to be a political prisoner.<sup>35</sup>

Tall, overly slender, elegantly attired, features accentuated through airbrushing and eye shadow, plastered throughout the pages of patriarchal culture, the Platonic supermodel is in effect a high-fashion SS guard overseeing the concentration camp of capitalist industrialism from the runways and catwalks of its capital, the skyscrapers of Manhattan.<sup>36</sup>

Constituting the essence of the beauty myth is a changeless "Platonic Ideal Woman," which all women must forever strive to be, if they are to be valuable women. It is a mythical ideal perpetuated over time in Western civilization, but transformed and exploited through the mass production of visual imagery under capitalist industrialism. For Wolf, not only is the beauty myth false, but it is inhumanely destructive. Wolf summarizes the beauty myth as follows:

The beauty myth tells a story: The quality called "beauty" objectively and universally exists. Women must want to embody it and men must want to possess women who embody it. This embodiment is an imperative for women and not for men, which situation is necessary and natural because it is biological, sexual and evolutionary: Strong men battle for beautiful women, and beautiful women are more reproductively successful. Women's beauty must correlate to their fertility, and since this system is based on sexual selection, it is inevitable and changeless.<sup>37</sup>

Perhaps many biologists or cultural theorists interpret Darwin's evolution as meaning "changeless" beauty and "survival of the fittest," implying that only the "master" species will survive. A more accurate interpretation implies species survive by varying fitness to serve functions for adaptive and co-

evolutionary living, which seems more consistent with the flourishing diversity of life on earth.<sup>38</sup> While she is right to call on women to reject a misguided Darwinianism and a timeless Platonic ideal, Wolf unfortunately accepts many of the assumptions of Platonic-Kantian aesthetics that permeate contemporary culture and cause many of the problems with which she is concerned.

According to Wolf, "ideal" beauty is presented in the media as being objective and attainable, yet it is actually impossible because no one can attain such ideal beauty. Not only is such beauty unattainable—Wolf follows Plato in claiming that "ideal beauty is ideal because it does not exist."<sup>39</sup> Women are deceived and coerced by the illusory and impossible ideal, a glittering veneer produced by the airbrushing and computer-imaging illusionists of capitalist media. In critiquing the ideals in the mass media, Wolf actually adopts the stance of Plato with regard to what she sees as the illusory qualities of beauty in the marketplace. She goes on to claim that beauty is determined by politics, specifically an industrial political economy perpetuating patriarchal power and profits.

None of this is true. 'Beauty' is a currency system like the gold standard. Like any economy it is determined by politics, and in the modern age it is the last, best belief system that keeps male dominance intact.<sup>40</sup>

From the common sense observation that the particulars of beauty have varied over time and across cultures, Wolf adopts a more modernist position which concludes that beauty is neither objective nor universal, but is determined by the industrial political economy.<sup>41</sup> Wolf's argument is that patriarchal industrial capitalism perpetuates the myth that the ideal female beauty is "objective" and "universal," when it is actually subjective and culturally-relative. This myth of objectivity keeps women enslaved. The mass media and advertisers remove physical "flaws" through airbrushing and computer imaging, thus becoming censorious masks of the true reality and identity of women. This identity is more truthfully expressed, according to Wolf, through aesthetic egalitarianism.<sup>42</sup> Wolf encourages women to jettison the Platonism and politicization of cultural aesthetics, the cause of deleterious consequences for women, while accepting the very assumptions that produced the consequences. To fully grasp the thesis of *The Beauty Myth*, we must peer beneath the veneer of Wolf's cultural relativism and understand her deep affinity with Plato, Kant, and Marx.<sup>43</sup>

In Plato's theory of beauty and the ideal forms, perhaps the most poetically powerful ever, he argued that truth and beauty reside in a world of "ideal forms" external to both the object and the perceiving mind, thus requiring for their grasp some form of divine intuition. In attempting to create a philosophical system to render knowledge "objective," Plato thought that the physical world of particulars revealed to the senses was not true "reality," but an imitation or reflection of ideal form, that constitute the true reality.<sup>44</sup> Truth is to be found apart from any particulars of the physical world, which are one step removed from truth.<sup>45</sup> Lovers of true beauty should go beyond the unimportant physical world available to the senses, the source of neither real knowledge nor real things, and ascend the ladder of wisdom in the world of ideals, to seek beauty "in itself by itself with itself."<sup>46</sup> Thus, the beauty of the physical objects is but a deceptive "image" luring us away from the real truth and beauty into a waking dream.<sup>47</sup> This illusion is compounded with art, which is but an imitation of an imitation of reality, thus leaving citizens thrice removed from the truth. For Plato, such deceptive illusion required that artists not be permitted to enter the market.<sup>48</sup>

Kant transformed Platonism into modern subjectivism and relativism by claiming that subjective consciousness imposed form on reality, and therefore human reason could know only appearances but not "the thing in itself." Kant sought to bridge the realms of noumena and phenomena, freedom and nature, through transcendental aesthetic judgment which mediated between the two worlds. Ultimately, aesthetic judgment, as with all judgment, is concerned with subject-supplied formal appearances serving no material purpose. For Plato and Kant, true reality was something unavailable to the physical world of the senses. Thus, the form and beauty of real objects are illusory appearances—the origins of notions such as "beauty is skin deep," "beauty is mere "appearances," and "beauty is in the eye of the beholder."

Marx transposed such illusory dependent formalism into the realm of political economy. Value, the

amount of labor and production in the commodity, was the underlying essence of a commodity expressed in the equivalent form of use-value.<sup>49</sup> Under the capitalist industrial forms of production, the use-value of commodities was concealed by the illusion of exchange-value, which was but a surface appearance creating a surplus value for capitalists in the form of profit.<sup>50</sup> Thus exchange-value is a one-sided depiction of a relation that masks coercion and exploitation. With the camera aiding the mass production of aesthetic imagery in advertising and merchandising, exchange-value became "commodity aesthetic." In *The Aesthetic Dimension*, Marcuse argued that:

the Establishment has created and effectively sold beauty in the form of plastic purity and loveliness—an extension of exchange values to the aesthetic-erotic dimension.<sup>51</sup>

Like Plato's conception of art, the illusion of exchange-value is itself transformed into the illusion of commodity aesthetic, and is thus thrice removed from the true economic value. While such aesthetic is presented in a "free press," commodity aesthetic transforms free speech into falsehood and force. Thus, "commodity aesthetic is one of the most powerful forces in capitalist society."<sup>52</sup> Integrating these themes, Wolf views beauty under capitalism as illusory formal aesthetic dependent upon exchange-value expressed in totalitarian market forces. *The Beauty Myth* is a popularized Marxist critique of commodity aesthetic premised in a contemporary Platonic-Kantian philosophy of beauty.

In arguing against the objective timeless Platonic ideal, Wolf follows the reasoning of most modern aestheticians and assumes that "objective" beauty is unchanging and something which with everyone must agree. Thus, since there are cultural differences and aesthetic disagreements regarding objects and standards of beauty, as Wolf illustrates, beauty must then be purely subjective and culturally-relative. Interestingly, the classical conception of "objective" beauty, which resulted in dogmatic tradition and rigid cultural conservatism, was also rejected by Rand. However, Rand embraced a contextually objective nonlinear conception of beauty. Wolf follows the modernist aesthetic tradition, with its roots in a Kantian aesthetic that sees beauty as purely subjective, culturally-relative, and politically-determined. In my view, modernism rightly rejected the dogmatic traditionalism of classicism but mistakenly accepted the relativism of a pure subjectivity that sought to explode "objective" classical forms and to express inner emotion in "subjective" non-representational forms. The classical conception of "objective" beauty implied that everyone must agree, thus (seemingly) reducing the subjective freedom of both the artist and the beholder. Similarly, any aesthetic that served an objective form or commercial purpose is seen to be limiting the freedom of the artist. Thus, aesthetics serving ends in a market are seen as not truly free. Here, Kant, Marx, and Wolf are conjoined in the realm of commodity aesthetics, where the "ideal beauty" promised as exchange-value is dependent on the capitalist industrial market, rendering beauty deceptive, coercive and totalitarian.

Although Wolf admits that the market would be powerless if women did not enforce it against each other,<sup>53</sup> the industrial mass media still manipulate (what she sees as) the world of Kantian appearances through the aesthetics of ideal beauty to enslave women. Wolf's conclusions have serious implications for the meaning of free speech. According to Wolf, mass media advertising works as censorship in two ways: first, women's magazines and other media refrain from criticizing the beauty myth for fear of losing advertising revenues from major advertisers in the apparel, health, and cosmetic industries; second, and more sinister, airbrushing and computer-imaging censor the real nature of woman and create the illusory Platonic ideal that is the beauty myth.<sup>54</sup> For Wolf, the capitalist industrial marketplace is coercive and not open to "consciousness raising"; it works to censor, not expand, free speech, thus requiring a coercive state through which liberty, free speech and truth are realized.<sup>55</sup>

Wolf believes individualist feminist efforts are not enough to overcome patriarchal industrial imagery and media control. Women, in their "natural solidarity," should adopt a communal collective way of thinking and unite in a "woman-centered political activism" which defines their "self esteem as political," part of a process which Wolf calls renewing "democracy."<sup>56</sup> Importantly, Wolf also calls for a "Feminist Third Wave," a set of political and cultural proposals for renewing the spirit of feminism. Unfortunately her Third Wave political proposals have the flavor of Second Wave statism, an ideology

that, in my view, will be impotent and irrelevant in a fully Third Wave society. Wolf's political proposals include the unionization of women's jobs, filing lawsuits, labor unions for women, enforced dress codes, antidiscrimination laws, parental leave, and fair compensation. Reproductive rights are also recommended and one would presume this means being free from the State, especially when it is guided by the Church. However, in her non-statist and more voluntarist cultural recommendations, Wolf suggests feminists turn away from such imagery and construct their own counterculture, become analytical, find alternative images in films, create feminist art, find feminist heroines, create better rituals, have more intergenerational contact, look directly at one another, seek communal nakedness, modify their behavior toward each other, and develop a sexuality free from violence.<sup>57</sup> It would seem that these cultural recommendations would be more likely to succeed in the kaleidic culture of the Third Wave, precisely because her suggestions are non-statist, voluntary, and seek to create culture instead of imposing it. Despite the dangerous reactions from Second Wave institutions, particularly Church and State, the Third Wave offers hope for creating an unlimited variety of distinct but interrelated cultures, precisely because its nonlinearity and networked systems will eventually break up hierarchy and hegemony in favor of horizontalized social arrangements less dependent on linear top-down structures.

There is no doubt Wolf is addressing a very real phenomenon, that of overconcern with media saturated "appearances" and the resulting various forms of psycho-cultural neuroses—from mere superficialism to the more destructive compulsive eating disorders. Misunderstanding beauty will always result in negative psychological and cultural consequences. Wolf's call for a new definition of beauty that is noncompetitive, nonhierarchical, and nonviolent, definitely has the flavor of Third Wave cultural aesthetics, wherein women can celebrate their individuality and take pleasure in their bodies.<sup>58</sup> But Wolf's real target is not *beauty*; it is the post-Kantian modern *superficiality* in understanding beauty, which spread during the nineteenth-century at the very same time as capitalist industrial mass production. Though modern culture is saturated with the idea that beauty is "unattainable," "skin deep" or "in the eye of the beholder," these ideas are not only incorrect but also lead to the psychological and cultural consequences which Wolf deplors. Similarly, Rand celebrated the body while being very critical of how physical beauty or ostentatious ornamentation could be used to superficially mask an ugly or vacuous spirit.<sup>59</sup> However, as we will see, Rand did not see fashion or ornament as being necessarily superficial; this is in direct contrast to the seeming pathological desire of most philosophers to denounce fashion as if it were an assault on some timeless Platonic truth.<sup>60</sup> There are no doubt complex reciprocal interactions between aesthetics, technology, and philosophy, yet it would be difficult to conclude that nineteenth and twentieth century industrialism necessitated the dissemination of post-Kantian aesthetics. Superficiality is the handmaiden to subjectivism, because both excuse the need for deeper critical thought. Aesthetic superficiality cannot be rejected by thinking superficially about aesthetics.<sup>61</sup>

This analysis, of course, does not mean that subjectivity has nothing to do with aesthetics, for it does, but it operates in a complex nonlinear feedback process between artist, object, and subject, requiring the subject's own aesthetic judgment bear some responsibility in the aesthetic experience and its consequences. If, after visiting a museum, a person then tried to physically transform into being exactly like a person portrayed in a painting, then she or he would seem perhaps disturbed and certainly superficial, but there would no need to condemn the painter for such behavior. If not, then why assign to industrial mass media deterministic linear causality for the same behavior among citizen-consumers, especially since everyone exposed to the media imagery does not develop alienation or eating disorders, nor has plastic surgery, nor emulates supermodels or celebrities? Seeing beauty, especially the human beauty presented in the media, as "appearance" or purely physical, will necessarily create a vicious feedback circle from which escape is impossible. The consequences include a culture-wide decontextualization of beauty manifested in a neurotic desire for *unnatural* physical perfection, preoccupation with youth, and decharacterization of the human face.<sup>62</sup>

A deeper view of human beauty would see a nonlinear reciprocal relation between body and mind, which, properly understood, is expressed through a natural physical-spiritual perfection in which human faces express the character of their souls and human bodies express their sexuality, in all its pleasure,

free from guilt. Such a view of beauty would be more in harmony with nature, for it has the possibility of unifying the devastating duality between *beauty* and *purpose*—placing universality and individuality, form and function, style and substance, subjectivity and objectivity in their proper contexts. While Rand does not present a complete aesthetic philosophy in *The Fountainhead*, it does suggest a foundation for a deeper understanding of beauty and purpose.

## SKYSCRAPERS AND STRANGE ATTRACTORS

*I have not spoken of the aesthetic appeal of strange attractors...a realm lies here to be explored and harmonies to be discovered.*  
—Physicist David Ruelle

Since Rand's stated purpose in writing *The Fountainhead* was to present "an ideal man," one might well conclude, from a feminist perspective, that Rand's aesthetics must therefore express linear masculinity. Both supporters and detractors of Rand usually begin their discussions of her cultural ideas by focusing on the ethical and economic *content* of individual and social actions, not on the aesthetic *forms* of such actions. However, in the cultural aesthetics of *The Fountainhead* there exists beneath the industrial metaphors an aesthetic vision of deep complexity and organicity, unlike typical industrial aestheticism. Rand created an aesthetic vision where humans and nature exist harmoniously, not in a static symmetrical world of timeless tradition and classical forms, but in a turbulent world of chaotic organicity and strange attractors, much like the aesthetics of the new nonlinear sciences. In humans, beauty and purpose are united as aesthetic form and spiritual function, expressed not in spiritless symmetry, but in an individuality that is both natural and strangely beautiful. For Rand, the beautiful is not a sterile object of aesthetic contemplation, but is instead the guide and end for virtuous action—egoistic integrity as the means, aesthetic beauty as the end. Form and function come together in an organic relation, with the ideal forms being the natural individuality inherent in all potentiality. This is not merely "form following function," but the full realization of the organic reciprocity that exists in the nonlinear relation between form and function.

In the famed opening passage of *The Fountainhead*, a nude Roark is poised at the edge of a cliff above a lake. Laughing at the aesthetic conformists in society, he dives "down into the sky."

He stood naked at the edge of a cliff. The lake lay far below him. A frozen explosion of granite burst in flight to the sky over the motionless water. The water seemed immovable, the stone flowing. The stone had the stillness of one brief moment in battle when thrust meets thrust and the currents are held in a pause more dynamic than motion. The stone glowed, wet with sunrays.

The lake below was only a thin steel ring that cut the rocks in half. The rocks went on into the depth, unchanged. They began and ended in the sky. So that the world seemed suspended in space, an island floating on nothing, anchored to the feet of the man on the cliff.

His body leaned against the sky. It was a body of long straight lines and angles, each curve broken into planes. He stood, rigid, his hands hanging at his sides, palms out. He felt his shoulder blades drawn tight together, the curve of his neck, the weight of the blood in his hands. He felt the wind behind him, in the hollow of his spine. The wind waved his hair against the sky. His hair was neither blond nor red, but the exact color of a ripe orange rind. ...

His face was like a law of nature—a thing one could not question, alter or implore. It had high cheekbones over gaunt hollow cheeks; gray eyes, cold and steady; a contemptuous mouth, shut tight, the mouth of an executioner or a saint.

He looked at the granite. To be cut, he thought, and made into walls. He looked at a tree. To be split and made into rafters. He looked at a streak of rust on the stone and thought of iron ore under the ground. To be melted and to emerge as girders against the sky.<sup>63</sup>

There are many things that could be said about this passage, but here the focus shall be on the aesthetic

metaphors. There are no doubt strong industrial metaphors represented in the final paragraph. In the beauty of nature Roark sees granite to be cut into walls, trees to be split into lumber for rafters, ore to be mined and melted into girders for skyscrapers. Similarly, the lake was "only a thin steel ring." One can see a metaphor for Newtonian linearity and Euclidean geometry in his rigid body of "long straight lines and angles, each curve broken into planes." Perhaps there is an expression of industrial dominative masculinity in his face comprised of "gray eyes, cold and steady, a contemptuous mouth, shut tight, the mouth of an executioner or a saint." It is possible to see a sterile objectivity in Roark's face, a law of nature "one could not question, alter or implore." It would be easy to dismiss this passage as the expression of a bygone age of masculine linear industrialism, the fading Second Wave of Euclidean Industrial Humans. However, there is more to this visually arresting passage.

Roark could also be as seen representing the beauty of humans in a harmonious state of nature, in contrast to a simplistic Hobbesian-Darwinian state of nature, where warlike death struggles prevail. The Hobbesian-Darwinian view has prevailed throughout the Industrial Age, but is now being challenged by the nonlinear and emergent sciences. "Chaos" and turbulence are now being seen as lawful, natural, and often beneficial to humans, not necessarily as threatening and deadly. Importantly, the process and results of such turbulent chaos yield forms of strange beauty, once they are properly understood. The state of nature Rand describes is not linear Newtonianism, but reflects the nonlinear relations between the objects and forces of nature. Rand's opening state of nature contains frozen explosions of granite, immovable water cutting through flowing stones, reciprocal thrusts and currents held in "in a pause more dynamic than motion," all seemingly suspended in space and floating on nothing, anchored to the feet of Roark on the cliff. Rand's words express the visual forms of strange attractors, the visual descriptors of the formal causality of the chaotic forces of nature as modeled in nonlinear phase spaces of physics.<sup>64</sup> Rand captured the essence of such visual modeling when she stated, through Roark, that "(w)e live in our minds, and existence is the attempt to bring that life into physical reality, to state it in gesture and form."<sup>65</sup>

Awaiting Roark as he stood against the sky was New York City, Rand's capital of industrialism and of the greatest human-made structures, the skyscrapers, themselves against the sky. From the perspective of the Industrial Age, Roark could be seen as the heroic architect who took the materials of nature, tamed through the logic of science and technology, and created great works of beauty. Here the aesthetic stress is upon the linear and geometric, symbolizing the cool rationality of the Euclidean Human in the Industrial Age, a purely dominative effort to subjectively fit reality into pre-determined patterns.<sup>66</sup> However, Rand's cultural aesthetic does not separate mind from body, nor spirit from science. Rand's geometry, while at times seeming Euclidean, more often express a nonlinear view of nature, where the processes of turbulence and feedback produce complex structures revealed in fractal-like forms. These new forms have a strange beauty which is expressed in Roark and Dominique's physical characteristics, in the various descriptions of nature, and, most importantly, in Roark's buildings.

As the opening passage illustrates, Roark is far from the classical male ideal, especially with regard to his face. Roark's face is a study of unusual contrasts. One might argue that his gray eyes are metaphors for industrial steel and his orange hair, a metaphor for industrial age electricity, or perhaps for the sun that gives life to nature. Yet, it is a strange face that Dominique knew "was the most beautiful face she would ever see, because it was the abstraction of strength made visible."<sup>67</sup> So too, in the visual descriptions of Dominique, there is a mixing of industrial and post-industrial forms that challenges the classical ideal.

Some of Dominique's specific physical characteristics often take on industrial forms. For example, her hair is not described as soft and feminine, in the traditional sense. In one of her more visually descriptive phrases, Rand describes Dominique's hair as follows:

(T)he straight mass of her hair stirred in a heavy ripple, like a wave through a half-liquid pool of mercury.<sup>68</sup>

Later Rand states that Dominique's hair was "like a pale helmet of polished metal."<sup>69</sup> Both descriptions are clear metaphors for the Industrial Human. Rand also gives Dominique's hair Euclidean form when

she writes that Dominique's hair "slanted in a flat curve across her forehead and fell in a straight line."<sup>70</sup> Industrial-Euclidean forms are also found in Dominique's body, in the "inflexible precision of her legs"<sup>71</sup> and in "the elegance of line you'll find in a good yacht."<sup>72</sup> Again, some might find it easy to dismiss such descriptions as simple linear masculine industrialism. However, Dominique's hair stirring in a wave-like heavy ripple through a pool of mercury also suggests a metaphorical recognition of turbulence and fluidity that occurs in "waves" in both the social and natural world.

Dominique's physical being is a complex mixture of Platonic, industrial, and post-industrial features that explodes classical forms in its "strangely elegant" beauty. Rand describes her as follows:

Her slender body seemed out of all scale in relation to a normal human body; its lines were so long, so fragile, so exaggerated that she looked like a stylized drawing of a woman and made the correct proportions of a normal being appear heavy and awkward beside her. She wore a plain gray suit; the contrast between its tailored severity and her appearance was deliberately exorbitant—and strangely elegant. ... She had gray eyes that were not ovals, but two long, rectangular cuts edged by parallel lines of lashes; she had an air of cold serenity and exquisitely vicious mouth. Her face, her pale gold hair, her suit seemed to have no color, but only a hint, just on the verge of the reality of color, making the full reality seem vulgar. Keating stood still, because he understood for the first time what it was that artists spoke about when they spoke of beauty.<sup>73</sup>

As I will discuss later in more detail, Dominique has a strong Platonic streak in her personality, for she believes that beauty and greatness have no real chance in this world because they will be defiled or destroyed by the tasteless masses. Rand symbolizes this Platonism by describing Dominique's face, hair, and suit as having only a hint of color, existing "just on the verge of the reality of color, making the full reality seem vulgar." It would seem fair to conclude that such aesthetic symbolism has ethical implications, for Rand clearly believed Dominique more virtuous than the vulgar masses. The industrial metaphors obviously could include the long lines of her body, her rectangular gray eyes, parallel lines of lashes, the severe tailoring of the plain gray suit, and her "cold serenity."

In the context of Wolf's beauty myth, Dominique's "slender body" which "seemed out of all scale in relation to a normal human body" could be construed by some to be a literary metaphor for the overly slender supermodel that Wolf holds responsible for various psychological disorders among women. Such a conclusion would seem rather linear in light of the full context in which Dominique resides and the symbolic meaning of her character. On one level, Dominique is obviously a metaphor for the Euclidean Industrial Human, her aesthetic form reflecting her ethical virtue, with her stylized long lines perhaps resembling an *avant-garde* Art Deco fashion model. However, the obvious masculinity residing in the industrial forms and her "exquisitely vicious mouth" gives Dominique a potential androgyny which explodes any notion of Dominique being a vision of conservative classicism. In the context of the cultural aesthetics symbolized by Roark's buildings, Roark's own physical features, and being Roark's lover, Dominique's physical forms are symbolic of a cultural aesthetic that suggests post-industrialism and nonlinearity. Dominique's exaggerated, out of scale, and seemingly incorrect proportionalities reflect linear-chaotic characteristics similar to those of strange attractors that exist on the edges of transitions between order and chaos.<sup>74</sup> Dominique's color, on the "verge" of full reality, could also be seen, in a very abstract sense, as a metaphor for existing on the edge of order and chaos. Dominique seems not real, yet reflects the essence of nature's structural forms and processes in a new beauty Rand describes as "strangely elegant."<sup>75</sup>

The battle between the ideal and the real harks back to Plato and Aristotle and rages in our culture wars today, setting the cultural context for Wolf's beauty myth, where aesthetic "idealism" is denounced in the name of egalitarian aesthetic "naturalism." Ideals are most misunderstood in the media. Contemporary social psychologists offer pronouncements about the impact of beauty ideals while showing little knowledge of aesthetic philosophy. It would seem that if "ideals" are transposed to a different context, one in which they represent nonlinear forms revealed through individuality, then there would be no need to reject them *carte blanche*.

Rand saw no necessary conflict between the ideal and the real. She claimed to follow Aristotle,<sup>76</sup> for whom the purpose of art was to objectify the essential and the universal. In conveying aesthetic ideals, the artist should imitate reality, not slavishly present what has happened, but represent what might happen or what is possible according to the essential and universal truths of nature. Free from contradiction, the moral and aesthetic are integrated in art and nature—art objectifying the real, fiction expressing truth.<sup>77</sup> This gives the aesthetic, especially the ideal of beauty, a powerful role in filling the cognitive needs of humans.

For Rand, knowledge begins with concrete particulars, grasped through the senses, from which nonlinear mental abstractions are derived inductively and integrated into cognitive units retained as concepts, themselves applied to reality deductively. Concepts are organized into complex nonlinear networks and mental hierarchies embodying the widest of abstractions, often in the form of an aesthos, which serves as the basis for our evaluations about the world around us, creating the natural need to "see" such abstractions directly. According to Rand:

Art fulfills this need: by means of a selective re-creation, it concretizes man's fundamental view of himself and of existence. It tells man, in effect, which aspects of his experience are to be regarded as essential, significant, important. In this sense, art teaches man how to use his consciousness. It conditions or stylizes man's consciousness by conveying to him a certain way of looking at existence.<sup>78</sup>

Art fills this need by stylizing consciousness in conveying a certain view of existence through abstract concepts concretized as organic wholes. Instead of faking reality, the artist stylizes reality. The artist omits the accidentals and selects the "essentials" that she regards as metaphysically important. By emphasizing and stylizing these "essentials," the artist subjectively objectifies her view of existence. Aesthetic forms are not divorced from reality, but properly, should integrate the facts of reality. Through a nonlinear process of abstraction and concretization, aesthetic forms provide a metaphysical evaluation of the facts in the form of a concept which can be grasped directly at the perceptual level, as if the concepts were percepts.<sup>79</sup> According to Rand:

the artist starts with a broad abstraction which he has to concretize, to bring into reality by means of the appropriate particulars; the viewer perceives the particulars, integrates them and grasps the abstractions from which they came, thus completing the circle.<sup>80</sup>

Via aesthetic abstractions in form, an aesthos is brought to one's perceptual level in a nonlinear process involving artist, subject, and the aesthetic object. This process gives aesthetics substantial emotive power. Thus the aesthetic is the subjective objectification of universal ideals, through the individual particulars of organic wholes, which are grasped and integrated subjectively by artists and subjects. Aesthetic concepts are identified inductively and applied deductively.

For both Aristotle and Rand, to present the flawed or imperfect actually represents falsehood rather than "truth," because the "essentials" are the real truth found in nature, which itself is always striving toward a realization of the better or best. This viewpoint is in direct conflict with aesthetic "naturalism," which assumes that aesthetic idealism is inherently Platonic and impossible. Naturalism opts for a representation of the flawed and the imperfect as representative of "nature" in the form of aesthetic egalitarianism. At times, Dominique often seems to be the pale hazy unrealized Platonic vision who believes that beauty has no chance to exist in a real world in which ideal beauty is brought down to reality and ultimately destroyed by the tasteless masses and the aesthetic egalitarianism of socialist intellectuals.<sup>81</sup> Dominique's Platonism is best symbolized when she drops the Greek statue of Helios down the airshaft of her high-rise, because, even though she loved the statue of a naked man, she thought it should be destroyed since no one should see such beauty.<sup>82</sup> It is Roark, the Aristotelian, who must make the sometimes-Platonist Dominique realize that beauty can exist in *this* world. This task required in part that Dominique be the model for an object of great art. Roark, in designing the Stoddard



Temple of the Human Spirit, commissioned a statue of Dominique to stand as the solitary symbol of the human spirit in the Temple. The sculptor Steven Mallory had Dominique standing, nude, with her arms by her side, palms out, head thrown back in exaltation, an object of art expressing simultaneously the aspiration and fulfillment of the human spirit.<sup>83</sup>

The statue of a naked woman...Uplifted in its quest—and uplifting by its own essence. Seeking God—and finding itself. Showing that there is no higher reach beyond its own form.<sup>84</sup>

Against the backdrop of the Temple's large windows open to the city skyline, the strangely elegant beauty of Dominique, the strangely attractive Third Wave supermodel, is brought down from the Platonic heavens to the real existence of this world through an inherently aesthetic and nonlinear process, where form and essence exist in a reciprocal organic relation. Rand presented not an impossible idealism nor a sterile industrialism, but suggested more of a natural and kaleidic aestheticism found in the laws of nature, not in the might of a State nor in the mysticism of a God. Purposeful individuality and nonlinear nature are symbolized by strangely beautiful faces, bodies, and buildings, existing far beyond the confines of a sterile industrial aesthetic, yet much deeper than a superficial Platonic impossibility.

### The Organic Relation Between Beauty and Purpose

*[T]he beauty of the human body is that it hasn't a single muscle which doesn't serve its purpose; that there's not a line wasted; that every detail of it fits one idea, the idea of a man and the life of a man.*

—Ayn Rand, *The Fountainhead*

An unfortunate legacy of post-Kantian aesthetics is the idea that beauty is not related to any purpose, creating an aesthetic duality that ripples throughout culture. Thus, the fine arts are alleged superior to the utilitarian arts, the aesthetic is tarnished by the commercial, aesthetic freedom is limited by market demand, the surface obscures substance, and human sexuality is separate from human virtue. The last three of these dualities underlie much of Wolf's beauty myth. She sees market demand as limiting artistic and human freedom, image as suffocating substance, and beauty as being separate from sexuality. Rand clearly rejected the idea of beauty being apart from purpose, seeing instead an organic relation between the aesthetic, the ethical, the cultural, and the sexual.

While the relation between beauty and purpose can have several variable yet similar meanings,<sup>85</sup> it is best represented by modern organic architecture which sees beauty as the result of a harmonious relation between form and function.<sup>86</sup> Unfortunately, this is often mistakenly expressed as "form follows function." This usually leads to a sterile formalism devoid of human spirit. Rand herself bordered on the same idea when she had architect Henry Cameron, Roark's early mentor, state that "the form of a building must follow its function."<sup>87</sup> Some elements of modern architecture and industrial design took "form follows function" to also mean "function apart from form," usually in the name of practical efficiency as a mask for aesthetic inadequacy. The most integrated interpretation is expressed by architect Frank Lloyd Wright as follows:

form and function become one in design and execution, if the nature of the materials and method and purpose are all in unison.<sup>88</sup>

Wright, perhaps the greatest architect of this century, was not only a prolific designer but was also a prolific writer, authoring numerous essays and books detailing his philosophy of "organic" architecture.<sup>89</sup> Wright is important because Rand considered him a great artist, one of the few men of integrity of the twentieth century, the only man she believed could really "understand" the ideas of *The Fountainhead*.<sup>90</sup> Rand corresponded with Wright several times in letters during the years she was working on *The Fountainhead*. Interestingly, in a letter dated December 12, 1937, Rand used Wright's own words to describe the theme of *The Fountainhead*, which

belief in "the natural way" and the prevalence of living and culture in vicarious forms rather than "existing as organic."<sup>91</sup> Wright himself was quite critical of the effects of linear industrialism on society, especially that of centralization.<sup>92</sup>

Despite her possibly inaccurate formulation of form following function, Rand suggests some additional components which give her conception of beauty a Wrightian organic flavor. Through Roark, she states:

The purpose, the site, the material determine the shape. Nothing can be reasonable or beautiful unless it's made by one central idea, and the idea sets every detail. A building is alive, like a man. Its integrity is to follow its own truth, its one single theme, and to serve its own single purpose.<sup>93</sup>

While one could see a sterile linearity in Rand's expression of "a single theme," such a reading would be an oversimplification. Several points are crucial here in Wright's and Rand's formulations. First, the concept of "purposeful" beauty was never meant to provide an intellectual license for mundane unimaginative industrial design, nor the spiritless uniform glass rectangles which numb many of the world's skylines. Second, such beauty does not mean that ornament was superfluous, but that ornament should be determined by the theme of the structure. As Roark's mentor Henry Cameron said:

"A building creates its own beauty, and its ornament is derived from the rules of its theme and its structure."<sup>94</sup>

The very same principles could be applied in interpreting apparel and personal adornment, with these representing an expression of the inner theme of the person, not a superficial layer masking the lack of substance. Of course, as the consequences of "the Beauty Myth" indicate, there exists an abundance of shallow post-Kantian citizens. Unfortunately, however, too often in contemporary culture a person's concern with fine design or apparel is viewed as an expression of superficiality. In reality, however, some critics project their own aesthetic superficiality onto others. As wonderfully illustrated by Hanson, traditional philosophy seems to have a pathological Platonic fear of fashion.<sup>95</sup> Even Rand, the rational philosopher, overlooked the intuitive artist, when she seemingly trivialized the importance of "decorative" arts in comparison to the "fine" arts.<sup>96</sup> With their roots in Newtonian and Kantian aesthetics, such unwarranted distinctions continue to haunt culture.<sup>97</sup> Understanding the nonlinear organic relation between structure (or theme) and ornament could defuse much of the prevailing superficiality in body adornment. As noted earlier, Rand herself recognized that a shallow beauty or elegance could be used to mask an ugliness or superficiality of spirit, whether in a building, body, or face. Of course, most of Rand's protagonists are "physically" beautiful, but that physicality is metaphorically symbolic of harmony between outer form and inner purpose. As Gail Wynand described Dominique:

You're so beautiful Dominique...the one person who matches inside and out.<sup>98</sup>

Thus, thirdly, Rand clearly integrated aesthetics with ethics when she suggested beauty is not possible without "integrity" seeking truth and "purpose" providing a central theme.<sup>99</sup> Full realization of potentiality, be it in a building or a life, requires integrity, a commitment to truth, to one's purpose. Rand saw such abstract beauty as an aesthetic-moral compass,<sup>100</sup> guiding human actions in the full realization of human potentiality, a self-chosen purpose marked by a commitment to truth and integrity. In *The Fountainhead*, the physical human beauty of Roark and Dominique was a metaphor for the organic relation between human form and purposeful function. Roark's buildings even had aesthetic moral qualities; Dominique described one of his buildings as being "beautiful, like an anthem."<sup>101</sup>

Fourth, Wright's and Rand's mention of "method" yields insights into their conceptions of beauty. Method, or style, may be characterized as a distinctive manner or mode of expression. Rand believed style reflected a certain manner of cognition or epistemics, and suggested that "method," apart from content, was crucial to the full realization of potentiality. She stated:

The architect...the man who had made this possible—the thought in the mind of that man—and not

the content of that thought...but the method of his thought, the rule of its function...<sup>102</sup>

Both Wright and Rand saw the organic role that "method," or style or form, plays in combination with function in realizing great design, whether it be the design of a building or a life. The method by which a mind deals with its content of knowledge will determine the efficiency of its functioning over time, precisely because method and content shape each other through their reciprocal interactions.<sup>103</sup> Method is formal causality integrating the structure and efficiency of functionality in a reciprocal relation, much like the feedback processes inherent in the dynamics of the nonlinear sciences.

Finally, for both Wright and Rand, science and technology are not in conflict with nature, and a dynamic and harmonious organic relation could and should exist between design, technology, nature, purpose, and humans. The beauty of nature also expresses the nonlinear organicity of the processes and forces of nature in creating the structures of the natural world. Appreciative of such natural beauty,<sup>104</sup> Roark's buildings are always built in harmony with the surrounding nature, often as if an extension of nature itself, reflecting the nonlinearity or chaotic structures of the surroundings. As the culmination of her cultural aesthetics, it is in Roark's buildings that Rand most clearly expresses a Third Wave aesthos in the forms of beautiful strange attractors.

### Strange Attractors and the Third Wave Aesthos

*But above all chaos is beautiful.* —Physicist Ian Stewart

As I have argued, the cultural aesthetics of Rand as presented in *The Fountainhead*, while in certain respects a metaphor for linear masculine industrialism, are also suggestive of an emerging Third Wave "aesthos"—an integration of science, ethics, and politics into an aesthetic worldview. This is an aesthos that would seem to be sympathetic to feminist concerns about the fading Industrial Age and its forms of power and social structure. However, before examining this aesthos in greater detail, it is necessary to discuss Rand's theory of concepts. Her theory provides not only an original and nonlinear theory of concepts, but it also provides unusual insights into the role of aesthetics in human reasoning, showing why humans naturally need and develop aesthetic worldviews to guide their judgments and lives. This explains why a cultural aesthos can be such a powerful motivator across the fields of human endeavor, and suggests deep aesthetic motivations in the clash of Second and Third Wave cultures. Like Roark's buildings, Rand's theory of concepts is also in harmony with the Third Wave.

According to Rand, concepts or universals are neither intrinsic to the object or the subject. They are identifications of relations among particulars existing objectively in the physical world, or of ideas existing in relation to such particulars. Concepts are relationally objective and have value when they serve purposes related to individual human lives. We are directly aware of the world via the senses, which allow us to perceptually apprehend particular "entities" that we distinguish from other entities. To form a concept, we identify relationships among the entities by grasping similarities and differences in their identities. Through a quantitative nonlinear process of measurement-omission we form a cognitive abstraction of the formal relations, where the specific measurements of the formal relations must be of some quantity, but could be of any quantity. This abstraction represents that which is universal to the given particulars, yet is open-ended, offering variation limited only by context and human purpose.<sup>105</sup> This theory of concepts is essentially aesthetic and nonlinear. Rand's theory of concepts seems to be sympathetic to feminist epistemological concerns with regard to linear masculinist deductionism that masquerades as objective "reason." Rand does not reject reason, but she places the processes of reason in a context where objective facts exist in a nonlinear relation with deduction and induction, universality and particularity. Thus, "reason" is freed from the "rationalist" tradition of totalitarian universalism and imposed social order.

For Rand, the world is one of particulars, not of timeless Platonic forms nor subjective appearances. These particulars are ontologically represented to our senses as distinctly different entities that exist in complex relations. Against the tapestry of differences we

identify varying proportionalities

of similarity and difference in spatio-temporal-conceptual relations revealed in patterns and forms among objects, ideas, and ourselves.<sup>106</sup> Forming concepts means identifying physical, telic, or conceptual proportionalities with referents in the physical world. Concept formation is inherently an aesthetic process as suggested by the very term "concept *formation*." Concepts are objective in the abstract and universal, subjective in the concrete and particular, and purposeful in context, yet they are not the result of Newtonian linear processes.

In my judgment, the first level of concept-formation operates like a beginning nonlinear equation, with the results of the identified varying proportionalities iterated into the original equation, so that concept-formation and modification resembles a nonlinear process of self-similarity within a wider scope of variation, differentiation, and contrast. The process of concept formation entails identifying purposeful proportionality, or the fitness of the relation between form and function, with the new "result" becoming a new or modified concept. Rand does not use the term "purposeful proportionality," but it is a term that can be used to describe the organic nonlinear formal and temporal relation between form and function, style and substance, or method and content.<sup>107</sup> Induction and deduction are like analogic and nonlinear processes,<sup>108</sup> wherein new particulars are iteratively inserted into the concept-formation equation, often yielding a new concept with new contours and parameters. Nature and reality, the existing physical and social facts, together with human purpose form the boundary for contextuality and for the feedback processes, within which the nonlinear causality continually reshapes the formed concept. The cognitive abstraction formed is an "ideal" capable of admitting open-ended variation. Ideal formation is not *a priori*, nor purely an element of linear logic, but is the result of a feedback process of iterative and analogic identification of purposeful proportionality. Through immensely complex feedback processes, proportion and purpose (form and function or method and content) simultaneously influence each other, becoming integrated as a conceptual or perceptual unit when properly identified or understood.

Rand's epistemology suggests that the aesthetics of concept-formation do not divorce mind from reality, nor universals from particulars, nor objectivity from subjectivity, nor form from function, nor style from substance. Embracing universalism and objectivity need not mean uniformity. Embracing subjectivity and particularity need not mean relativism. Embracing form and style need not mean appearances and superficiality. Pursuing beauty and individuality need not mean separating the ideal from the real, nor mind from body, nor love from sexuality, nor lover from lover, in whatever combination. As physio-material needs are more satisfied, individuals will seek more physio-cognitive gratifications inducing ever more variation-seeking purposes in sexual relations. This kaleidic sexual variation will be simultaneously fueled and satisfied by high social-communications plasticity in the Third Wave. Rand's suggested relational objectivity, as interpreted here, permits universalism and individuality, allowing contextual variation and the subjective individuality sought by Wolf, without either cultural relativism or nihilism. Beauty is culturally contextual yet open-ended—a nonlinear complexity of purposes, forms, and variations.

The aesthetics of concept-formation are deeply embedded in our thinking processes, guiding our valuations of the world around us and creating a deep cognitive need to "see" and "feel" such abstractions in varieties of physical forms and experiences. The aesthetics of concept formation give rise to not only the need for art, but also the need for seeing beauty in nature, culture, and life. Scientific discovery is motivated by the pursuit of beauty, as are our political and cultural visions.<sup>109</sup> While *The Beauty Myth* presents a capitalist industrial aesthetic of imaged humans, self-alienation, and impossible ideals, *The Fountainhead* presents a post-industrial aestheticism which transcends the fading industrial age, clearly expressing the spirit of Third Wave scientific and aesthetic dynamics.

Rand presents an aesthos expressed through asymmetric forms which exhibit turbulent processes, fractal self-similarity, chaotic complexity, and kaleidic organicity—all integrating human purpose with nature in beautiful strange attractors.<sup>110</sup> Roark's buildings are extensions of this aesthos, his buildings designed in harmony with nature while simultaneously improving upon such nature. Even though Rand saw Roark's buildings as improving nature, this was not an apology for all architectural and urban design. While Rand clearly rejected the "moldering ruins" of classical European culture and

architecture,<sup>111</sup> she also rejected the dogma of modern architecture and its aesthos of sterile Newtonian linearity expressed in static, regular, predictable, orderly forms.<sup>112</sup> In addition, she was quite appreciative of the beauty and spiritual importance of "an untouched world." This sentiment is expressed in the opening passage of the section of *The Fountainhead* entitled "Howard Roark," where Rand states:

The leaves streamed down, trembling in the sun. They were not green; only a few, scattered through the torrent, stood out in single drops of a green so bright and pure that it hurt the eyes; the rest were not a color, but a light, the substance of fire on metal, living sparks without edges. And it looked as if the forest were a spread of light boiling slowly to produce this color, this green rising in small bubbles, the condensed essence of spring. The trees met, bending over the road, and spots of sun on the ground moved with the shifting of branches, like a conscious caress. The young man hoped he would not have to die.

Not if the earth looked like this, he thought. Not if he could hear the hope and the promise like a voice, with leaves, tree trunks and rocks instead of words. But he knew that the earth looked like this only because he had seen no sign of men for hours; he was alone, riding his bicycle down a forgotten trail through the hills of Pennsylvania where he had never been before, where he could feel the fresh wonder of an untouched world.<sup>113</sup>

Here is a vision of a dynamic nature full of radiant light and colors, produced through nature's inherently turbulent and reciprocal processes. There is nothing static or timeless in this "untouched world"—nature is boiling, leaves are trembling, trees are bending, branches are shifting, and colors exist in fiery torrents so bright they do violence to the eyes.

Rand sees the beauty of nature as the outcome of turbulent and seemingly violent processes operating in a realm very much like what the nonlinear sciences would describe as "the edge of order and chaos."<sup>114</sup> Rand sees nature's forms exhibiting what could be called a "turbulent harmony." Simply put, the processes of nature are turbulent, constantly in turmoil, and ever-evolving into new forms and structures of complex reciprocity and organicity. Rand describes such a process in a scene depicting Roark working with a gang of men in a stone quarry:

He stood on the hot stone in the sun. His face was scorched to bronze. His shirt stuck in long, damp patches to his back. The quarry rose about him in flat shelves breaking against one another. It was a world without curves, grass or soil, a simplified world of stone planes, sharp edges and angles. The stone had not been made by patient centuries welding the sediment of winds and tides; it had come from a molten mass cooling slowly at an unknown depth; it had been flung, forced out of the earth, and still held the shape of violence against the violence of the men on its ledges.<sup>115</sup>

Roark is working in such violent conditions because, at this point in the novel, he has been unable to earn a living by designing his type of visionary buildings. He leaves New York City to work in a stone quarry, which is the place where he eventually meets Dominique because her father owns the quarry. It is fitting that they meet in such a naturally violent and turbulent setting, because throughout the novel they both experience waves of turbulence and seeming chaos, yet these conditions are necessary for both to fully develop themselves.

In the following passage, Rand metaphorically illustrates their existence on waves of turbulence through the thoughts of Dominique:

She liked to lie with him at the edge of the water; she would lie on her stomach, a few feet away from him, facing the shore, her toes stretched to the waves; she would not touch him, but she would feel the waves coming up behind them, breaking against their bodies, and she would see the backwash running in mingled streams off her body and his.<sup>116</sup>

The waves "breaking against their bodies" is quite symbolic of the turbulent harmonizing that occurs on

"the edge of order and chaos," which is exactly where the form of a wave breaks. "Turbulent harmony" is a process that runs throughout Rand's aesthos, though it should not be misconstrued as a simplistic Hobbesian-Darwinian state of war requiring sovereigns and sacrifices. Turbulent harmonizing represents the never-ending processes which produce nature's structural forms and are potentially beneficial to humans if properly understood. Though turbulence could endanger life, it could also lead to higher levels of living and aesthetic experience. Waves of turbulent harmonizing and chaotic structuring often produce sublime natural beauty and intense sexual eroticism.

Ironically, the "waves" of chaotic turbulence have become key visual and structural metaphors for the dynamics of the emerging post-industrial era, as illustrated by Toffler's Third Wave, Wolf's own Feminist Third Wave, and wave-centric phrases such as "surfing the Web" and "surfing the turbulence." Nature, reason, technology, life, and human purpose can exist together in organic relations structured in waves of continual chaotic and turbulent harmonizing. When Rand describes Roark's buildings to convey such ideas, it is as if the philosopher of industrial capitalism is overwhelmed by the intuitive artist of post-industrial aestheticism, resulting in a Third Wave aesthos expressed in the buildings of Howard Roark (See Table 2).

## Strange Attractors and the Third Wave Aesthos of Roark's Buildings

### **The Heller House**

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

—*The Fountainhead*, 119

### **The Gowan Gas Station**

"The gasoline station "was a study in circles; there were no angles and no straight lines; it looked like shapes caught in a flow, held still at the moment of being poured, at the precise moment when they formed a harmony that seemed too perfect to be intentional. It looked like a cluster of bubbles hanging low over the ground, not quite touching it, to be swept aside in an instant of wind speed; it looked gay, with the hard, bracing gaiety of efficiency, like a powerful airplane engine."

—*The Fountainhead*, 156

### **Sanborn House**

"(I)t seemed only that the trees **flowed** into the house and through it ..."—*The Fountainhead*, 166

### **The Enright House**

"He did not grasp it as a building, at first glance, but as a rising mass of rock crystal. There was the same severe, mathematical order, holding together a free, fantastic growth, straight lines and clean angles, space slashed with a knife, yet in a harmony of formation as delicate as the work of a jeweler; an incredible variety of shapes, each separate unit unrepeated, but leading inevitably to the next one and to the whole; so that the future inhabitants were to have, not a square cage out of a pile of square cages, but each a single house held to the other houses like a single crystal to the side of a rock."

—*The Fountainhead*, 238

### **Monadnock Valley**

"He knew that the ledges had not been touched, that no artifice had altered the unplanned beauty of graded steps. Yet some power had known how to build on these ledges in such a way that the houses became inevitable, and one could no longer imagine the hills as beautiful without them—as if the centuries and the series of chances that produced these ledges in the struggle of great blind forces had waited for their final expression, had only been a road to a goal—and the goal was these buildings, part of the hills, shaped by the hills, yet ruling them by giving them meaning.

The buildings were of plain field stone—like the rocks jutting from the green hillsides—and of glass, great sheets of glass used as if the sun were invited to complete the structures, sunlight becoming part of the masonry. There were many houses, they were small, they were cut off from one another, and no two of them alike. But they were like variations on a single theme, like a symphony played by an inexhaustible imagination, and one could still hear the laughter of the force that had been let loose on them, as if that force had run, unrestrained, challenging itself to be spent, but had never reached its end. Music, he thought, the promise the music invoked he had invoked, the sense of it made real—there it was before his eyes—he did not see it—he heard it in chords—he thought there was a common language

of thought, sight and sound—was it mathematics?—the discipline of reason—music was mathematics—architecture was music in stone—he knew he was dizzy because this place below him could not be real."

—*The Fountainhead*, 528-529

### **Wynand House**

"The house was a shape of horizontal rectangles rising toward a slashing vertical projection; a group of diminishing setbacks, each a separate room, its size and form making the successive steps in a series of interlocking floor lines. It was as if from the wide living room on the first level a hand had moved slowly, shaping the next steps by a sustained touch, then had stopped, had continued in separate movements, each shorter, brusquer, and had ended, torn off, remaining somewhere in the sky. So that it seemed as if the slow rhythm of the rising fields had been picked up, stressed, accelerated and broken into the staccato chords of the finale."

—*The Fountainhead*, 610

### **Cortlandt Homes**

"Cortlandt Homes presented six buildings, fifteen stories high, each made in the shape of an irregular star with arms extending from a central shaft. ... The apartments radiated from the center in the form of extended triangles. ... The entire plan was a composition in triangles. The buildings, of poured concrete, were a complex modeling of simple structural features; there was no ornament; none was needed; the shapes had the beauty of sculpture."

—*The Fountainhead*, 613

### **Stoddard Temple to the Human Spirit**

"Its lines were horizontal, not the lines reaching to heaven, but the lines of the earth. It seemed to spread over the ground like arms outstretched at shoulder-height, palms down, in great, silent acceptance. It did not cling to the soil and did not crouch under the sky. It seemed to lift the earth, and its few vertical shafts pulled the sky down. It was scaled to human height in such a manner that it did not dwarf man, but stood as a setting that made his figure the only absolute, the gauge of perfection by which all dimensions were to be judged. ... There was no ornamentation inside, except the graded projections of the walls, and the vast windows. The place was not sealed under vaults, but thrown open to the earth around it, to the trees, the river, the sun—and the skyline of the city in the distance, the skyscrapers, the shapes of man's achievement on earth. At the end of the room, facing the entrance, with the city as the background, stood the figure of a naked human body."

—*The Fountainhead*, 343-344.

Rand's descriptions of Roark's buildings are quite suggestive of the strange attractors being discovered by such nonlinear sciences as chaos theory. In Roark's buildings, there exist chaotic structure, fractal self-similarity, dynamic flow, relational organicity, all expressed through the asymmetrical forms of strange attractors existing in reciprocal relations with human purpose and nature. Rand saw structure as "the solved problem of tension, of balance, of security in counterthrusts."<sup>117</sup> Strange attractors result as the product of the chaotic natural tension in the forces and processes of nature, expressed through the structure of Roark's buildings. In the Heller House, there exists fractal self-similarity within the ledges of the cliff and the many levels, and dynamic flow in the rising planes of the building. Organic relations are evident in the integration of the granite cliff and the granite walls rising upward, the concrete terraces flowing outward following the "line of the waves." In the Gowan Gas Station, there exists an obvious dynamic flow and organic relation (mixed with an industrial metaphor). The "study in circles" is suggestive of a highly complex form of a smooth circular strange attractor.<sup>118</sup> In the Sanborn House, there exists a dynamic flow and an organic relation as the house welcomes the surrounding trees.

The chaotic and structural complexity increases in the Enright House and the homes of the Monadnock Valley resort complex. In the Enright House, Rand explicitly presented turbulent harmony



in the "space slashed with a knife." Yet, there exists severe structure formed out of the "free growth" of lines and angles, forming a fractal self-similarity in the unrepeated variety of shapes, each determining the next shape and the whole. Thus, there is a reciprocal relation between the variety of shapes and the shape of the whole—"each a single house held to the other houses like single crystal to the sides of a rock." Rand also presents the idea of "free growth," metaphorically recognizing not only the striking and complex pattern of structure, but also the freedom of the creative artist expressed through principles that are similar to natural processes.<sup>119</sup> Terminology similar to "free growth" also appears in descriptions of the processes of chaotic and nonlinear sciences.<sup>120</sup> Similar principles of harmonious chaotic complexity are developed in Monadnock Valley, beginning with the "unplanned beauty of the graded steps" on the ledges, which were produced over the centuries through a "series of chances" and a "struggle of blind forces." There is also a fractal self-similarity in the houses, of which no two were alike, yet they reflected "variations on a single theme" to which Rand ascribes the musical metaphor of a "symphony."

The structure of Wynand House also exhibits fractal self-similarity in the "successive steps" of "the interlocking floor lines." Rand expresses again the natural processes of turbulent harmonizing in the "slashing vertical projection," in which the last level appears as if it was "torn off" in the sky by a hand. Organic relations are reflected in the structure that picks up and stresses the "rhythm of the rising fields." Cortlandt Homes too reflects fractal self-similarity and dynamic flow in its asymmetric composition of triangles radiating from the central shafts of the high-rises. Of course, its overall layout suggests organicity in which "the shapes had the beauty of sculpture."

In the Stoddard Temple to the Human Spirit, there exists a deep organicity in the relations of the forms of Temple and the surrounding natural world. This "Temple to the Human Spirit" is not a gargantuan monument to the state, nor a gargoylesque monstrosity of the Church. Here the standard is the human form and human potential, symbolized by the single figure of a naked human body—the statue of Dominique. This building generates enormous controversy in the novel because many people could not comprehend how its unorthodox design related to "the human spirit." Indeed, throughout the novel, Roark's buildings invite controversy and pejorative descriptions because they are perceived as strange and "disorderly."<sup>121</sup> However, The Stoddard Temple is the most controversial: it is labeled in the media as "spiritual embezzlement," "an outrageous sacrilege," and "an insolent mockery of all religion."<sup>122</sup> The outcry is so great that Roark is sued by Hopton Stoddard for architectural malpractice.<sup>123</sup>

Here, the relevance of the trial lies in the testimony of architectural "experts," who claim that Roark's design for the Temple is an effrontery to both architecture and religion. In the testimony of Roark's fellow architects, Rand clearly illustrates Roark's break with aesthetic tradition and the inability of his contemporaries to grasp the new asymmetric proportions and nonlinear forms that are in harmony with nature and humans. For example, the "parasitic" architect Peter Keating testifies:

The Stoddard Temple has an improperly balanced plan, which leads to spatial confusion. There is no balance of masses. It lacks a sense of symmetry. Its proportions are inept... It's out of scale. It contradicts the elementary principles of composition. ... it shows no sense of structure, no instinct for beauty, no creative imagination...<sup>124</sup>

In addition, famed architect Gordon Prescott testified:

The correlation of the transcendental to the purely spatial in the building under discussion is entirely screwy. ... The flowing life which comes from the sense of order in chaos, or, if you prefer, from unity in diversity, as well as vice versa....is here entirely absent.<sup>125</sup>

Keating's testimony represents the majority of architects, critics, and members of society who simply cannot understand or appreciate the spirituality of Roark's buildings, expressed through the forms of beautiful strange attractors. Like Keating, Prescott is testifying against Roark, claiming that "the sense of order in chaos" is *absent* from the design of the Temple. However, precisely because Prescott is

testifying against Roark and is a typical architect, Rand's point is just the *opposite*—Roark's buildings indeed contain "the flowing of life which comes from the sense of order in chaos."

Not surprisingly, Rand's love of the skyscraper and the New York City skyline is based not only in its symbolism of "egoism" and industrial "capitalism," but also because the skyscraper and the skyline represent her aesthetic vision of turbulent harmony producing beauty in the forms of strange attractors. In the passage below, Rand describes Dominique's late night trips on the Staten Island Ferry. Rand writes:

Once, she took the Staten Island Ferry at two o'clock in the morning; she rode to the Island, standing alone at the rail of an empty deck. She watched the city moving away from her. In the vast emptiness of sky and ocean, the city was only a small, jagged solid. It seemed condensed, pressed tight together, not a place of streets and separate buildings, but a single sculptured form. A form of irregular steps that rose and dropped without ordered continuity, long ascensions and sudden drops, like the graph of a sudden struggle. But it went on mounting—toward a few points, toward the triumphant masts of skyscrapers raised out of the struggle.<sup>126</sup>

Here the skyscraper and the skyline exist in a reciprocal organicity, where the skyline of individual skyscrapers becomes a "single sculptured form." This piece of sculpture is comprised of jagged edges and irregular steps which rise in long ascensions and suddenly drop "without ordered continuity," as some skyscrapers triumphantly rise out of the struggle of nature's turbulent harmony. For Dominique, the skyscrapers of the New York City skyline form a sculptured strange attractor.

## CONCLUSION

Ayn Rand is perhaps best known for her passionate and eloquent defenses of science, egoism, and capitalism. However, both libertarians and feminists have overlooked the insights of Rand's cultural aesthetics, which transcend the fading Industrial Age and suggest an aesthos for the emerging Third Wave. Neither *The Fountainhead* nor *The Beauty Myth* present complete theories of beauty, yet both present passionate and eloquent aesthetic visions suggesting radically different worldviews. Naomi Wolf is right to call for a "Feminist Third Wave," but it must be a "wave" that is free from outmoded Second Wave structures and ideas. Despite Rand's industrial metaphors, her cultural aesthetics transcend purpose and nature, culture and gender, the Newtonian skyscraper and the Cosmopolitan supermodel, expressing deep intuitive insight into the complex organicity and turbulent harmony of The Third Wave aesthos. Ayn Rand's cultural aesthos is "a strange attractor" feminists may find worth exploring.

---

<sup>1</sup> The first book analyzing Rand's theory of art is forthcoming. See, Louis Torres and Michelle Marder Kamhi. *What Art Is: Ayn Rand's Philosophy of Art in Critical Perspective*. Chicago: Open Court. While Rand's book entitled *The Romantic Manifesto* offers unique and valuable insights into the relationship between philosophy, psychology, and the arts, it does not present a complete philosophy of fine art. It stresses the moral-psychological processes in creating and valuing art, presenting no broad philosophy of beauty or aesthetics in which fine art resides. See, Ayn Rand. 1971. *The Romantic Manifesto*. New York: New American Library.

<sup>2</sup> Ayn Rand. [1943] 1968. *The Fountainhead*. New York: Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc. (1983 hardcover).

<sup>3</sup> Alvin Toffler. 1980. *The Third Wave*. New York: William Morrow & Company, Inc.

<sup>4</sup> Libertarianism is saturated with calls for returning to "tradition," or "classical liberalism," or "capitalism," or "free markets," or "laissez faire," or "the Bill of Rights," or "the Constitution," or "the ideas of the Founders."

<sup>5</sup> Naomi Wolf. 1991. *The Beauty Myth*. New York: William Morrow & Company, Inc.

---

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, 277-283.

<sup>7</sup> For a discussion of the relation between feminism and aesthetic tradition, see Peggy Zeglin Brand and Carolyn Korsmeyer [eds.]. 1995. *Feminism and Tradition in Aesthetics*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press. 1-114.

<sup>8</sup> Hilde Hein suggests these premises must be rejected in any feminist aesthetic. Hilde Hein. 1995. "Feminist Aesthetics in Feminist Theory," in *Feminism and Tradition in Aesthetics*, 454-455.

<sup>9</sup> The term "aesthos" is my own and is explained in greater detail in Barry Vacker, *Beauty & Anarchy: Chaos at the Edge of Utopia*, unpublished doctoral dissertation currently being revised for publication. Barry Vacker. 1995. *Beauty & Anarchy*. Diss. U. of Texas. Ann Arbor: UMI.

<sup>10</sup> In another dialectical vein, Josephine Donovan sees a feminist aesthetic in which there is an integration of beauty and use in craft works to form a "negative critique" of commodity exchange. Josephine Donovan. 1993. "Everyday Use and Moments of Being: Toward a Nondominative Aesthetic," in *Aesthetics in Feminist Perspective*. Hilde Hein and Carolyn Korsmeyer [eds.]. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. 53-67.

<sup>11</sup> The term "kaleidic" is used in this article to suggest structure and pattern unfolding temporally through surprising and seemingly chaotic processes, yielding variable tendencies toward formal structures which are not static, uniform, or equilibrating, as in neoclassical economics. Such constant evolution produces ever-changing structures and patterns which are often beautiful to behold, much like the patterns in a kaleidoscope. However, this does *not* mean that reality is unknowable or unpredictable in a general sense, as one might interpret the ideas of Austrian economist Ludwig Lachman. See, Ludwig Lachman, "From Mises to Shackle: An Essay on Austrian Economics and the Kaleidic Society," *Journal of Economic Literature*, 14 (March 1976): 54-62.

<sup>12</sup> One should not underestimate the role of advertising in comparison with "socialist realism." See, Michael Schudson. 1984. *Advertising: The Uneasy Persuasion*. New York: Basic Books. 209-233.

<sup>13</sup> Importantly, Rand was no conservative. She advocated a libertarian separation of state from the realms of ideas, science, sexuality, economics, religion, etc.

<sup>14</sup> Mark Poret. 1980. *The Information Society*. Washington, D.C.: PBS Video. Toffler estimates the year at "about 1956." See, Alvin Toffler. 1970. *Future Shock*. New York: Random House. 16.

<sup>15</sup> *The Fountainhead*, p. 270.

<sup>16</sup> The interview was reprinted in Alex Haley, *The Playboy Interviews*. Edited by Murray Fisher. New York: Ballantine (1993). Reportedly, one dozen "Playmates" have stated that Ayn Rand was their favorite author. *IOS Journal*, The Institute for Objectivist Studies. vol. 6, no. 6. (February, 1997): 5.

<sup>17</sup> *The Third Wave*, 144-156.

<sup>18</sup> Chris Matthew Sciabarra. 1995. *Ayn Rand: The Russian Radical*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press. 297-329.

<sup>19</sup> For a popularized explanation of chaos theory, see James Gleick. 1987. *Chaos: Making a New Science*. New York: Penguin Books. For a discussion of the science of complexity, see Ilya Prigogine and Isabelle Stengers. 1984. *Order Out of Chaos: Man's New Dialogue With Nature*. Toronto: Bantam Books. The new discoveries of the evolutionary sciences can be found in Stuart A. Kauffman. 1995. *At Home in the Universe: The Search for the Laws of Self-Organization and Complexity*. New York: Oxford University Press.

<sup>20</sup> Michael Batty and Paul Longley. 1994. *Fractal Cities*. London: Academic Press. See also, Don Lavoie, "Economic Chaos or Spontaneous Order:" Implications for Political Economy of the New View of Science," *Cato Journal* vol. 8. no 3 (Winter 1989): 613-635.

<sup>21</sup> David Friedman has argued that Rand's concerns about anarchism are perhaps unfounded. David Friedman. 1989. *The Machinery of Freedom*. La Salle, Illinois: Open Court. 109-200. Bruce Benson has explored how a legal system could emerge and function without a nation-state. Bruce L. Benson. 1990.

---

*The Enterprise of Law: Justice Without the State*. San Francisco: Pacific Research Institute For Public Policy. 349-378.

<sup>22</sup> *The Beauty Myth*, 15, 19.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, 13-14.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, 273.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, 12, 18.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, 12, 86-130.

<sup>27</sup> *The Beauty Myth*, 66. Here she is referring to Betty Friedan's cultural landmark *The Feminine Mystique*, which was reviewed quite favorably in 1963 in Ayn Rand's *The Objectivist Newsletter*. See, Edith Ephron, Review of *The Feminine Mystique*, by Betty Friedan. Reprinted in *The Objectivist Newsletter* [Volumes 1-4 1962-1965]. 26-27 Palo Alto, California: Palo Alto Book Service.

<sup>28</sup> *The Beauty Myth*, 61-85.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, 14, 284.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, 12.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, 273.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, 14.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, 16.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, 12, 16.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, 208.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, 31, 41,

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, 12.

<sup>38</sup> See, Stuart Kauffman. 1993. *The Origins of Order*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 29-32.

<sup>39</sup> *The Beauty Myth*, 176.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, 12. Here Wolf does not realize that the purpose of the "gold standard" was to try to maintain for money an "objective" value connected to production, and not to subjective government fiat.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, 12, 36.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, 83.

<sup>43</sup> In a more explicit form, Donovan presents an aesthetic which integrates feminist and Marxist theory. Josephine Donovan. 1993. "Everyday Use and Moments of Being: Toward a Nondominative Aesthetic," in *Aesthetics in Feminist Perspective*, 53-67.

<sup>44</sup> Plato. 1956. *Phaedrus*. W. C. Helmbold and W. G. Rabinowitz [trans.]. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill. § 247.

<sup>45</sup> Plato. 1989. *Symposium*. Alexander Nehamas and Paul Woodruff [trans.]. Indianapolis : Hackett. § 210.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, § 210-211.

<sup>47</sup> Plato, *Phaedrus*. § 248-250. Plato. 1974. *The Republic*. G. M. A. Grube [trans.] Indianapolis : Hackett. § 601. Plato. 1984. *Sophist: Being of the Beautiful. Part II*. Seth Benardete [trans.]. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. § 236.

<sup>48</sup> Plato. 1980. *The Laws*. Thomas L. Pangle [trans.]. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. § 817.

<sup>49</sup> Karl Marx. [1867] 1967. *Capital*. New York: International Publishers. 38, 41.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 36.

<sup>51</sup> Herbert Marcuse. 1968. *The Aesthetic Dimension*, Boston: Beacon Press. 62.

<sup>52</sup> W. F. Haug. [1971] 1986. *Critique of Commodity Aesthetic*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. 10.

<sup>53</sup> *The Beauty Myth*, 282.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, 82.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, 79, 82, 277, 278.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, 280-281, 282, 289.

---

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, 277-283

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, 285-286.

<sup>59</sup> Examples include: parasitic architect Peter Keating, *The Fountainhead*, 17; Rand described the shallow avant-garde actress Eve Layton as "Venus rising out of a submarine hatch." *The Fountainhead*, 581. Lillian Rearden was the woman of classical beauty and vacuous spirit. Ayn Rand. 1957. *Atlas Shrugged*. New York: Random House. 33.

<sup>60</sup> Karen Hanson brilliantly illustrates such reactionary philosophical criticism on the part of traditional philosophy. Karen Hanson. 1993. "Dressing Down Dressing Up: The Philosophic Fear of Fashion." in *Aesthetics in Feminist Perspective*, 229-241.

<sup>61</sup> For several reasons, pure subjectivist relativism is a *non sequitur* on a culture-wide scale. Across cultures and within cultures, there are *differences* among subjects regarding particular objects of beauty. Is this proof of pure relativism? If so, then how can we explain the widespread *agreements* with regard to objects of beauty across and within cultures? Are we to conclude that there is "nothing" about these "objects" upon which subjects agree, even though such subjects have little in common other than their humanity and the capacity to appreciate objects exhibiting principles or qualities of beauty? Further, aesthetic disagreement still presupposes the existence of objects about which people disagree. Is it possible that subjects can judge different things beautiful for similar reasons? How can we explain things such as the ancient golden ratio and Fibonacci spirals showing up across cultures, and in all kinds of human, organic, and physical phenomena? If beauty is truly is "in the eye of the beholder," then are we to presume that the training and efforts of artists around the world to produce their aesthetic objects and experiences has nothing to do with the judgments of the subjects? Further, there is the simple fact that aesthetic experiences happen in the presence of objects and ideas which stimulate such experiences. Ultimately subjectivist relativism must mean that the mind constitutes the true reality, a la Plato and Kant. Thus, if subjective relativism is true, then the blame for the consequences cannot rest with the aesthetic objects in the capitalist media.

<sup>62</sup> The relationship of philosophy of beauty to the market and commodities is discussed at length in Barry Vacker and Wayne R. Key, *Beauty and the beholder: The pursuit of beauty through commodities. Psychology & Marketing*. Special issue: The Pursuit of Beauty. 10(6) (December 1993): 471-494.

<sup>63</sup> *The Fountainhead*, 3-4.

<sup>64</sup> Stephen H. Kellert. 1993. *In the Wake of Chaos*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 7-8.

<sup>65</sup> *The Fountainhead*, 541.

<sup>66</sup> Donovan, "Everyday Use and Moments of Being: Toward a Nondominative Aesthetic," in *Aesthetics in Feminist Perspective*, 55.

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*, 207.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, 142.

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*, 522.

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid.*, 138.

<sup>71</sup> *Ibid.*, 216.

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*, 457.

<sup>73</sup> *Ibid.*, 105.

<sup>74</sup> An example might be the Feigenbaum attractor in which period-doubling leads from linear order to nonlinear chaos. Heinz-Otto Peitgen, Hartmut Jurgens, and Dietmar Saupe. 1992. *Chaos and Fractals: New Frontiers of Science*. New York: Springer-Verlag. 585-593.

<sup>75</sup> Rand made it clear she did not think that physical beauty resided in universal physical standards or purely subjective standards but instead, the standard was determined by the objective facts of the cultural context. "In this respect, a good example would be the beauty of different races of people. For instance, the black face, or an Oriental face, is built on a different standard, and therefore what would be beautiful on a white face will not be beautiful for them (or vice-versa), because there is a certain racial

---

standard of features by which you judge which features, which face, in *that* classification is harmonious or distorted." Harry Binswanger [ed.]. 1986. *The Ayn Rand Lexicon*. New York: New American Library. 49-50

<sup>76</sup> Some scholars have maintained that Rand misunderstood Aristotle on the role of the artist. See, Stephen Cox, "Ayn Rand: Theory vs. Creative Life," *Journal of Libertarian Studies* 8 (Winter 1986): 19-29.

<sup>77</sup> S. H. Butcher. 1951. *Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art*. New York: Dover. 150-151, 391-392.

<sup>78</sup> Ayn Rand. 1971. "Art and Cognition," in *The Romantic Manifesto*. New York: New American Library. 45.

<sup>79</sup> Ayn Rand. 1971. "Art and Sense of Life," in *The Romantic Manifesto*, 36.

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.*, 35.

<sup>81</sup> *The Fountainhead*, 294, 299, 462, 463, 493, 508, 510, 528.

<sup>82</sup> *Ibid.*, 142.

<sup>83</sup> *Ibid.*, 341, 344-345.

<sup>84</sup> *Ibid.*, 341

<sup>85</sup> Harold Osbourne. *Aesthetics and Art Theory*. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. 46-53.

<sup>86</sup> *Ibid.* See also, Reyner Banham. 1960. *Theory and Design in the First Machine Age*. New York: Praeger Publishers. 320-330.

<sup>87</sup> *The Fountainhead*, 35.

<sup>88</sup> Frank Lloyd Wright. 1977. *An Autobiography*. New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce. 38.

<sup>89</sup> For example, Frank Lloyd Wright. 1960. *Writings and Buildings*. Edgar Kaufmann and Ben Raeburn, eds. New York: Meridian. 282-326.

<sup>90</sup> Michael Berliner (ed.). 1995. *Letters of Ayn Rand*. New York: Dutton. 108-119.

<sup>91</sup> *Ibid.*, 109.

<sup>92</sup> Frank Lloyd Wright. 1958. *The Living City*. New York: Meridian. 81-116.

<sup>93</sup> *The Fountainhead*, 12.

<sup>94</sup> *Ibid.*, 492.

<sup>95</sup> Karen Hanson. 1993. "Dressing Down Dressing Up: The Philosophic Fear of Fashion." in *Aesthetics in Feminist Perspective*, 229-241

<sup>96</sup> Ayn Rand. 1971. "Art and Cognition," in *The Romantic Manifesto*. New York: New American Library. 74-75.

<sup>97</sup> In this regard, see Donovan, "Everyday Use and Moments of Being: Toward a Nondominative Aesthetic," in *Aesthetics in Feminist Perspective*, 53-54.

<sup>98</sup> *Ibid.*, 516.

<sup>99</sup> In a similar vein, Marilyn French sees a feminist art which is "useful and beautiful and moral." Marilyn French, 1993. "Is There a Feminist Aesthetic," in *Aesthetics in Feminist Perspective*, 76.

<sup>100</sup> "'Don't be astonished if I tell you that I feel as if I'll have to live up to that house'...'I intended that.' said Roark." Roark to Austin Heller in *The Fountainhead*, 132.

<sup>101</sup> *Ibid.*, 276.

<sup>102</sup> *Ibid.*, 532

<sup>103</sup> Ayn Rand. 1971. "The Comprachicos." *The Anti-Industrial Revolution*. New York: New American Library. 193-194.

<sup>104</sup> *The Fountainhead*, 3, 33, 482, 697.

<sup>105</sup> Ayn Rand. 1990. *Introduction to Objectivist Epistemology*. Expanded Second Edition. Harry Binswanger and Leonard Peikoff, eds. New York: NAL Books. 83-87.

<sup>106</sup> This means that there is a relation between the individual subject and object and a relation among the parts of the object to each other, but that these parts are themselves existents or objects. In identifying

---

beauty, the subject must identify the relations of the existents comprising the "object" and the relations between the object and herself.

<sup>107</sup> This term is explained in greater detail in Barry Vacker, *Beauty & Anarchy: Chaos at the Edge of Utopia*.

<sup>108</sup> For a fine description of similar "analear" processes, see, Katya Walter. 1994. *The Tao of Chaos: Merging East and West*. Austin: The Kairos Center.

<sup>109</sup> For example, see S. Chandrasekhar. 1987. *Truth and Beauty: Aesthetic Motivations in Science*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

<sup>110</sup> See also, Chris Matthew Sciabarra. 1995. *Ayn Rand: The Russian Radical*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press. 209-210.

<sup>111</sup> Influenced by Wrightian ideas, Rand was very critical of the 1893 Columbian Exposition of Chicago, which glorified the classical architecture of the European traditions. "The Rome of two thousand years ago rose on the shore of Lake Michigan, a Rome improved by the pieces of France, Spain, Athens and every style that followed it. ...To sanction it was Culture; there were twenty centuries unrolling in moldering ruins..." *The Fountainhead*, 34-35.

<sup>112</sup> *The Fountainhead*, 492.

<sup>113</sup> *The Fountainhead*, 527.

<sup>114</sup> Kauffman, *At Home in the Universe: The Search for the Laws of Self-Organization and Complexity*, 23-28.

<sup>115</sup> *The Fountainhead*, 203.

<sup>116</sup> *Ibid.*, 318.

<sup>117</sup> *Ibid.*, 576.

<sup>118</sup> This type of strange attractor is known as a "Lorenz attractor." Gleick, *Chaos: Making a New Science*, 28-29.

<sup>119</sup> For example, in describing the Wynand Building, "(Dominique) thought: they say the heart of the earth is made of fire. It is held imprisoned and silent. But at times it breaks through the clay, the iron, the granite, and shoots to freedom. Then it becomes a thing like this. *The Fountainhead*, 726.

<sup>120</sup> For example, see Frederick Turner. 1995. *The Culture of Hope*. New York: The Free Press. 118-119.

<sup>121</sup> Other descriptions include: "rebellious," "screamingly funny," "crazy," "queer," "law breaking," "rebellious," "a blot on the profession," and "a wound on the face of the city." *The Fountainhead*, 133, 195, 272.

<sup>122</sup> *Ibid.*, 348-349. The Stoddard Temple is a brazen denial of our entire past, an insolent "No" flung in the face of history.

<sup>123</sup> *Ibid.*, 350. Stoddard, on the advice of arch-villain Ellsworth Toohey, commissioned Roark to design and build the Temple while Stoddard was traveling around the world. Knowing that Stoddard would hate Roark's designs and their would be an outcry, Toohey hoped to destroy Roark and the ideas reflected in the designs.

<sup>124</sup> *Ibid.*, 362-363.

<sup>125</sup> *Ibid.*, 364.

<sup>126</sup> *The Fountainhead*, 317.