

On writing

Ray Luo

February 2002

Preface

This set of remarks was made in an effort to clarify in my mind what writing fiction should involve at a strictly theoretical level. I also feel a great need to justify the practice of writing in the framework of science, although the word “science” in my definition is much broader than just the experimental or even the purely mathematical. Writing, I feel, is an extension of science to the examination of social and psychological phenomena. Although the approach is different, writing’s ultimate goal is the same as science: the discovery of new facts and interpretations. Moreover, writing requires some of the similar creative skills as mathematics; the elegance of the mathematical construction is replaced by the degree of satisfaction of the narrative description.

Chapter 1

On writing

The goal of writing fiction and biography is to express conditions and events in an effort to uncover general rules of action and describe complex social interactions. To separate writing from aesthetics, we must opt for realism above art, although our particular brand of realism may seem to be abstract in relation to the real world (as in Cubism), as long as the principles underlying our writings are justified on the basis of some transformation from reality to fiction. Writing is the science of data mining on primitives based on social phenomena. Note the resemblance to computation, in which given a set of examples, we infer the underlying aspect of some property of the phenomenon. Note also, however, that writing itself presents the interpretation of the event, i.e. writing argues for the dominance of a particular explanation for social-interaction primitives, just as a scientific theory argues for a particular unifying mechanism. What sets writing apart from science, however, is the ability to study any subjective phenomena that are difficult if not impossible to examine using traditional experimental or quantitative scientific analysis (e.g. sociology, psychology).

When viewed from this perspective, all writing from Homer to Descartes to Shaw to Freud to Plath to Irving is an approach to discovery amidst complex phenomena. By this criterion, however, some works are better than others, just as some scientific theories (e.g. special relativity) are better than others (e.g. ether) at explaining certain aspects of the world. The method of writing, however, has a broader application than simply sociological research. Just as quantitative methods of science have been used to study human interactions, writing can be used to study scientific methodology, limits of scientific understanding, the expanding universe, technological limitations,

the Big Bang, evolution, emotion and stress, medical implications, and the like. This justifies writing as a method of human inquiry.

There are two types of consciousness streams: one cuts from one person to another, giving a stream embodying an entire community, the other cuts from one thought to another thought, giving a temporal stream integrating an entire memory set. I will adopt only the second approach and not necessarily the first, for the novel as a medium supports only the individual stream dictated by the individual narrator. Note however that the narrator can probe into the thoughts of others and hence create a stream similar to a community stream. It will necessarily be tainted by the narrator's own bias, however, and will not serve an integrated view of some set of people. The novel medium can only support the biased view of an individual author, which is the scientific reality behind creative expression, for no expression can give the whole wherein it necessarily twists truth in surveying truth.

Logical positivism suggests that metaphysics is nonsense. It seems to me that metaphysics is attempting to accomplish the same thing as analytic philosophy, with the difference that metaphysics combine atomic propositions in such a way that a great deal of uncertainty is involved, whereas scientific observations rely on physical principles that are fairly certain due to empirical studies that stood the test of time. Hence, writing and metaphysics, as modes of expression, are attempting to arrive at universal propositions that make claims that are not necessarily easily verifiable, directly or indirectly. They are more difficult to conclude but rewards of certain conclusions are greater.

Writing can be described as a form of metaphysics in which universal facts can be uncovered, all-be-it with a great deal of uncertainty even after an inordinate amount of effort. Note however, that *getting* to a universal fact may require value judgments and commands that are may not be true or false (or uncertain, for that matter), but they do *describe* a situation, which is implicitly stating a fact for a *given* context. In general, the ethics behind analytic philosophy is always qualified by a context and certain assumptions, wherein the uncertainty arises. (Note that it is the obsession in regard to context that causes Wittgenstein to change his views in between the *Tractatus* and *Philosophical Investigations*.) Key: contextual assumptions are really uncertainties. We just need a language to adequately describe it.

Can science answer the question of how to bring oneself from her existential condition to her essential condition? Science can give a description of the human processes involved in decision-making and, in the ideal case, provide a complete account of human motivation. Yet this still does not solve the problem of how to get us to where we want to be, because we may simply not take the actions that lead us there. For a single event, this resolves into a mathematical problem of uncertainty. But for human actualization, which is a pattern of existence, this inability to exert our will becomes a problem not addressed by science in its most complete form. One solution may be the expression of will, for human expression, however scientifically analyzed, is essentially a force against scientific reduction. This is not to say that science will not ultimately triumph, but only that some counter-force may always be available.

The existence of God is in the hands of man. Whether there is something beyond explanation will always be a question that eludes science. If we know everything there is to know, by ourselves, then we would have arrived at God. But if an individual arrives at God, then what about others who arrive at God? Imagine the span of infinite time. Will human existence arrive at perfect knowledge? No, because it is biologically impossible for humans to be God. God will always be a form. Whether we can truly become such a form is a matter that cannot be settled by our current methods of inquiry (and probably never will). The existence of God seems to be disappearing.

A great question of philosophy is: why should I do good? All great individual and societal problems can be reduced to the disunity of constituent parts: contradicting motivations in the case of the individual and contradicting individuals in the case of the society. When individual and societal interests contradict each other, the individual is led to deceive others. Only if honesty is preferred biologically will individuals choose not to deceive. You have to convince individuals that society interests are, at the end, just as important to each one of them. Thus it is a total functionalism that takes into account all human factors that can predict individual behavior.

Other than these theoretical issues, there is a greater problem of inconsistent behavior caused by lack of seriousness. For example, a person may lie just for the sake of entertainment, regarding personal pleasure as more important than social well-being. A person may simply wish to torture others for her own enjoyment. Here the individual chooses to receive some small pleasure while causing enormous harm to others. She might as well do something else that gives just as much pleasure without harming others. This I call a concentration of effort, or concentration of will. The key is to do the greatest good possible within the individual framework while observing societal needs. (Note the difference between this and utilitarianism.) Lack of concentration of effort would be folly for one would not be getting the most out of life.

To get around the problem that only first person narratives are realistic, we introduce (after Virginia Woolf) the biography. The biographer makes the work a realistic account in first person, much as Nick Carraway in *Great Gatsby*. But it is also able to comment on and describe the central character, and hence is not limited by the limited view point of the realistic first person narrative. In the case of *Great Gatsby*, however, the story-teller must be at the right place at the right time, making it difficult to structure the novel. But using Woolf's approach of the omniscient biographer, the greatest rewards of realism and flexibility are achieved.

Variable manipulation in writing is universal across mediums. For example, you can manipulate color and grain in film as the drama unfolds, showing us differing view of the world, bringing color to black-and-white, etc., delivering a message. Similarly, in opera and music, tone, texture, and melody can be manipulated. In writing, these elements are put into a restricted microcosm for further study. Narrative perspective, language, timing, dramatic focus, maturity, etc., can all be changed as the story progresses. Fantasy can build up with color and Xerox texture. Usually, you want to make things less and less real as to take the audience from the real to the unreal.

The grandest scheme I can think of in constructing a novel is to use and reuse material found in every sentence. Every sentence says at least one significant thing and each significant thing is repeated or transformed in some way somewhere in the novel. Thus along with the global continuity and cohesion of theme, character motif, plot, etc., you have a local mirroring of the same strange loop happening. Ideally, each component of the loop (i.e. each significant thing) serves its purpose in weaving together the themes of the novel into the grandest single theme of them all. Thus you have expressed the inexpressible (by fewer sentences) by a leap of novelistic complexity. In a sense this is also the most economical and compact novel ever. In fact, it would satisfy the information criterion in the sense that it would pack the most bits (of expression) into a single literary work possible for the number of sheer literary moments depicted. I have come up with a catchy and relevant title as well: *Recall Tomorrow*. Note: this is an application of Minimum Description Length to fiction.

According to the Stroop effect, linguistic interference is inevitable. Hence, to take away the influence of real-life characteristics from my characters, it is necessary to choose names that do not match the names of anyone I know personally. For example, Constance, Hansen, and Dan are good names. Recall the mistake of using Daniel in one of my stories: there will either be incongruent mismatches or extra-linguistic social influence. A story exists in a social atmosphere of its own. Use personal experience only within the context of a story's own situation, not across a story's objective existence.

Virtual reality and multimedia take away our action and replace it with stasis, i.e. make dreamers out of us, but not heroes. For the rewards of action are imitated by watching from TV, experiencing in RPGs, and reading from novels. The imperative for change and direct action is diluted (and satisfied) by the net, TV, magazines, movies, novels, games, etc.

On the other hand, virtual realities are descriptions of reality, just like writing. How can we make virtual realities as realistic as possible? Fighting should be in waves. Enemies should be smart and not dangerous. Everything in your arsenal should be in hers. User interfaces should be minimal and must

rely on very simple command primitives, i.e. controllers should have no more than two function buttons (old Nintendo). Actions should revolve around the story, for without fiction, virtual reality will only dilute our motivation. Fighting should be continuous with the world-view, so that no special status is given to combat. Users should be able to zoom only in special story-relevant circumstances. Much of a game should be mapped out like a story. To allow for interaction, however, the key point of a story must involve a user-specified decision. Users should not be able to choose names or partners. Text messages should also be minimal. Buying weapons should be like shopping in a supermarket: you must look in the right aisle. Conversation can be simultaneous: we know according to the Cocktail phenomenon that users can pick up the key conversation even if multiple conversations take place at the same time. Multiple players should get distinct multiple perspectives of view. Each perspective should be customized to the player (e.g. height and field of view). Ideally characters in games are played by real people. However, in order to have a story, the central determiners of plot (in addition to the hero's party) should be concocted by the author.

The game must be a literary endeavor: start with players unaccustomed to life in virtual reality and progress to a realization of the theme of existence. The game should be a microcosm for life, a special way of living life in which certain modes of communication have been specialized. Well why not just live life? Because the game can be stylized just like a movie. It can heighten certain aspects of life just as literature highlights certain elements of existence. The difference between literature and virtual realities is that the latter can model interaction and decision making in addition to pure description.

What we often call freedom is really the absence of substance. Freedom is the inability to find meaning in life and act on certain principles. Freedom destroys the substance around it because it consumes that which conforms to a certain standard. What we call freedom, however, is often more complicated. Our freedom is often a counter-strike against some ideology, and is thus not the absence of substance, but the counter-substance. We use the word freedom to mean the assertion of our own will, despite what ever the mandates are from others. In that sense, freedom has substance and is hence directed. Freedom as void, however, still persists in life, and is the subject of examination by existentialists.

An example of lack of freedom is that forgetting the past is impossible. You can never start anew because everything you've done in the past has some (possibly indirect) influence on your actions, which you may or may not be aware of. The past is a cumulative stream that affects you. We expect the fairly recent to affect us more than the distant past, perhaps by an exponential decay law. Note, however, that childhood experience is more influential than adult experience. Thus we have a tradeoff between the recent past and the distant past that depends on the specific action examined.

A story should be constructed as follows: specific to general, concrete to abstract, common to surprise, objective to subjective, numerous ideas to a single abstract notion, surface to depth, realism to fantasy. Symbolism should begin lightly and progress to more concrete identifications. (Note that symbolism in itself is abstraction.) The reason we need a progression is that the reader must be taken from his world to our own. That is, experience (the past) must be transferred. In order to make others see something from a different point-of-view, we must begin from their frame-of-reference and proceed to our own.

According to the principle above, science fiction should be "near-sighted." That is, the view of a future world should be probable in relation to our current world. Only with a probable world will audiences be immersed in the story, identify with characters in the story. More may be revealed as the story progresses, but initially, the story should seem to take place in our backyards.

Stories should reflect personal endeavors, narrator's background and attitude, the mapping between interpretation and action, the two sides of a biting issue, cross-referencing, naturalized speech and dialogue, the frenzy of everyday existence, and the current confusion between intellect and depravity.

What is literature? A composition must be an aspect of reality, but it cannot be reality itself. For if it were, it would sustain no interest and would

nullify the reason for its existence: “To create new ways to think about reality by abstracting it in specific ways.” Literature is the contextual examination of the different methods and modes of abstraction.

Why follow the theory? One must either live or die. I must choose, for I can only avoid choosing by dying. I must do as I choose, for else, I should not have chosen, i.e. I have not really chosen. I must choose wisely (for the goal at hand - which may be good), for choosing unwisely is to escape from choosing. I must choose for the best, for choosing the worst can only be choosing to die (the worst thing possible is death), and choosing the norm is to choose unwisely (i.e. escaping having to choose). I choose to understand by creating from examination, for the highest virtue is the wisdom of understanding, the highest understanding is the implementation of ideas, and the highest creation abstracts necessities from levels of reality (“high” means best here).

One such examination is literature.

What literature is not? Assuming that no middle ground exists, literature cannot be:

1. entertainment; for film, games, sports, etc. surpass it in sensory stimulation.
2. moral education; for facts, not fiction, serves best to warn and direct us.
3. art; for literature does not recreate the world, but abstracts from it.
4. record of the past; for it is highly inaccurate in its depiction.
5. foretelling of the future; for real prophets tell the truth, not allegories.
6. philosophy; for philosophy is not real enough to penetrate the depths of reality.
7. commandment; for stores cannot carry the same threat as physical violence.
8. romance; for romance without image is like sex without lover.

9. puzzle; for the clues of life leads to distinct choices, only abstractions.
10. a piece of consciousness; for language cannot model thought.
11. illustration of an idea; for illustrations don't need details.
12. absurdity; for absurdity can be found every where, why limit it to literature?
13. drama (in the strictest sense); for drama is every where one speaks and hence, reality itself.
14. poetry; for rhythm and harmony belongs to music, not to literature.
15. myth; for creativity is not the goal of literature, only its consequence.
16. action; for words don't describe motion and motion doesn't generally generate words.
17. reality; for literature cannot reproduce reality in its *entirety*.
18. language; for literature manipulates language for a higher purpose; an emergent property.

Therefore, literature is a science; for it is a creation which abstracts certain aspects of reality (i.e. implementation through examination).

Literature should address, however:

- reasons for existence.
- how to organize experiences and external objects.

In writing fantasy, one should get as weird as one can while still linking with current issues. We need to construct a whole new world in fantasy, a framework for this weirdness. A simple mantra: that which is complex needs restatement, but that which is simple should be directly stated once only. The art of writing involves forcing two most unlikely things together, e.g. war and humor, myths and adventure, politics and allegory. Keep in mind that we love things we don't understand.

Issues to tackle: conform vs. nonconform, censorship vs. freedom, practical vs. romantic, society vs. individual, idle vs. change, analytic vs. developmental, materialistic vs. idealistic, pride (“upper” class) vs. prejudice (“lower” class), tolerance vs. intolerance, trust vs. skepticism, truth vs. illusion, happiness vs. ambition, idealism vs. realism, freedom vs. destiny, intrinsic vs. extrinsic, cause and effect vs. interaction, conformation vs. rejection, nature vs. nurture, value judgment vs. genetic influence.

Techniques to use: stream of consciousness, gradual extrapolation, multiple themes, sudden change, sequence of parallels, allusions, add color and flavor but not necessarily words, give writing a personality, have people in crisis look at it from a different light, inside and outside minds, explain and explain and explain, restate in a different way.

A novel is a consolidation of ideology, either:

- progression, or
- organization.

Change your normal mode of writing. Put character, plot, and idea together, adding a lifetime of practice and “motivated entertainment.”

A book is written in reverse of being read, so while the reader reads from the beginning to end, you must write from the end to beginning. The trick is to block reality from the reader until the end. The job of a writer is to write creatively, not to invent things to say, but to write out of experience. The trend is toward a more realistic portrait of the world (for prediction). Your work has to tell people in a real way.

Have a gradual beginning followed by multiple themes, keeping everything in mind (ideally all thought out before writing). Need a cumbersome plot to contrast the dramatic idea of the climax and ending. The most important

aspect of the story is the plot, because it is critical to design. Include elements that demand a change (e.g. just lost a job, end of a relationship, etc.). Have to be clear in beginning of writing and complex near the end to take into the account of needed adjustment. Express uncommon emotions. Change up radically so readers wouldn't be bored. Have a set group of characters with a predefined number of chapters of stories. Some keys:

1. Save something that links to later moments.
2. Predict consequences.
3. Categorize.
4. Adjust for change.

It's generally a good idea to pack as much stuff into as little room as possible. Don't introduce something new unless you can find further use for it. General principles for movies, plays, and novels are the same. Four elements of writing: milieu, idea, character, event. Switch topics by stream of thought. The goal of literature is uniqueness. Every single word and section of the book has to lead to one unifying point. Take us inside emotions; the more you express, the more real the work is. Everything – word and event – has to have some significance. Use a limited stream of consciousness, a selective memory. Apply déjà vu of feelings and thoughts. Illustrate determinism by neutralism. Reflect the author's mood like someone is writing this. Portray the inner self as in *Jane Eyre*'s two portraits of self-examination. Take something new to the extreme limit. Start with your own idea and stretch it with others'. Look for the thin line between things. Any sound with a pattern is music. Similarly, any combination of events makes a story. No characters are perfect; no genre is set. Secondary goals should be espoused subconsciously.

Start at any point and use realism to complete portrayals, e.g. in *Metamorphosis*. This realism has to be intellectual (like man adapting and learning from world) and have multiple aspects (such as time, life, thought, being, and fears). The universal hero knows evil but is a sentimentalist at heart. Make an inherent contradiction, e.g. hero gains sympathy but deserves blame. Be brief and concise but still have philosophy.

There are two states of being in time: mental and physical.

1. The mental must be continual, one thing leads to another, a total stream of consciousness.
2. The physical is influenced by the mental, but can influence the mental as well, moving the story forward.

Write with continual realism in psychological flow and states of mind.

Combine both pity *and* terror in aesthetics and writing, and also static and kinetic emotions. Combine lyric, epical, and dramatic forms, progressing from first person to third person, or vice versa. Define perception in three or more phases, e.g. wholeness, harmony, and radiance. Slow down when encountering impressions.

Start with as large a goal as possible: to revolutionize literature is the only way to succeed and be worth your while in writing. One must add an element, much as stream of consciousness once did. One must subtract an element, such as eliminating a happy ending. But do not worry about having to conform – a first novel is about finding yourself.

Writing a journal as a book requires writing naturally as you think, except using different names. Voice should be informal for speaking and relating, and real for important things.

Create a world by talking *about* it. Incorporate:

1. Language must go from simple to complex, or vice versa, reflecting real growth and life.
2. Levels and fields are applied to consciousness so that we write about what is higher in our levels of interest and disregard other phenomena. I call this realistic psycho- portrait, because it models selective attention.
3. Relish obscure endings, just as in *The Giver*.
4. Different themes every chapter in part I integrated into one moral conflict in part II.

5. Human drama and emotion must be kept in mind at every moment of writing.
6. Fiction is a great part of moral and social education. Look inward for a proof.

Some miscellaneous comments:

- Can't force a character to do what it doesn't want to do.
- Easiest way to tackle philosophical questions is to write science fiction about myths.
- Two types of writers: methodological and emotional.
- Easiest to publish a third person short story first.
- Start with your own experience, but characters can then deviate and evolve, creating your own world.
- Don't worry about money or other external factors.
- Use different voices for different situations, similarly characterize smells, touch, sound, etc.
- Develop yourself as a writer – do not give up pitching.
- Film writing is all about connections, i.e. an agent.
- Read constantly for ideas and write for fun.
- Must allocate an amount of your time for writing.
- Most important thing is to develop characters.
- Express life through writing.
- Biggest problem is getting started.

Use language appropriate for that occasion in the work.

Know what you want to show before starting. Allow themes to develop, but not the plot. Foreshadow character and events by description. Blend influences, along with lyricism, characterization, suspense, and thought. Scenes must relate to each other. Use evolving levels of revelations as plot unfolds. Start with love story and suspense-science-fiction style, moving on to action, philosophical revelation, cosmic consequences, and an incredible ending. Look for will. Put interactive elements into a novel, even if it is contrived. Use a complete set of illusions, with illusions within each. A story should ask questions. Make characters look themselves in the mirror. Go from fantasy to realism, obscure to familiar, switches in perspective to third person, stream of consciousness to objectivity, chaos to resolution. Keys:

1. Real growth by language *progression*.
2. Different voices, different characters *relative*.
3. *Psychological* realism.
4. *Economy* of language.
5. *Duality* of ideas and themes (e.g. not just dreams but also mechanical dreams).
6. *Linking* of events and themes using markers.
7. Write what you *see* concisely.

Intriguing stories in some way: use melodrama when needed. Stories are meant to convey different emotions – use the whole range of a writer’s repertoire. Take a simple philosophical idea to a limitless frontier, expanding and extracting. Retell story in different ways: sequence of the same story in one longer story, repeat until complete realization.

Write a story called *Penthesilia* under the pen name Berrian contrasting with *Looking Backward*:

“A story excluding all effects drawn from contrasts of wealth and poverty, education and ignorance, coarseness and refinement, high and low, all motives drawn from social pride and ambition, the desire of being richer or the fear of being poorer, together with

sordid anxieties of any sort for one's self or others; a romance in which there should, indeed, be love galore, but love unfretted by artificial barriers created by differences of station or possessions, owning no other law but that of the heart." (Bellamy, 137-138)

Evoke a struggle between rationality and emotionality and portray it in its naked contrast (e.g. *Sons and Lovers*). Show a certain struggle with the conscious and unconscious self as you experience first hand.

Show the concepts of responsibility and recklessness. A man is reckless before marriage; a woman responsible. When man makes the decision to marry, he must give up his recklessness and take on responsibility; when a woman decides to marry, she must make a leap of recklessness and give herself up. Let us have a heroine just as keen, courageous, and sacrificial (the embodiment of love and unconditional greatness). But let us also see the rationalizing behavior of men, dragging and coloring greatness with drab.

All love is selfish. Heroism is only possible when all characters in a story are hidden selfish, except one. An ordinary life, yet described so unordinarily. Novelty, ideas, a scheme, an abstraction are part of reality as literature.

Leitmotiv identified with a character (i.e. sacrificial love with Miriam, independence with Paul, sexuality with Clara, etc.) that haunts the characters are known implicitly by the character and the reader. Change of some leitmotiv at the end. Conflict of leitmotivs dominates the story.

Description of consciousness, i.e. "he lost himself in . . .," "could only see . . .," show subtle effects produced by the psychological clarity of a description of human consciousness and direction of thought.

In your works, describe a world afraid of coming together. A person wills for the good and righteous and for the unfortunate, but he is surrounded by a world not ready to trust him or help him. So what can he do? What can he do but isolate himself? Society is beset by the wish to better itself and simultaneously, the selfish need to protect itself.

A book studying love and passion would best be historical and must concentrate on the subject itself. A book dealing with intellectual discovery and idea would best be related to science. Someone who advocates every idea he sees and someone who denies every idea for its falsity.

Lawyers are hypocrites; artists are hypocrites but they admit it; scientists are hypocrites but they look for a way around it.

Berrian: “Over the unborn our power is that of God, and our responsibility like His toward us. As we acquit ourselves toward them, so let Him deal with us.”

Man as half good, half bad, rationalizing animal, not complete moral or immoral beings.

When do you tell the reader what is going on (drama) and when do you conceal the psychologies from them (suspense)? It depends on the theme you wish them to grasp. Must tell them explicitly themes you advocate and may be difficult to accept. Must conceal from them themes that comes back to haunt them in a common way.

Need a totally different way of thinking.

Bring fiction and nonfiction together: an image of voice, no specifics, only telling of thoughts. Break down language: humorous or critical portrayals of human speech. Narrator is a silent but educated character who becomes an explorer of enigma. Every character reveals himself, giving clues that must be picked up by the reader. Concentrate on the moment as if only it matters. Things should break down more and more as the novel goes on. Location reinforces thematic dissonance. Uniformity of culture, styles, and trends; evolution as explanation; different characters with different philosophical positions. Collectivized individualism: keep society striving, but if everyone is striving, there's no real individual. You have but one life to live: show the transience of life and the reckless pursuit of misguided souls. Writing should be more indicative of life than anything else. We need honesty to transform persona to writing. The ideal book of C. S. Lewis: style and content of an angel.

Berrian's *Penthesilia* written in the language of C. S. Lewis' angel, using logic of Leibniz and Russell to frame the elements of the story.

An apprentice novel can be written with artful language and déjà vu pieced together. Use a frame work of suspense well planned out. Write in first person who relates a series of events but is not the focus of attention. Draw out experience onto paper. Use symbolism as in *Psycho*'s mirror and secrets and “rosebud.” A psychological thriller employs attention: easy to grab by media, control of consciousness.

What happens to an unhealthy infatuation with the past? A biographer: extraordinary memory, rehearse the past, cannot accomplish anything, likes to collect things wants to have everything, love of the past personalities, identification with the past – unsatisfied with present and can't face the present. Confrontations: future, living in an artificial past, escape from now and here, his childhood he has forgotten, language, past, metaphor.

Why analyze? Why not make it personal? What is the same thing that makes the heart yearn?

“Accustomed to her face” song from *My Fair Lady*: identification with Henry Higgins, music and emotion. Early childhood exposure to Eliza Doolittle in *My Fair Lady* and its reinforcement through *Pygmalion*. Switch of love in *Breakfast at Tiffany's*. Living as acting: humanitarian, love of children, beauty, summation of universal virtues. Goodness and purity are most susceptible to identification. Bringing up love, acquiring it in adolescence in *My Fair Lady*; unattainable love and futility of love of early adulthood in *Roman Holiday*; acceptance of your evil (three) and love's acceptance in *Charade*; pity of ignorance and forgiving of sins and innocence retained in *War and Peace*; love of the underdog and Cinderella and wish of identification *Sabrina*; admiration for the free spirit and shunning of materialism and acceptance of modernity and change in *Breakfast at Tiffany's*; mind to be respected and smart in *Funny Face*; adaptation to society by fantasy and innocence retained in *Love in the Afternoon*. Identification results in empathy.

Elaborate set of narrators as in the plot structure of *Wuthering Heights*. Man's relation to nature is depicted with repetition and antithesis of themes. Creating suspense requires reader's active participation to frame a story. Rouse interest by subjective narration, recognizing the horror of the narrator's complacency and lack of understanding of the human passions involved (e.g. Nelly Dean, for whom conformity is favored to extremes).

All stories necessarily need an *inadequate* narrator, because direct philosophical arguments never get through. All story tellers must have their point of view and are of necessity inadequate. For example, the narrator could be writing a book.

The ability to invent situations, dilemmas, or events comes only with experience. Thus one must first learn to write by writing what she knows,

then gradually, using the same “transfer” to operate on creative situations by abstracting the essential components and implementing her own events or specific consequences.

Lead audience astray, in a way similar to *Psycho*, to keep surprise and suspense, i.e. give them an unexpected “Gothic” explanation for an unnatural phenomenon. Conceal the real person as in *The Great Gatsby* or *Citizen Kane*. Only hidden ideas are ever interesting. Realism (i.e. Woody Allen) can only be used within the story’s context as in specific situations. The overall framework must incorporate suspense. There is no totally realistic or totally fictional novel, but use realism and imagination at different levels. The following aesthetic structures are possible:

- Individual “reals” spell suspense and realization: overall macabre explanation is veiled in tight realistic style. Realism in basic mechanics and plot, but suspense at the overall message level.
- Individual “suspenses” spell reality and trueness: overall realistic portrayal is clouded by suspense at every turn. Suspense in each plot element and idea, but realism in the overall portrayal.

Devotion as characteristic of the aesthetics of writing, i.e. just as Kubrick reads articles and books in preparation for a film, a writer must be absorbed in the themes of his books, i.e. that which concerns him most at the moment. Specialization leads to depth and richness.

Writing from experience does not mean writing at the same point in time as your experience.

Ignorance and miscommunication makes people feel, causes suspense, horror, love, tragedy, etc. Human progress, meanwhile, attempts to eliminate both.

Goal of my fiction: “To pour forth sanity.” Writing showing characters in all their realism, showing their beauty and their inadequacy; but also bring forth the message of “Knowing thyself” and knowledge and understanding and tolerance for sake of sanity.

Method of my fiction: “Passion without reservations.”

Absolute precision of detail necessary, e.g. dates, law, botany, and topography of *Wuthering Heights*. Realism's first basis is the reproduction of absolute knowledge. Only subjective experiences should hold the mark of relevant discrepancy.

All story-telling narrators must have a point of view and are, of necessity, inadequate, biased, and interpretive.

"We cannot tear out a single page of our life, but we can throw the whole book in the fire." (George Sand)

First person narration: Story told from real person in real space.

Realism: Portrayal of reality.

Linguistic relativity: Each has a different method of discourse, unique voice or dialect.

Characteristic leitmotif: Each with a symbolic signifier, noticed through arousing attention.

Recurrent memory: Past influences the present, reflect on, continuous progression of consciousness, use of phrases to stabilize.

Fictional time: Importance is emphasized, the trivial is passed over, not processed as real time.

Narrative inference: Infer properties based on context, think about only specific aspects of a subject, subjective narrator.

Real speech: Everyday words, including both nonfiction and fictional accounts, must also express ideas.

Progressive tone: Change in voice, style, image, etc. as story progresses.

An author's motto: "Practice is better than theory."

I am writing about preconceptions. If you've ever read a box-summary of *Last Year at Marienbad* after seeing the film, you would have realized how utterly ridiculous and laughable the summary is. While all summaries of works of art are necessarily unwarranted abstractions, the grotesqueness of the summary is apparent only in more complex art works. Consider the purpose of a summary, examples of which includes the abstract, the advertising, the slogan, the review, and the title. A summary is a consumer's device used to focus attention on appropriate objects. While summaries are genuinely useful for scientific papers and news articles, I contend that they are only useful in the advertising sense for works of fiction. A summary of a story is not an extension of its primary objective. A summary is useful only for attracting people to the work. Thus a novelist should not spend time summarizing her work. A novel should be a set of text of which the title should not exist. According to this consideration, the title of the book is best omitted. Since this is impossible, we shall make the title the first few words of the text.

Marcel Proust in *Remembrance of Things Past* uses involuntary, sensory memory to link events and emotions. While that does happen in occasion, the majority of interesting memory structures occur with explicit, declarative knowledge that is not simply the linkage of one thing with another, but, for example, some specific part of one aspect of a certain property with a special scientific relationship, or, a more specific example, Aristotle's golden mean and one's personal development. Such complex explicit and implicit memory structures should profitably be studied by the methods of cognitive psychology and possibly even physiology.