

THE ANTI-FASCISM OF ERNEST HEMINGWAY

A Thesis
By
MACKENZIE DOEBLER

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies
at Appalachian State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
MASTER OF ARTS

May 2023
Department of English

THE ANTIFASCISM OF ERNEST HEMINGWAY

A Thesis
By
MACKENZIE DOEBLER
May 2023

APPROVED BY:

Carl Eby, Ph.D

Chairperson, Thesis Committee

Başak Çandar, Ph.D

Member, Thesis Committee

Kristina Groover, Ph.D

Member, Thesis Committee

Leonardo Flores, Ph.D

Chairperson, Department of English

Marie Hoepfl, Ed.D.

Interim Dean, Cratis D. Williams School of Graduate Studies

Copyright by Mackenzie Doebler 2023
All Rights Reserved

Abstract
THE ANTIFASCISM OF ERNEST HEMINGWAY

Mackenzie Doebler
B.A., Appalachian State University
M.A., Appalachian State University

Chairperson: Carl Eby

Despite complicated political views, Ernest Hemingway remained a staunch opponent to fascism throughout his life. Sometimes writing as a newspaperman, sometimes a lifestyle writer, sometimes a naturalist, and frequently as a novelist, the Hemingway oeuvre is robust and teeming with political thought. This thesis seeks to dive deep into Hemingway's political thinking during the interwar period. From the end of World War I to the defeat of Republican forces in the Spanish Civil War, the paper tracks Hemingway's antifascism through letters, novels, short stories, public appearances, essays, and journalism. While Hemingway's political thinking is complicated and sometimes contradictory, examining his development as a political thinker reveals that

his motivations almost always remained the same. Hemingway was fascinated with proletarian masses and aspired to advocate for their needs in his writing. His leftist inclinations can be found throughout his work in varying degrees of obviousness that fluctuate with pressures both outside and within. The same can be said for his serious criticisms of war. Once present on the Italian Front in 1918, Hemingway became hugely critical of war. These consistent motivations, advocacy for proletarian concerns and antiwar sentiment, were driven by his disdain for fascism and the despots he'd criticize from the early twenties on. Tracking the matrix of these motivations through Hemingway's interwar work produces a complicated but politically impassioned interpretation of Ernest Hemingway.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Dr. Carl Eby for his unwavering patience as I found my footing as well as his indispensable insights over the past several months. This project would be nothing without his support. I'd also like to thank my stellar committee members Dr. Başak Çandar and Dr. Kristina Groover for their willingness to put up with my ramblings and provide thoughtful and constructive feedback. Having taken classes with all three of my committee members over the last six years (undergrad included), I can say with certainty that I would not be the scholar I am today without their excellent guidance, care, and patience. I mean it when I say it: thank you. Additionally, I'd like to thank my good friend Daniel Wartham whose consistent friendship and willingness to stake out long hours in the library well into the night helped me stay (mostly) sane as deadlines drew near.

Dedication

This text is dedicated to the writers, scholars, and artists who have and continue to oppose the specter of fascism in whatever form it takes.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	iv
Acknowledgements.....	vi
Dedication.....	vii
Standard Abbreviations.....	ix
Introduction.....	1
Chapter 1.....	6
Chapter 2.....	43
Chapter 3.....	70
Conclusion.....	96
Works Cited.....	99
Vita.....	103

Standard Abbreviations for the Works of Ernest Hemingway

<i>BL</i>	<i>By-line: Ernest Hemingway; Selected articles and Dispatches of Four Decades.</i>
<i>CSS</i>	<i>The Complete Short Stories of Ernest Hemingway: The Finca Vigía Edition.</i>
<i>DLT</i>	<i>Datelines: Toronto; The Complete 'Toronto Star' Dispatches, 1920-1924.</i>
<i>FC</i>	<i>The Fifth Column</i>
<i>FTA</i>	<i>A Farewell to Arms</i>
<i>FWBT</i>	<i>For Whom the Bell</i>
<i>GHOA</i>	<i>Green Hills of Africa</i>
<i>IOT</i>	<i>In Our Time</i>
<i>Letters vol. 1</i>	<i>The Letters of Ernest Hemingway: Volume 1 (1907-1922)</i>
<i>Letters vol. 2</i>	<i>The Letters of Ernest Hemingway: Volume 2 (1923-1925)</i>
<i>Letters vol. 3</i>	<i>The Letters of Ernest Hemingway: Volume 3 (1926-1929)</i>
<i>Letters vol. 4</i>	<i>The Letters of Ernest Hemingway: Volume 4 (1929-1931)</i>
<i>SAR</i>	<i>The Sun Also Rises</i>
<i>SL</i>	<i>Ernest Hemingway: Selected Letters, 1917-1961.</i>
<i>THHN</i>	<i>To Have and Have Not</i>

Introduction

When Ernest Hemingway began covering the Spanish Civil War for the North American Newspaper Alliance, leftists rejoiced at the sudden burgeoning political consciousness the writer seemed to have miraculously grown. Indeed, writing correspondents from the frontlines of combat, narrating a propaganda film, and appealing to the President of the United States on behalf of the Loyalist cause, Hemingway seemed to have emerged into the world with more political emphasis than ever before. But, the applause of leftist critics, like those at *The New Masses*, at his sudden political awakening, was indicative of a blatant misunderstanding of Hemingway's work—a misunderstanding that would spread to become something like a myth. Under this myth Hemingway, the writer, naturalist, journalist, hunter, fisherman, hard-drinking extraordinaire became an apolitical enigma, forsaking political involvement to pursue pure art. While a romantic portrait to be sure, this myth could not be farther from the truth.

While Hemingway's political development likely began sometime in his youth, the serious cultural and political rupture caused by World War I allowed Hemingway access to the landscapes, cultures, and people of Europe; that would go on to serve as a core of his politics throughout adulthood. In June 1918, at nineteen years old, Ernest Hemingway traveled to Italy, serving first with an ambulance team and then in a rolling canteen during the Piave assaults and along the Fossalta road. The military pushes that Hemingway aided in saw Italy gain major victories over Austrian forces, victories just as symbolic as they were material after the harrowing and mismanaged defeat at Caporetto in October 1917. While brief, Hemingway's experiences on the Italian front was monumental in his development as a writer, journalist, and, certainly, in the political realm. Despite being very nearly mortally wounded on 8 July, 1918 and pulled from the front, Hemingway revisited World War I through Italy on the page over and over again throughout his career. His literary reunions with the Italian front were characteristic

of his adoration with the swaggering Arditi shock troops, but their tone shifted as he later realized the rife political atmosphere and terrible oppression that characterized the war.

Indeed, Hemingway's experiences in World War I were foundational to an anti-war sentiment that characterized his political leanings for decades to come. He had witnessed what happens when the state forces war on a people who have no taste for it. To Hemingway, World War I was a conflict of oppression, with corrupt politicians and monarchs forcing soldiers to die in horrendous conditions for causes they could not believe in, let alone have any real stake in. As his political beliefs developed over the years his recognition of the injustice inherent in World War I would help clarify his interest in wars fought by people—especially proletarian masses—to preserve their sovereignty or way of life. The discrepancies between just and unjust wars is a difficult one, but Hemingway's acknowledgement of the injustices on the Italian front influenced his judgement on when and why a war may be necessary. This was certainly true of Italy, a nation that joined World War I as an aggressor seeking to claim land to fuel its young and passionate nation-hood and the echoes of risorgimento ideology. Yet, a young Hemingway working as a journalist covering European politics was quick to identify corruption and deceit in nearly every European political and national arena. Fueling his anti-war sentiment, Hemingway produced prescient, biting, and sometimes sardonic pieces of journalism for *The Toronto Star*, and it seemed that almost everywhere he found corruption and poor rulership so too did he find fascism. Fascism would become, to Hemingway, the clear ideology of evil. In nearly every case of major political development that would follow, his choices and beliefs were informed by his disdain for fascism.

Despite his very open criticism of fascism, Hemingway avoided adopting clear political allegiances, especially in regards to political parties. As the '20s drew to a close and the Great

Depression spread and infected budding world economies, the literary circles Hemingway had been a part of began politicizing forming a popular leftist front that Hemingway criticized as phony and shallow. Rejecting what he called fashionable politics, Hemingway began to profess an isolated stance fueled by individualism. Interested more in producing timeless art than the petty politics of his peers, this often-condescending Hemingway could not escape politics—nor, it seems, did he truly wish to. He studied revolutions throughout the early '30s, and even witnessed—with a questionable mix of excitement, bitterness, and fascination—the Cuban revolution of 1933, that ousted Cuban dictator Gerardo Machado. Hemingway, already critical of Spanish colonial efforts in Africa, criticized Benito Mussolini's fascist regime and his war in Ethiopia. Anti-war as ever, Hemingway identified war as the political remedy used by dictators caught up in the repercussions of poor ruling. He warned of a coming general war in Europe, and told Americans to stay out.

Yet, in 1936, when Civil War broke out in Hemingway's beloved Spain, a nation whose political development Hemingway had been conscious of and fascinated with since at least the Rif War (1921-1927), Hemingway could not stay out. The revolt against a democratically elected government by fascist forces in Spain not only encouraged his involvement, it necessitated it. The conflict forced to a head many of Hemingway's long held political beliefs erupting into a passionate, intense, crescendo of political involvement for the writer. Knowing that the Spanish front would only be the beginning of a gruesome war against fascism without the proper support, Hemingway appealed to the United States, France, and the United Kingdom to send aid to the Spanish Republic. Abandoning, his political isolationism, Hemingway worked closely with Soviet forces in Spain. While it seemed that his anti-war sentiments had given out, in truth it had only knelt to a more deeply held belief: that fascism must be stopped. While the

Republic lost the Spanish Civil War, plunging Spain into a decades long dictatorship under falangist Francisco Franco, the fight against fascism continued into World War II. Despite his bitter disappointment in the Spanish Civil War's outcome, Hemingway would go on to cover WWII.

Clearly, the myth of an apolitical Hemingway should not be taken seriously. As this brief history shows, Hemingway was consistently politically involved. Throughout his life core beliefs guided him through warzones, literary clubs, safaris, and deep seas. He was devoutly antifascist, and had been since the early days of fascist rumblings and activity. His antifascism was influenced by a distrust of politicians and fascination in the people (sometimes veterans, sometimes peasants, sometimes simply the working classes). This antifascism drove his stances. He was wary of party politics, but took sides when it really mattered, all to combat fascism in Europe. He was anti-war, but condoned it when the stakes were high. Hemingway's politics are, certainly, far from consistent. He changed throughout his life, he held conflicting beliefs that pestered and troubled him profoundly; and yet his antifascism remains a relevant core.

By tracking Hemingway's political development some terms require clarification. While all dimensions of Hemingway's writing are treated as political, discussion of politics occurring contemporaneously with Hemingway retains different standards for what constitutes politics. Hemingway may be said to be apolitical by 1930s standards, as he avoided political affiliation with specific parties; but the political dimensions of his work as they reach audiences in 2023 necessarily categorize it—party affiliated or not—as political.

This thesis aims to track Ernest Hemingway's politics, specifically foregrounding and exploring his antifascism. Exploring the hidden details of his masterfully woven novels and short stories illuminates his political stances in new ways. Tracking the themes of his narratives

as they develop over time accentuates the political changes that occur both within and around Hemingway—and can signal the significance that each may have held for the writer. Indeed, even the very form of Hemingway’s work begins to take a shape that is decidedly antifascist. Although many of the conclusions of this project are concurrent with pre-existing scholarship, tracking Hemingway’s beliefs over time and through a diverse array of works reveals the consistent motivations that fueled his always evolving politics. Hemingway was political, that much we can be sure of; but, how did it manifest and for what reasons? These are the questions this thesis explores. Exploring Hemingway’s political development over the course of two decades and through a variety of letters, essays, novels, and short stories, reveals that his political beliefs were reliant upon a pursuit of truth and a rejection of fascism as a violent and oppressive lie.

Chapter 1

In early June, 1918, a young Ernest Hemingway arrived in Schio, northern Italy to work on an ambulance team aiding in the great European war. His experiences in Italy and at war would become formative and return in his writing for years to come. Italy remained a space Hemingway was drawn to and fascinated by, perhaps in part because of the trauma he endured there. This interest helped drive the young writer toward prescient recognitions and acknowledgements about the shifting landscape of Europe following World War I, especially as they pertained to the rise of fascism both in Italy and throughout Europe. During the aftermath of the war and throughout the 1920s, Hemingway's political beliefs began to take shape, developing rapidly and undergoing significant change. As the war drew to a close, the young writer was infatuated with Italian militarism and the swaggering heroism of the Italian shock troopers known as the Arditi. Arditi were lauded as highly efficient soldiers tasked with breaking through enemy trenches and clearing the way for infantry and general assaults. Their flashy heroism paired easily with the proto-fascist factions of Italian Modernism such as the modernists in Milan who asserted that "the world's only hygiene" was "militarism, patriotism, the destructive gesture of freedom-bringers" (Marinetti 251). Hemingway's fascination with the Arditi brought him troublingly close to these proto-fascist beliefs. But, as he reflected on his experiences in the war and explored the conflict's repercussions through fiction and journalism, Hemingway began to recognize the political maneuvering and power structures that sell and attempt to vindicate war. Identifying the relationship between militarism and fascism, Hemingway concluded the decade with a novel that both criticizes participation in war while implicating corruption and a deferral of proletarian will in the advent of fascism. From a young man glorifying war to a prominent American writer denouncing war and implicitly criticizing the

power relations that produce it, Hemingway's politics underwent sweeping changes throughout the 1920s.

A Political Hemingway

It is a widely held critical belief that Ernest Hemingway's works contain some level of political efficacy, but frequently acknowledgements of his politics become complicated by a timeline seeking to produce an early apolitical Hemingway who suddenly becomes a political ideologue during the Spanish Civil War. Michael Solow, for instance, explains, "Hemingway's position was that a writer must devote himself to writing and stay aloof from political or personal involvement—writing above the fray" (106). According to this interpretation, Hemingway's artistic endeavors are necessarily devoid of politics as the writer felt political attachments would impede his ability to produce great works. Solow highlights quotes from Hemingway's 1930s *Esquire* correspondences that create opposition between understanding and 'politics'. These observations are reflect Hemingway's stances towards the popular politics of the literary left following the 1929 stock market crash and are not indicative of a broader apolitical stance, as discussed in chapter two. Further, Solow includes quotes from Hemingway's personal writing and a conversation the writer had with his friend Harry Sylvester in the mid 1930s. Although these sources are genuine, they also gesture toward an inconsistency frequent in discussions surrounding Hemingway's political stances. The conversation between Hemingway and Sylvester requires more context. According to the account Solow treats, Hemingway felt misrepresented by Sylvester and was requesting that Sylvester stop referring to him as a "Catholic writer," saying, "when I write, I try to have no politics nor religion nor any friends nor any enemies" (qtd. In Reynolds, *1930s* 243). This quote appears apolitical, but it is not the end

of the conversation, as Hemingway went on to explain how he “could never support fascists trying to ‘exterminate the Spanish working class’” (Reynolds 243). Implicit in Hemingway’s reaction to Spanish fascism is a defense of working class people and working class concerns. Thus, the continuation of Hemingway’s initial apolitical stance is concluded with a decidedly political perspective.

This particular instance of Hemingway voicing a supposed apoliticism occurred in 1936—on the cusp of what is widely regarded as his burgeoning politicization during the Spanish Civil War—and as such it may seem as though Hemingway assumed this apoliticism throughout the 1920s as well. This is far from the truth, as discussed by Robert O. Stephens as early as 1968. Stephens asserts that Hemingway possessed “a coherent political view of twentieth-century events” and that his political observations spanned “from the beginning of his career to the mid 1940s” (180-181). The coherence Stephens identifies is explicitly derived from Hemingway’s non-fiction. Stephens identifies three major themes in Hemingway’s political thinking: the necessity of revolution, appeals to peasant populations, and distrust of politicians. While these themes do provide a useful interpretive lens and coherence, an examination of Hemingway’s writing—fiction and non-fiction alike—reveals the developments of these themes in real time, and the larger goals they served in Hemingway’s political thinking.

The intentionality of Hemingway’s politics in his writing are sometimes easily missed because of the writer’s inventive style. Much has been made of Hemingway’s famous iceberg theory. In brief, Hemingway believed that strong writers could produce better work if they omitted some of what they knew. The power of an iceberg, after all, is the felt enormity of it as it moves; a hulking mass unseen to the average eye. As Marc D. Baldwin argues, “when Hemingway tells us that he will write ‘truly’ and ‘omit the things that he knows,’ I believe that

he is asserting his intention to historicize beneath the surface” (179). Historicizing beneath the surface produces, for Baldwin, a sort of repression of both textual production and politics producing a kind of a political unconscious in much of Hemingway’s fiction. Searching the icebergs in Hemingway’s texts to discover some of the political dimensions of his writing and seek out what is left unsaid and what makes the page becomes pertinent.

With the iceberg in mind, some of Hemingway’s political interests can easily be overlooked. Or, at best, they can be reduced to a sort of secondary fact of life, as Peter Hays posits in “Hemingway as Social and Political Writer.” Hays argues: “political ideology was not Hemingway’s main focus ever... but his work does explore the intrusion of economics and politics into daily life as part of his intense scrutiny of characters’ lives” (111). Within this interpretation, politics become incidental. They are relevant to the text inasmuch as they are relevant to uninterrogated political realities of Hemingway’s narrative settings. The characters, then, bump up against politics like a force of nature and its inclusion does not become indicative of any further political interests on the part of Hemingway. While this interpretation occupies an interesting middle ground between Solow’s interpretation of Hemingway as apolitical and Stephens’ understanding of Hemingway as explicitly political, it appears to shun an exploration of Hemingway as a political writer by relegating politics to the sphere of the secondary, incidental, and fact-of-life. But, as Baldwin’s interest in Hemingway’s iceberg as a political unconscious demonstrates, Hemingway’s political interests were present in subtlety and his expression of them in his writing is not incidental.

Moving forward, a simple framework is necessary to establish a level of coherence in what is meant by “political.” I assume a somewhat radical stance that the political is omnipresent within culture, therefore an objective claim to apoliticism quite literally cannot

exist. Hemingway's politics are derived from his personal experiences and while they manifest in fictionalized characters and circumstances, there is no way to divorce his biography from the politics of his work. Hemingway's approaches to war are treated as political. His implementation of iconography and symbols is treated as political. Stances he has taken against political ideologies that appear to impart some level of disaffection or apolitical superiority are treated as political. With a primary focus on Hemingway's opinions regarding fascism, war, and leftist populism, this project seeks to analyze texts and biography with a broad conception of politics that acknowledges ideology in nearly every corner.

The Myth of the Arditi: Hemingway's Early Fascination with Militarism

Ernest Hemingway was only a few months shy of his eighteenth birthday when the United States entered World War I in April of 1917. As a young man Hemingway longed to join in the fighting, maybe inspired by the wartime adventures of his childhood hero Theodore 'Teddy' Roosevelt, an American president who also saw combat during the Spanish-American war. A young Hemingway joined what would become the National Guard in 1918, and later enlisted to travel overseas working in an ambulance division in Italy for the Red Cross. Hemingway was excited, writing to his sister Marcelline that "it is a big relief to be enlisted in sometging [sic]. I enlisted for immediate service but got gypped [sic] on the immediate end of it" (*Letters 1 87*). Hemingway's impatience and desire to join in the conflict is indicative of his youth and romantic idea of combat, but, it also played a large part in the early development of his politics as they relate to militarism and war.

Hemingway served in an ambulance team and later in a rolling canteen unit during World War I, but through his youthful desire for military fame and adventure, the young writer crafted a

faulty personality around tall tales. The adornments, lies, and editorializing that Hemingway employed were bolstered by his unique position on the Italian front. One aspect of this unique position were his uniforms. Hemingway and some of the other men working with him like Ted Brunback and Howell ‘Jenks’ Jenkins were issued Red Cross Uniforms and granted ranks equal to Soto Tenente or second Lieutenant. Prior to deployment, Hemingway and his friends tested out their new uniforms; and as Hemingway describes, they “thought at first it would be fun because all privates and non commissioned officers [would] have to salute us. But by the time we had returned about 200 salutes it had lost all its fun. But it was fun to have the men snap up to salute” (*Letters 1* 100). Although he allows for a slim glimmer of humility, admitting at that getting all the salutes was a little less fun than anticipated, Hemingway expresses interest in utilizing his dubious rank. Despite its potentially propagandic reason for existing and his blatant lack of real military training (outside the quick drills done in New York), Hemingway is proud to be regarded as a soto tenente—even if it wasn’t entirely true¹. He furthered his ability to bolster wartime embellishments by commissioning a uniform by the Italian designer Spagnolini, a uniform he frequently wore around Oak Park upon his return to the states. While the uniform may have bolstered his assumed rank, in truth, Hemingway adopted ranks without any proper qualifications; it was a narrative tool in the revolving door of the tall tales he’d spin directly after the war. Hemingway again employs the rank to identify ambulance driver Frederic Henry in *A Farewell to Arms*. But, Michael Reynolds identifies the origins of Hemingway’s non fictive use of the rank in a questionnaire for returning veterans set up by the Memorial Committee of Oak Park (*Young Hemingway* 55). In August 1918, recovering from serious mortar wounds in a Milan hospital, Hemingway wrote in a letter to his family, “I got a letter today from the Helmles

¹ The American Red Cross’ mission in Italy, according to Foley and Gardner, was more diplomatic than anything, as “[V]olunteers with no military experience, let alone officer status, were dressed in officers’ uniforms to inflate the appearance of a US military presence” (6).

addressed Private Ernest H— what I am is S. Ten. or Soto Tenenente Ernest Hemingway. That is my rank in the Italian Army and it means 2nd Liet.” (*Letters 1* 133). Again, Hemingway appears attached to his adopted rank and seems at least offended in a small degree that he was addressed as a Private. With his interest in rank and his excitement for service, Hemingway’s approach to war as a young man—very nearly a child—was one seemingly of endorsement.

At some point over the course of the eight months Hemingway spent in Italy during his service he came into contact with the elite force of Italian Shock troopers known as the Arditi. These ‘daring ones’ were soldiers given the harrowing task of breaching German lines to lay the groundwork for broader infantry assaults. They were feared, and their proficiency and proximity to danger captured the attention of a young Ernest Hemingway, and members of the growing Italian fascists. In a speech given on 24 May, 1920 Benito Mussolini reflects on the necessity of war and praises the Arditi saying, “[I]t was the “Arditi” who went to the trenches singing, and if we returned from the Piave and the Isonzo... it is due to them” (Mussolini, *Political Speeches*). Hemingway very quickly adopted a sort of awe for the Arditi, conflating the figures with notions of bravery, tenacity, morality, and just putting up a good fight.

These Arditi soldiers played a prominent role in the various stories Hemingway told and the juvenilia he wrote immediately following the war, and they continued to appear, albeit with less prominence, in the fiction he composed throughout the 1920s. In an attempt to conflate or associate himself with the image of the brave Italian shock troopers, a young Hemingway told stories of combat with the troops and even “claim[ed] that the Italian Arditi troops had schooled him knife-throwing ‘and even offered him an Austrian prisoner to practice on’” (*Letters 3* 540). In another instance revealing his affinity for the Arditi as a sort of metaphorical and mythological force, Hemingway remarks that rainbow trout “are the Arditi of the Lakes” on

account of how well they fight a fisherman trying to reel one in (*Letters I* 193). Hemingway's willingness to bluff about the Arditi while also using their image as a sort of metaphor for strength comes with little surprise when considering his eagerness for military service and willingness to present himself as a Soto Tenente. Despite the nearly mythological status of the shock troopers, Hemingway rarely wrote a piece of fiction with an Arditi narrator but they do appear throughout his work.

In Hemingway's early fiction the Arditi represent the best of soldiering, and enact romantic roles. The result is the image of a swaggering soldier-type that occupied the war zones of World War I as an outlier rising above the horrors of bravery and cowardice. This phase of Hemingway's writing is perhaps even more indicative of his political stances than his juvenile letters could be. Biographical editorializing appears within the earlier Hemingway stories, indicating that he likely used writing to aid in processing his experiences affording more reflective and concise observations on the war and his—as well as the Arditi's—place in it.

While Hemingway's attachment to the Arditi brought him ideologically close to burgeoning Italian fascism, his juvenilia and early stories reflects a misplaced fascination with the soldiers that, once recognized, accounts for his quick retaliation against Mussolini's Blackshirts. The Ardito Sarsi specifically occupies romantic territory for Hemingway ideologically. He dispenses violence against corruption, rather than for corrupt leaders. It is certainly true that Hemingway's youthful attraction to the Arditi, and by extension, early Italian fascism, indicates a troubling attraction to national militarism. Yet, the appeals to individual action present in his juvenilia plant the seeds that ultimately reject violence for the sake of the state.

Hemingway's fictive representations of the Arditi over time unveil his developing opinions on both militarism and nationalism, hinting subtly at the young author's growing antifascist politics. In the early unpublished piece of juvenilia "How Death Sought Out the Town Major of Roncade," an Arditi soldier, Sarsi, operates as an agent of righteous death who dispenses a sort of vigilante justice uncommon during war. The vignette "A Very Short Story," published in *In Our Time*, features a romantic Arditi major who courts, loves, and leaves the narrator's fiancée. This story reflects Hemingway's own biography, and experiences with his hospital love Agnes Von Kurowsky who left him for a fruitless love affair with an Italian major (indeed, early drafts of the story in the John F. Kennedy Library were composed in first person with the fiancée named 'Ag'). In "A Very Short Story" Hemingway hints at potentially negative side effects of the Arditi's swashbuckling myth, but he trails short of condemning them. Finally in "In Another Country," Hemingway includes a brief reference to the Arditi as the narrator explores his alienation from the soldiers around him. The Ardito from "In Another Country" acts as a wounded man at the whim of experimental rehabilitation technology and is despised by the socialists in Milan. The narrator, like Hemingway by the mid 1920s, feels alienated from the soldier. The arc of these stories clearly show how Hemingway's developing attachment to the Arditi, is established by a conflation of the Arditi and Hemingway's interest in militarism and the futile adventure of war. As a young man he idolized the soldiers, but as he grew and began to recognize the mechanisms of war and reflect on the horrors he experienced, his attachment to the Arditi and the nationalistic militarism they represented became bitter and alienated.

"How Death Sought out the Town Major of Roncade" takes place during the Piave assaults that signified a major victory for the Italians in World War I, especially after the devastating defeat at Caporetto in October of 1917. Referred to summarily as "the June

offensive,” Hemingway describes the war in a way that is both frightening and brutal. Roncade, a town south of the Piave river close to where Hemingway was wounded in July 1918, is a stepping stone, the story tells us, as “[A]ll were bound for the front.” Trucks, dubbed the Italian ‘Camions’ by Hemingway, move in and out, through the town. The setting becomes ambivalent. The bustling camions and movement toward the front are energetic, and with hindsight may even be read as optimistic and signs of the shifting tide of the war. Yet, as Vergara spends his restless nights listening to the distant sound of gunfire, all is not well and the bloodshed continues in the distance. The energy surrounding the conflict at this time would’ve been readily accessible to Hemingway as well, as he arrived in Italy in June of 1918 as the Piave assaults were taking place.

Hemingway was often frustrated with land owners and privileged politicians, and although he was not a communist, his political allegiances and beliefs were almost always tied to populist and proletarian interests. Roncade, situated along the trail of the energetic push to war, is primarily abandoned and empty save the town major and the two girls who run the cafe and trattoria. The girls are sympathetic to the wounded soldiers who are carted through town probably signifying, to Hemingway, a moral strength. In comparison, the town major, Vergara, is a privileged coward who stands as the villain of the story. Vergara takes the sacrifices of the soldiers for granted and uses his nobility to get his position in Roncade. Hemingway unveils Vergara’s corruption and cowardice writing “A town major does nothing and if he is lucky has a nice town to live in. Vergara knew the wires to pull to make himself lucky.” Hemingway created a caricature of wartime corruption and cowardice in Vergara, but the character also indicates some of Hemingway’s early politics. Vergara is indicative of a juvenile representation of these

beliefs: a nobleman hiding away at a crucial period in the war while soldiers fight and die. Not only this, he is a coward who abuses the women in Roncade.

If the problem of the text is corruption, cowardice, and abuse of the powerless during war, then the vigilante justice of the Ardito Sarsi is Hemingway's proposed answer. Sarsi enters the text and very quickly murders Vergara after the girls imply that he has sexually assaulted them. His actions, then, become a sort of moral retribution. Assuming the role of death Sarsi provides Vergara with reasons for killing him saying "It is death because yesterday my brother was killed. It is death because of all the good men who have spilled out their guts along the Fossalta road while you have made love in Roncade." Hemingway's politics are clearly on display here. Although he hints at the horrors of war, the story is ultimately an indictment of cowardice that argues for the necessity of fighting a war when one is presented with it. While Hemingway's opinion on militarism and war would undergo serious change throughout the 1920s, the politics represented in this early text are a far cry from the anti-war sentiment that would come to prominently characterize Hemingway's political thinking by the end of the '20s.

Troublingly, "How Death" reveals a dangerous sentiment in Hemingway's early fiction that, mixed with his fascination with the Arditi, treads close to the fascist rumblings in Italy directly following World War I. Sarsi, Hemingway's embodiment of a good and just soldier, dispenses vigilante justice—vigilante being an important distinction. He appears to answer to no one; he guides himself. This radical individualism is not unusual in Hemingway's male heroes, but it becomes problematic when an Arditi soldier commits an act of murder. In the years following the war, the image of the Arditi—indeed many Arditi themselves, such as Italo Balbo—were incorporated into fascist imagery and ideology. When, in 1919, Gabriele D'Annunzio marched on and captured Fiume, he was joined by Arditi. The black shirts worn by

Benito Mussolini's early followers and street militiamen were inspired by the Arditi uniform. Mussolini even wrote great praises of the Arditi in his fascist newspaper *Il Popolo d'Italia*. The swashbuckling militarism that the Arditi represented to Hemingway were easily interpolated into the nationalist fervor that contributed to the rise of Italian fascism. Hemingway's endorsement of the spontaneous and retributive justice through Sarsi is a short jump from interpolation to early fascist propaganda. In fact, Hemingway himself wanted to join D'Annunzio's occupation of Fiume, offhandedly writing to his mother in a letter critical of Woodrow Wilson: "Wish I were at Fiume tho" (*Letters 1* 211). Wilson endorsed the ceding of Fiume to the newly formed Yugoslavia, a move that angered Italian nationalists. Hemingway's criticism of Wilson along with his desire to be in Fiume allies him as ideologically with Italian nationalists at this stage of his life. Hemingway's heroic treatment of Sarsi's vigilante justice and his support of D'Annunzio's claiming of Fiume (a move that was not supported by Rome at the time) indicate that Hemingway still valued bravery in war and supported Italian nationalist causes. He'd almost have made a good candidate as a Blackshirt if it weren't for his allegiances to the working class. But, these beliefs were in their infancy and his other depictions of Arditi show, the author was in for a good deal of development.

Arditi next appear in "A Very Short Story" quietly inverting the characterizations that may have redeemed the vigilante Sarsi, becoming instead almost insidious, threatening, and hollow. The vignette strikes a more personal note for Hemingway, revealing the intimacy of his politics and his inner life. The story reflects a piece of autobiographical fictionalizing on Hemingway's part. The narrative beats of the short story mimic Hemingway's own experiences with Agnes Von Kurowsky. As the protagonist's fiancée, Luz, leaves him for an Arditi major, Kurowsky left Hemingway for an Italian major after he traveled to the U.S. thinking the two of

them were engaged. Writing to Bill Horne in March of 1919, Hemingway explained the situation: “She doesn’t love me Bill. She takes it all back... Oh Bill I can’t kid about it and I can’t be bitter because I’m just smashed by it” (*Letters 1* 177). The end of his relationship with Agnes left a large wound and “A Very Short Story” appears to be an attempt to treat his emotions and lay out a clean and neat retelling of events, perhaps a practice to “cauterize out her memory,” as he had told Howell Jenkins he had done (*Letters 1* 193). Whatever the reason, the story's strong biographical content makes it a very personal story for Hemingway (indeed, ‘Personal’ was the working title given to the story in early drafts), but this does not disqualify any political relevance. The major, whom Luz—a probable stand-in for Agnes—leaves the unnamed man for is identified as a member of the Arditi, carrying all the symbolism and imagery previously discussed surrounding these figures in Hemingway’s work.

Interestingly, Hemingway seemed to know very little about the major Agnes left him for meaning his inclusion of the Arditi was explicitly fictionalized. He explains his ignorance on Agnes’ new romantic situation to Bill Horne writing that Agnes had not supplied the name of her new lover when breaking off their relationship (*Letters 1* 177). While the lover was later identified as Domenico Caracciolo, an Italian officer and heir to Italian dukedom, this likely wasn’t known by Hemingway at the time of writing “A Very Short Story,” and so his implementation of the Arditi appears significant outside of biographical inspiration. When the unnamed man in the story returns to America, Luz goes to Pordenone where “[I]t was lonely and rainy [there], and there was a battalion of *arditi* quartered in the town” (*CSS* 96). Pordenone is described as wet, cold, and lonely. It is the type of environment that one of Hemingway’s Arditi could thrive in, but one that would probably be hostile to Luz. Confined by the loneliness, the major makes love to Luz and she, who “had never known Italians before,” calls off her

relationship with the unnamed man. This portrayal of the Arditi is not the astonishing endorsement of “How Death,” rather it depicts an Arditi soldier who is manipulative and threatening. The major threatens, and ultimately destroys, the protagonist and Luz’s relationship making him, essentially, the story’s villain. Pordenone is a hostile environment, raining and cold. The major comforts Luz, but his love, like fascism, is a lie. Ultimately Luz and the Ardito do not marry. The Arditi’s swagger and ability is still recognized in Hemingway’s somber but coy discussion of Luz and the major’s sexual relationship, but ultimately, the Major acts as the unnamed man’s rival and is directly involved in his heartbreak. This is not a flashing endorsement of the Arditi and signifies a shift in Hemingway’s appreciation of the shock troopers. Perhaps the young writer felt the need to cauterize both his youthful love with Agnes and his romantic idolization of the Arditi.

Hemingway’s somber turn away from idolizing the Arditi in “A Very Short Story” is symbolically similar to the total alienation the narrator of “In Another Country” experiences and continues to symbolize a shift toward more mature political thought for Hemingway. “In Another Country” follows an American wounded at the Italian front and recovering with experimental physical therapy technology. The narrator is joined with other soldiers through virtue of their military status. They travel in groups to ward off angry communists who are frustrated with them by virtue of being soldiers and therefore believed to be complicit in the corrupt bid for expansion that characterized Italian involvement in World War I. In addition to their protective pack travel, the soldiers go to the hospital together and they sometimes go to cafes, but it is never enough to put to rest the alienation the narrator feels in relation to the others. They do very little together beyond these interactions and the narrator feels distanced, especially as they discuss medals. The narrator implies that he was given his medal simply because he was

an American, whereas the soldiers around him had fought for and earned theirs. As the men spend time together Hemingway writes, “their manner changed a little toward me, although I was their friend against outsiders. I was a friend, but I was never really one of them” (CSS 165). Of all the men who carry medals in the story, an Arditi soldier is described as having the most. The young man had “a very pale face” and “was to be a lawyer and had been a lieutenant of *Arditi* and had three medals of the sort we each had only one of” (CSS 165). These medals signify exemplary service and would normally elevate the soldier, but the tone of the story does not allow for it.

The lawyer-to-be is a far cry from the soldiering Sarsi or the romantic major, and while *How Death* told the story of retribution in warzone justice, “In Another Country” is a story about the loneliness and damage of war. The Arditi soldier is present, but after living “a very long time with death” he is “a little detached” (CSS 165). The image of nationalistic fervor that a younger Hemingway had subscribed to and admired in his writing has wilted into a bitter alienation. The figures that would take violence into their own hands and symbolize national militarism are now displayed as victims of the war. Hemingway’s pseudo biographical narrator’s alienation toward these soldiers symbolizes a quiet rejection of his youthful romance. He no longer identifies with them, no longer sees the flashy soldiering as adventurous. Although a young Hemingway was fascinated by the Arditi and Italian militarism, by the time he wrote *Men Without Women*, the myth of the Arditi was dead to him.

The Hollowness of the State ~ Hemingway, Fascism, and the Aftermath of World War I

Hemingway was very quickly skeptical of politicians, but through an involved relationship covering the aftermath of World War I, his skepticism would turn to a deep

cynicism. It was Armistice Day, 1919, and Hemingway was reflecting on the immediate fallout of the war. The young writer's thoughts were caught up with the soldiers who had died fighting over the disagreements and concerns of statesmen—statesmen who continued these fights in conferences and political theaters. The soldiers, Hemingway wrote to his mother, “thought they were dying to make an end to war” (*Letters I* 211). Hemingway's letter implies that the horrific realities of the war could only be justified if it lived up to the promise of ending all wars is implicit in his letter. If the dead could hear, Hemingway frustratingly thought, “it must make them bitter to hear all the Congressmen talking about the ‘next war’” (*Letters I* 211). A hallmark of Hemingway's ethics and politics is taking shape in this letter, formed through his revulsion at the prospect of another war and his sympathy for veterans. These early ethics shine through, slightly underdeveloped, but earnestly in this young letter. As he ponders, Hemingway asks his mother, “[W]hat do you think the 500,000 dear old wops that died think of Wilson robbing them of what they fought for?” (*Letters I* 211). The question was, perhaps, never answered, but the criticism of the political response to the war would continue to develop in Hemingway, sparking both an impetus for his journalism and a cynical disillusionment that would reside just below the surface of some of his best fiction.

Hemingway would get close access to the political leadership of Europe in the early 1920s, and this quick education encouraged a growing cynicism that would typify much of his politics for years to come. Returning to Europe in December of 1921 and recently married to Hadley Richardson, Hemingway arrived in Paris with a job writing freelance stories for the *Toronto Star*. Through his work as a journalist Hemingway would cover the various peace conferences following World War I, European border and trade disputes, and even—under a false name—the Greco-Turkish war. Hemingway's position as a journalist made him a witness

to European politics in a unique way. As an American, he worked primarily as an outsider and wrote with North American audiences in mind. But due to his proximity to the site of European conflicts, Hemingway had the opportunity to meet leaders of the world like Mussolini, Tchitcherin, and Ismet Pasha. The politics represented by Hemingway's early Ardití romanticism were quickly reoriented through his front seat exposure to the leaders and aftermath of the war in Europe. This reorientation led to a rapid maturation of some of his early political beliefs. Through his understanding of European politics, and perhaps because of his experience romanticizing the Ardití, Hemingway would quickly become a staunch opponent to fascism—a political stance he retained throughout the tense years to come in Europe.

World War I figured heavily in Hemingway's 1920s fiction, and as he began to grow beyond his youthful adoration of the militaristic Ardití, so too did his protagonists become more reflective and cynical. He did not cease writing stories set during the war, but the time that had passed opened new narrative settings for Hemingway to unpack and his cynical peek into European politics significantly influenced his narrative worlds and characters. Veterans in Hemingway's 1920s work are aimless, or bitter. Protagonists like Jake Barnes look back on their service with frustrated irony and self-deprecation. The world is rent asunder while monarchs drink whiskey and soda.

For Hemingway, poor leadership was indicated by economic malpractice and a lack of care for the working classes, and during the aftermath of the war he saw poor leadership all around. Indeed, as Hemingway worked as a journalist, he began to notice how the old contrivances and conflicts of World War I had not entirely been subdued, instead spilling out into other conflicts and disagreements like the occupation of the Ruhr or the Greco-Turkish war. Robert Stephens notes that early in his career as a journalist Hemingway came to understand

how “[T]he war had not stopped. It had only shifted to the conference table” (184). The ensuing conflicts and aftermaths of World War I hang in the backgrounds and icebergs of Hemingway’s fiction in the ‘20s, persistently evoking a political perspective of deep rooted dissatisfaction. At the center of the quiet observations Hemingway makes in fiction and the bolder more defined claims he stakes in his journalism is a politics interested in protecting the working class and disenfranchised veterans. His criticisms of the French occupation of the Ruhr explicitly point out how German workers were disproportionately effected by worsening exchange rates and rapid inflation, for example. He criticizes regimes that utilize conflict and war to hide their poor policy making or dangerous authoritarianism. As a journalist Hemingway suggests following the money, looking into exchange rates and inflation. He examines the economic relationship between the Vatican and the Blackshirts or the franc and the mark. Hemingway’s tactic of following the money does expose corruption, but it leaves little suggestion for how to act against it. Similarly, while these politics clearly inform his fiction writing, his protagonists still occupy and fulfill duties of war or exist under the oppressive memory of war indicating that although Hemingway had become critical of the conflict and the regimes it upheld, he had yet to develop a sort of answer to the problem it posed.

To understand the political landscape that Hemingway was writing in during the ‘20s, it is paramount to recognize the significance of the Italian fascists, a political ideology and faction that violently swept through Italy and manifested all over Europe in unique national contexts. Hemingway aptly describes the Italian fascists for readers of the *Toronto Star* in his piece titled “Genoa Conference.” The piece centers around concern about the Soviet delegation arriving in Italy for the Genoa conference while street warfare breaks out between communists and fascists. Hemingway satirizes the communists painting them as overly romantic on the one hand and

politically impotent—opting to discuss, and only discuss, politics once a day—on the other. But, while he satirizes the communists, his descriptions of the fascists are downright denunciations. He refers to them as “a brood of dragons’ teeth that were sown in 1920 when it looked as though Italy might go Bolshevik” and that, “[I]n short, they are counterrevolutionists, and in 1920 they crushed the Red uprising with bombs, machine guns, knives and the liberal use of kerosene cans” (*DLT* 131). Hemingway’s descriptions are not unimpassioned distant clarifications of violent occurrences. The adjective ‘liberal’ in reference to kerosene indicates excess on the part of the fascists. Additionally, the modifier is ironic for its double meaning referencing the left/right political spectrum and a history of free-market capitalism (a system reliant upon property rights and labor relations that the Blackshirts violently upheld) while also being bitterly sardonic. Any use of kerosene cans is too much, used liberally or not. Early on, Hemingway identifies the dragon’s teeth as a violent menace.

Hemingway’s descriptions of the fascists put him quickly at odds with the murderous, militant, Blackshirts who were in league with the ruling class against proletarian concerns. The fascists in “Genoa Conference” sound a little like Hemingway’s own Sarsi. They are vigilantes taking their own perverse notion of justice into their own hands through violent means. But class motivations form an important distinction between the real Blackshirts and Hemingway’s fictional Sarsi. Recall that Sarsi kills Vergara, a character the narrative was very deliberate in describing as a corrupt cowardly nobleman. Sarsi voices sympathy and solidarity with the soldiers dying along the Piave and Fossalta road, an appeal to deprived masses. The Blackshirts instead enacted vigilante justice in order to protect the capital relations and property rights of the upperclasses in Italy. The fascist’s protection of bourgeois interests was potentially reactionary, as they came to the rescue at a time when faith in the established order was

crumbling dramatically. What is worse, the clearly defined enemy of the Blackshirts, the Reds, are not really so clearly defined. As Hemingway explains, “[T]he Fascisti make no distinction between Socialists, Communists, Republicans or members of cooperative societies. They are all Reds and dangerous” (*DLT* 131). Hemingway’s journalism reveals a murderous faction established to maintain the status quo in the aftermath of World War I. They attack and murder practically indiscriminately under the blanket threat of ‘Reds’ while enjoying police protection due to the virtue of their service to the landed elite of Italy. Hemingway called out the threat in April of 1922; a few short months later the fascist leader Mussolini would begin to consolidate power with his infamous march on Rome on 28 October, 1922.

The scope of Hemingway’s political criticism, however, was not confined to Italy, and he identified a similar corruption and deferral of proletarian political will in France. Hemingway’s observations on French politics, much like those on Italian politics, stemmed from World War I. As he later noted, but claimed to have observed at the time, “France was whipped and ready for revolution in 1917 after the failure of the Chemin des Dames offensive” (*BL* 181). Hemingway was aware of the crumbling steadfastness of the politicians who secretly fumbled and hoped for peace while soldiers fought and died with disillusionment brewing among their ranks. Seditious soldiers were taken up in mass arrests, court martialed, sentenced to hard labor, and and executed by firing squad. According to Guy Pedroncini, 49 soldiers were executed, though a staggering 629 death sentences were delivered. In response, wounded veterans took to the streets to protest, and under orders from prime minister Clemenceau came

the Garde Republicaine, with their shining breastplates, their horse-hair plumes, and those high-chested, big-hoofed, well-shod horses, [who] charge[d] and [rode] down the

parade of mutilated war veterans who were confident the Old Man would never do anything to them, his poilus that he loved. (*BL* 182)

The protesting veterans were slaughtered, and shortly after—just in time—American forces arrived to assist the French in the war quelling the fear of the murderous politicians who, for a brief moment, faced revolution.

The makeup and faces of the French political climate quickly changed in the years following World War I as fascist factions began forcing France into new territory through military occupations, notably of the Ruhr. By February 1922, Hemingway declared Clemenceau politically dead, citing a lack of war as a major motivator: “She [France] wants a builder instead of a fighter... there is no fighting to be done, with the callousness of republics, she has dropped Clemenceau” (*DLT* 95). As Clemenceau faded from political relevance, Hemingway turned his attention to Raymond Poincaré. Poincaré appeared to be more measured than any of his predecessors, including Clemenceau. For instance, while one former French Prime Minister Aristide Briand had struggled to produce an agreement surrounding reparations with Germany (with a lack of agreements threatening precarious military occupations from France), Hemingway noted that as of March 11, 1922 “M. Poincaré has occupied no territory, nor sent French troops into any new territory” (*DLT*, Hemingway, 107). Hemingway appeared a little pleased with the start of Poincaré’s leadership, and while memories of the crushed revolutions of the war did linger, perhaps Poincaré would avoid future conflicts. Yet, this would not be the case as Poincaré was quickly co-opted by the French Royalists, a party, Hemingway noted, that “control[ed] several newspapers, including *L’Action Française*, and ha[d] organized a sort of Fascisti called the Camelots du Roi” (*DLT* 261). These fascists, Hemingway hinted, controlled Poincaré and were purposefully instigating conflict over German reparations forcing France into

a military occupation of the German Ruhr. Hemingway claimed that the reparations scheme was enacted to amass wealth under the pretense of postwar repair projects and that it critically wounded the German working class who were paid in a rapidly inflating currency. Hemingway recognized that in France, as with Italy, the working classes were the victims of the fascist agendas. Throughout the early 1920s, Hemingway's reporting on France and the *Action Française* continued to affirm Hemingway's interpretation that conflict appeared inescapable and the violence and danger of the war remained.

Hemingway's fictional settings and characters from this period reflect a tired cynicism suggesting a lack of faith, especially in government. *The Sun Also Rises* features the narrator Jake Barnes, whose narrative voice frequently attempts to intentionally avoid politics as his "psychological biases indelibly highlight what he wants us to see, and blur what he does not want us to see" (Baldwin 171). He obscures political relevance, instead attempting to focus the narrative on character scrutiny, unraveling the habits and addictions of Brett Ashley or the stubbornness and naivety of Robert Cohn. But, as with all Hemingway fiction, a political element lies hidden beneath Jake's (and Hemingway's) iceberg. Jake's lack of political representation is itself a political act that points to disillusionment. Considering the amassing power of conservatism and fascist regimes provoking conflict through forced settlements and continued violence following the horror and loss of World War I, it is not difficult to understand his disillusionment.

Jake represses the political significance of his thoughts, specifically as they pertain to his memories of World War I, while taking a taxi up the Boulevard Raspail. Riding in the taxi Jake narrates: "The Boulevard Raspail always made dull riding. It was like a certain stretch on the P.L.M. between Fontainebleau and Montereau that always made me feel bored and dead and dull

until it was over” (SAR 32). Jake delivers a clever joke, seeing as though the Boulevard Raspail ends at the Paris catacombs aptly providing a ‘dead and dull’ feeling; but, the joke is a misdirect. The connection between the Boulevard Raspail and the *Paris-Lyon-Méditerranée* train route hides the political connection Jake attempts to bury. As H.R. Stoneback argues, “from the train he [Jake] might get a glimpse of the *École militaire* and the large military garrison at Fontainebleau, which would serve as an unpleasant reminder of the war” (84). The dead feeling rising in Jake is thus probably derived from his mental association between the road, the train route, and the war. While he attempts to bury the political implications of the implied disdain for the war in a macabre joke, Hemingway leave behind clues to Jake’s political iceberg.

Jake’s bias slips from time to time, signaling his overall frustration with both politicians and journalists, casting the former as avoidant and the latter as either writing only to see their own by-line or ill-equipped to succeed in their work by nature of politicians’ avoidant behaviors. Jake, like Hemingway, is a newspaper man. The intricacies of his job are mostly left unsaid, but he would likely be present at the Anglo-American newspaper meetings that featured “such a backstage view of European politicians, conferences, coronations and world affairs” that they would utterly shock the average American (DLT 99). Jake follows a beat with the French foreign ministry at the Quai d’Orsay. While working the beat Jake narrates that he “sat about with a dozen correspondents, while the foreign-office mouthpiece, a young *Nouvelle Revue Française* diplomat in hornrimmed spectacles, talked and answered questions for half an hour” (SAR 29). Jake’s tone is pessimistic. He notes that the President of the Council had been in Lyons delivering a speech, making politics. Most of the journalists around him “asked questions to hear themselves talk” and the news service men who actually wanted to get answers were disappointed. Jake sums it up nicely: “There was no news” (SAR 29). Even the light jab at the

somehow diplomatic relationship between the literary magazine *The New French Review* and the Foreign Affairs department appears potentially cynical. To Jake, the government sends out mouthpieces to field questions from the narcissistic press while the folks looking for real answers are given nothing, all while politicians go out to make big speeches.

Hemingway's indictments of power and wealth in the story collection *In Our Time* (1925) charge his disillusionment with a macabre and sardonic anger directed towards politicians and the ruling classes. The stories alternate between photographic snapshots and longer narratives of war, executions, bullfights, and upper Michigan. The Greco-Turkish war, one of several conflicts recognized as the Independence War in Turkey, provides a consistent throughline for the story collection. The Greco-Turkish war informs *In Our Time*, beginning with "On The Quai At Smyrna"—a story about the transition of power between Greek and Turkish forces in the city of Smyrna (today known as İzmir)—and concluding with a portrait of the Greek king entitled "L'Envoi." In many of the stories, working class characters and low-ranking soldiers bear the brunt of violence. German soldiers are 'potted' like fish in a barrel, unnamed men desperately pray to God as war is waged around them. Prize fighters are driven crazy by their wounds and matadors are gored to death as spectacle. When all the stories of success and failure and struggle are told, Hemingway closes with a brief story about the King of Greece.

The stories Hemingway tells about the Greco-Turkish war describe harrowing conditions and reflect the crushing weight that government decisions can force upon masses of people. The Greco-Turkish war began in 1919 and was fueled by Greek irredentists seeking to establish one nation with territory on each side of the Aegean sea. The Greeks—with the support of the British—invaded Smyrna on 15 May, 1919. Taking the city, they continued to push into Turkish

territory. Many battles ensued, Britain's interest in the war waned and Turkish national efforts found victory on other fronts garnering support from the Soviet Union. After a bitter stalemate was broken, the Turkish military forced the Greeks back to the Mediterranean and out of Smyrna. Greek irredentist aims were inspired by the large community of Greeks in Smyrna. Though the actual ratio of ethnicities in the region is disputed, the cultural plurality present was exploited and individuals caught in the crossfire of Greek and Turkish nationalist aims suffered. Hemingway's interest in the Greco-Turkish war is influenced by his experiences covering the war, specifically the horrendous mistreatments of the people who lived in the contested lands.

The depictions of terror and violence in "On The Quai At Smyrna" are thinly veiled in the sarcasm of the narrator, and the irony of the language juxtaposed with what it describes implies the ridiculousness of the devastation being dealt to the people. The narrator explains that "they screamed every night at midnight"—'they' being the people suffering in the city—but curtly explains that "We used to turn the searchlight on them to quiet them. That always did the trick" (CSS 66). The phrase 'did the trick' grafts a careless and almost playful veil over the horrors clearly depicted. The narrator goes on to describe women carrying dead babies and women delivering children on the pier. He explains that when there was no room left for pack animals "they just broke their forelegs and dumped them into the shallow water" (CSS 67). The devastation is clear, but again the narrative voice attempts to cover it saying that it "was all pleasant business. My word yes a most pleasant business" (CSS 67). The cynicism of the narrative voice is two-fold. On the one hand it's clear mimicry of British linguistic idiosyncrasies reflects the British involvement in Greece's irredentist aims. The British voice on Smyrna further implicates British colonial efforts as described by Çiğdem Oğuz's argument that "the historical background of the occupation of Western Anatolia by Greece is truly reaffirming

his [Hemingway's] view of Great Powers' involvement in 'war business' in every respect" (9). This war business cares very little about the suffering people of Anatolia, opting to shine light on their situation only to keep them quiet.

The migrants displaced by the Greco-Turkish war appear again in "Chapter II" of *In Our Time* described by a stripped down narrative voice that is as soaked with dread as the muddy, rain-laden, earth the migrant travel. The brief chapter describes a march in totalizing detail. It encompasses everything, there is "no end and no beginning. Just carts loaded with everything they own" (CSS 72). The chapter details the migrations in Thrace, where both Greek and Turk populations migrated in and out. The people seem miserable, and the only indication of an authority lies in the "Greek cavalry [who] herded along the procession" (CSS 72). Although Hemingway was able to distinguish between the interests of soldiers and the interests of the state, especially on the Italian front, it is significant that a representative of militarism guides the totalizing and drenched migration. Again, the suffering of the people becomes a charge against the state and the ruling class.

The final chapter, the "L'Envoi" of *In Our Time* is a brief sketch-up of a King on house arrest, and it drips with cynicism and disillusionment. In September 1922, Turkish troops captured Smyrna, the base of operations for Greek troops during the Greco-Turkish War. In the fallout of Greece's military failure, a massive evacuation took place and a revolutionary coup targeted Greek Royalists, holding them responsible for the defeat. As retribution, six cabinet ministers were executed. While the ministers were being executed and the King abdicated, Greek refugees fled from Anatolia. While Hemingway had covered the migrations in Thrace, both in his journalism and in his fiction, he was did not witness the 1923 population exchange, an event that forced migration of Greeks and Turks on both sides of the Aegean. The event was

an outcome of the Lausanne Conference (which Hemingway covered for *The Toronto Star*), and the forced migrations on both sides of the conflict resulted in tragedies and cultural unmooring. With this political instability and violence in mind, Hemingway concludes *In Our Time* with a king who “was working in the garden” and “seemed very glad to see me” (CSS 144). The narrator and the king drink whiskey and soda and discuss the Bolshevik Revolution and Nikolaos Plastiras (the Greek Prime Minister following the abdication of the king and execution of the cabinet members). The king jokingly endorses political executions but admits that “the great thing in this sort of affair is not to be shot oneself!” (CSS 144). His concern for being shot immediately calls to mind the German soldiers ‘potted’ like a game in chapters III and IV, or Nick pulled away from machine gunfire after being shot in the back in chapter VI, and of course the six ministers executed for their allegiance to the king himself, an event described in chapter V. By placing this chapter at the end and displaying such a ridiculous image of privilege, the chapter indicates the cynicism beneath much of Hemingway’s fiction in the 1920s. He acknowledges that those in power care very little about the soldiers who fight their wars or the individuals who fill their constituencies; and that, even after all the suffering and violence in the pages of *In Our Time*, the kings still sit in comparative luxury tending gardens and drinking whiskey.

Driven by a cynicism and a scorned attachment to militarism, Hemingway’s politics developed quickly over the course of the 1920s and all fed into the strong political statement of a novel that would bookmark his first decade as a public writer. As a very young man, Hemingway grappled with his romanticism of military life and imbued the Arditi with a mythological prowess. As he reflected on his time in the war, a romantic view of military life became nearly impossible to grasp; but, as his critique of Woodrow Wilson shows, for

Hemingway there had been a hope that the war had been fought for something. His letter implies a hope that with peace talks and conferences the war to end all wars may hold its promise.

Working as both a novelist and a journalist, Hemingway watched as conflict, war, and the advent of fascism erupted in the years following World War I, and he came to realize that the politicians and ruling classes could not be trusted to avoid war. Instead, conflict is what they fed upon. As the 1920s progressed and the threat of fascism grew louder, Hemingway's anti-war beliefs grew stronger. With the decade drawing to a close Hemingway published *A Farewell to Arms*, a largely political novel that seemed to finally supply Hemingway's response to the question of war.

Denouncing War and Fascism in *A Farewell to Arms*

A Farewell to Arms occupies a unique space in Hemingway's writing. Published in 1929 and just over a decade after World War I, the novel reflects Hemingway's political maturation during the 1920s as the text portrays the disillusionment and disdain for political leadership Hemingway had developed in the prior years. As Hemingway's political beliefs developed, so too did the Italian fascists. In order to protect the propaganda machine that supported Mussolini's government, the fascists recontextualized and rewrote the history of the Italian front of 1915-1918—especially the defeat at Caporetto in October 1917. These palimpsestic revisions included over-utilization of nationalist language in new spaces as well as complete censorship as, “Mussolini had forbidden any published mention of the retreat from Caporetto, hoping Italy's humiliation could be effaced from national consciousness” (Cirino 31). Hemingway was all too aware of these propagandistic developments. Hemingway critiqued and jabbed at the fascists throughout his journalism and short fiction, but Mussolini's horde of dragon's teeth continued to

hold over the country. After the publication of articles like “Italy’s Blackshirts: ‘Pot-Shot Patriots’ Unpopular in Italy” and “Mussolini: Biggest Bluff in Europe,” Hemingway had been told, apparently by Mussolini in person, that he was no longer welcome in Italy (*SL* 76). His work was viewed as a threat to the country and banned or selectively translated. And yet, regardless of the fascist state’s attempts to keep Hemingway out, he returned via the page, to the Italian front and World War I with a thesis in mind. *A Farewell to Arms* was Hemingway’s most political work at the time of its publication. The novel synthesizes the writer’s political beliefs into a damning critique of the Great War and its role in the rise of fascism. In a retelling of the cataclysmic defeat at Caporetto, Hemingway weaves together his politics in typical affective yet ‘truthful’ prose to argue against war and for a separate peace.

Two key moments frame the politics of *A Farewell to Arms*: the auto-ambulance drivers’ conversations just prior to the shelling that will wound Frederic Henry and kill Passini, and the proto-fascist executions at the retreat of Caporetto. These scenes depict stark contrasts in Frederic’s character, and, when taken together, dramatically explain the growth and development of his politics and Hemingway’s thesis for the text. Frederic starts the novel inwardly critical of the war and hoping, like anyone might, for it to end soon. In order for the war to end, however, Frederic believes there must be a winner and loser, and he draws these distinctions explicitly on national lines early in the novel. Pondering the end of the war, he thinks to himself “[M]aybe it would finish this summer. Maybe the Austrians would crack. They had always cracked in other wars. What was the matter with this war?” (*FTA* 35). There’s news of the marches on Paris after the failed Chemins des Dames assaults, but these were ‘stopped,’ the soldiers say; a bitter inclusion for audiences in 1929 who may better recognize the reference to the state-mandated slaughter of veterans for the sake of the war. With this subtle nod, Hemingway motions towards

the many failed revolutions that the dire circumstances of the war provoked. The passing treatment of the march on Paris indicates Frederic's stance on the war. He feels that it "did not have anything to do with" him, wishing—mostly—for it to conclude. But, his later discussions with the mechanics give readers a more targeted glimpse at Frederic's beliefs.

During an attack at dark, Frederic and his fellow ambulance drivers talk politics. The men are mechanics, a likely nod to the workers' strikes at Fiat factories in Turin. The strikes were potentially influenced by the riots in Petrograd that contributed to the Soviet revolution in Russia, and by late August 1917 the government felt the need to silence the strikes and riots. The military was called to Turin and "[T]anks crushed the barricades, and machine guns were used liberally" (*Today in World War I*). A further connection between the events in Turin and the mechanics is established when Manera, one of the mechanics, is described possessing a lighter "shaped like a Fiat radiator" (*FTA* 44). The men, like the rioters, share dissident beliefs as they talk amongst each other. Hemingway begins the conversation by letting the mechanics identify what they are not. One man, Gavuzzi, asks "who goes to the attack?" and someone responds "Bersaglieri"—Italian marksmen whom Hemingway had once compared Mussolini to—Manera does not believe that anyone would attack if they were properly informed, but Passini retorts, "Yes they would... Bersaglieri are fools" (*FTA* 45). The mechanics imply that the Bersaglieri are fools for their blind belief in the war, implicitly critiquing the sort of nationalist and irredentist idealism that fueled national interest in the war to begin with. Originating around 1877, in the early days of Italian unification, the irredentists were "[F]ormed by cells of disillusioned Garibaldians, Mazzinians, and other hotheads" (Thompson 10). With romantic and patriotic dreams of territorial expansion, many Italian nationalists took to the Great War to secure regions in Southern Austria like Tyrol or Trieste. The mechanics possess no such

disposition, but instead claim that the men who'd fight for such romantic nationalist dreams are "fools." Importantly these dreams of expansion were directly linked to proto-fascist ideology during the war. This profascist thinking that fueled such irredentist idealism was propagated most influentially by Gabriele D'Annunzio, an early fascist and emphatic lover of war. Touring Italy in the weeks leading up to the nation's involvement, he gave passionate and frenzied speeches with a very consistent message: "now is the time for all of you to find the courage to die for your country" (Thompson 44). D'Annunzio's is a suicidal nationalism that the mechanics simply cannot abide. Once again, Hemingway illustrates the great opposition between socialist coded proletarian concerns and the crushing violence of fascist ideology.

The Bersaglieri are not the only soldiers who the mechanics imply would fight for the nationalist cause; indeed, the Alpini and V. E. (Victor Emmanuel) soldiers are believed by the mechanics to fight blindly and put the nation even above their own families. With this, Hemingway revisits familiar romantic territory of Sarsi and the Arditi—but with a significant difference. In a letter to the translator of the novel Maurice-Edgar Coindreau, Hemingway writes, "V.E. soldiers were Infantry designated as shock troops which wore those initials (Victor Emmanuel) on their left sleeves—after 1917 these were incorporated into the Arditi" (*Letters 4* 382). Flashing across the page only briefly, the Arditi reappear in Hemingway's fiction, though they are no longer the heroes of his youth or even the distant wounded soldiers of his earlier fiction from the '20s. These V.E. soldiers, these Arditi, are fools.

Frederic defends the soldiers who go off to fight on the frontlines revealing his internalized nationalist ideals and his inability to recognize the more class-based arguments of the mechanics. Shortly after the V. E. are mentioned, the mechanics bring Frederic into the conversation as Passini jokes "You should not let us talk this way, Tenente. Evviva l'esercito"

(*FTA* 46). Frederic gives his opinion and reveals his further belief about war more generally. He believes wars must be won, he claims the men cannot give up; but his reasons are hypothetical. He warns the mechanics that if the Italians gave up fighting their enemies would “come after you. They take your home. They take your sisters” and “They hang you. They come and make you be a soldier again,” then finally, “it is bad but we must finish it” (*FTA* 46-47). Frederic provides important concerns in war, especially pertaining to the repercussions of defeat, but he is still missing the point that the mechanics are trying to make. While Frederic’s interest in fighting the war does not stem from deeply held nationalist allegiances, like those held by the bersaglieri, Alpini, or V. E. soldiers, he still refuses to see loss or victory in terms outside of national framing. Either the Italians will win or the Austrians will win. While the mechanics discuss class violence, Frederic is still caught up in fighting for the state—even if he sets himself apart from the zealots who represent elite soldering. While arguing with the mechanics, Frederic attempts to be pragmatic, arguing, essentially, that if the men do not fight in the Isonzo, the Austrians will come down the mountains and pillage their land. His reasoning appears sound, but he speaks in hypotheticals—the men do not care. If the Austrians come, the mechanics reason, then the deserters will protect themselves for themselves; let everybody defend his home, Passini says. And finally, a class consciousness explicitly emerges as one of the mechanics, unattributed in the text (though likely Passini), claims that “[T]here is a class that controls a country that is stupid and does not realize anything and never can. That is why we have this war” (*FTA* 47). Manera shuts the men up and Frederic goes to find food.

Frederic’s initial rejection of the mechanics’ socialist coded anti-war rhetoric sets the stage for his later acceptance of the totalizing defeat of war, especially when compared with the executions at Caporetto. The mechanics’ conversation is blatantly political and linked to

Hemingway's own political observations that the ruling class had betrayed the workers and soldiers of Europe with World War I, while subtly updating his stance on the Arditi with the hindsight of Italian fascism. As Barbara Foley and Peter Gardner argue in "Retrospective Radicalism: Politics and History in Ernest Hemingway's *A Farewell to Arms*," for Hemingway, "victory and defeat were defined in class terms" (4). Of the three sides brought into the ideological conversation taking place, Frederic undergoes the most change and is likely the messenger to the text's thesis. Despite arguing with the mechanics, he is eventually converted when faced with the monstrous result of the class concerns the mechanics discuss; soldiers who will not die *for* the state are, in turn, murdered *by* the state. When the specter of fascism arrives in the form of the Carabinieri, Frederic abandons the war, choosing a separate peace and following the politics of the socialist coded mechanics.

In the confusion and catastrophe of the military defeat and retreat from Caporetto, Hemingway depicts a violent clash between the military bound by nationalist fervor and the fed-up deserting masses that is both gruesome and symbolic, portraying a vindictive embryonic-fascist crack down on socialist coded sentiment and the will of the masses. Retreating from the front along with some 400,000 other soldiers, Frederic's story is not so unique as it is symbolic. He is caught up in the conflict like the hundreds of thousands of soldiers fleeing death, but his choice to abandon the front symbolizes his transition toward the ideals of Passini and the mechanics.

Still, the historic scope of the defeat at Caporetto is an astonishing display of ineptitude in military leadership that goes beyond literary symbolism. As the Austrians and Germans attacked in a near *blitzkrieg* approach, punching through Italian lines and spreading through to assaults at Mount Krn, Flitsch, Saga, and of course Caporetto, Italian Military leadership—namely Luigi

Cadorna—held off retaliation or organized retreat, believing the attack to be a misdirect. The real battle would begin on the Corso, they believed. As the situation worsened, soldiers turned heel, falling into informal retreats and declaring themselves *Brigata di Pace*, the peace brigade. Cadorna would not have it and issued a warning “that the only choice was victory or death. The harshest means would be used to maintain discipline” (Thompson 316). The response from Cadorna and military leadership is the unfortunate conclusion to Frederic’s prior understanding of the war. It must either be won or lost, and for the nationalists, the only acceptable loss is death. While his logic may have sounded pragmatic in discussion with mechanics, Frederic faces the repercussions of his beliefs on a bridge over the Tagliamento river.

Retreating with fellow ambulance driver Piani, Frederic joins in with a large column of soldiers crossing a narrow bridge over the Tagliamento River and comes face to face with the vile, murderous, militarism of fascism. As they cross Frederic notices “[A]t the far end of the bridge there were officers and carabinieri standing on both sides flashing lights” (*FTA* 207). The Carabinieri, military police, inspect and execute ranking soldiers in accordance with Cordona’s orders; and in Hemingway’s retelling of Caporetto, they embody a flash of the impending grim face of fascism. The allusions to the fascists are blatant, especially in light of Hemingway’s earlier characterization of the socialist-coded ambulance drivers and their opinion on the war. The Carabinieri execute the bitter vindictiveness of a failed nationalist goal. If the soldiers would not fight, if the hard won battles of the last three years were reversed, the nationalist dream would fail and the echoes of irredentist idealism may appear empty. As the soldiers give up arms just as Passini, Manera, and Gavuzzi suggested they should, the corrupt ruling military class cracks down.

This scene recalls the brutal fights and killings between the Blackshirts and the communists described by Hemingway in “The Genoa Conference” seven years earlier. The Blackshirts killed with police protection; the Carabinieri do so with explicit command. They kill efficiently, questioning their next victims as the previous is murdered behind them. Just as the Blackshirts targeted all kinds of ideologies under a blanket term—“Reds”—Frederic recognizes that the Carabinieri “had shot everyone they had questioned” (210). As Lena asserts, the “efficient behavior as embodied in the noncombatant *carabinieri* is very similar to that of the Fascist forces of which Hemingway reported for the *Toronto Star*” (91). The similarities do not end there, of course, as Frederic recognizes the narrow-minded approach the Carabinieri bring to their executions realizing “[T]hese were all young men and they were saving their country” (*FTA* 210). The military, Frederic realizes, is being ‘re-formed’, with young idealistic nationals murdering the men falling back for their lives. Consider the description of the young men in comparison to Hemingway’s description of Mussolini’s Blackshirts “formed from all the excitement-loving youths of the middle and upper-class families” who “set about a counter-campaign of terrorism against the workers” (*DLT* 175).

Through the Carabinieri and the executions at the retreat of Caporetto, Hemingway insightfully ties a history of romantic nationalism to a future of crushing totalitarianism with the average man caught between and dissenters excised. The Carabinieri speak with empty national jargon that “Italy should never retreat” and blame the soldiers, accusing them that “[I]t is you and such as you that have let the barbarians onto the sacred soil of the fatherland” (*FTA* 209). Evoking a fatherland, the carabinieri draw from national aims indicative of unification and the Risorgimento, a romantic political rise again that echoed in the belief that “Italy had to throw itself into the struggle [WWI], not only to extend its borders but to strengthen the nation”

(Thompson 5). Looking back, the nation building goals of Italy's involvement in World War I inform the rhetoric of Hemingway's Carabinieri while their efficiency, propensity for murder, and appeal to the ruling classes identify them as hauntingly fascist. Perhaps in a moment of ironic hindsight Frederic Henry bewilderingly asks "Who are you?" to which the carabinieri reply, "You'll find out" (*FTA* 208). Snarling a bit, still embryonic, the dragon flashes a single tooth.

Frederic Henry escapes, following the ideology of the mechanics he had argued with earlier in the novel and establishing a clear development in his character and signaling a political will of the masses—some 400,000 other deserters—who, like Frederic, threw down their arms and refused to fight. What's more, Frederic's growth becomes reflects the political lessons Hemingway learned throughout the 1920s. While he may have half-heartedly defended the bersaglieri, Alpini, and—most importantly—the V. E. soldiers, he no longer sees vindication in that violence. Parallels are obvious. Although a young Hemingway romanticized the Arditi and wrote juvenile vigilante narratives about their bravery and swagger, his reflections on war and witness to the rise of fascism shifted those beliefs and hardened him against the vaguely Italian nationalist ideals of his youth. Frederic witnesses firsthand the violence of the state and the ruling class's drive to war. This drive to war is a force of disillusionment for Hemingway while working as a journalist and for Jake Barnes, who hides his disdain just below a veil of cynicism. The realities that produce this disillusionment are a major theme of *In Our Time*. Frederic Henry's dissolution with the war is total, he holds no stake in it after escaping down the Tagliamento telling himself "I was not against them. I was through... it was not my show anymore" (*FTA* 218).

Frederic's abandonment of the war reflects Hemingway's own anti-war stances, stances that would develop into a bitterly isolated perspective that cut ties and criticized frequently. While Frederic's desertion appears to present an ethical choice in war by staunchly opposing participation and denouncing it at the individual level, it is derived from a place of great luck and privilege for both Frederic and Hemingway. Abandoning both the front and the class struggle, Frederic's isolation is totalizing. While he is cut off from war and participation in its horrors, he is similarly disconnected from avenues of resistance against the corrupt governing that nearly had him killed. This choice is deliberate on Frederic's part. Hemingway's internalization of *A Farewell to Arms*' lessons in the years to come would gridlock the efficacy of his political resistance and alienate him from the class struggle he had begun to engage during the 1920s.

Reflecting throughout the decade, witnessing failed revolutions, endless wars, and an insidious conservatism strike through Europe, Hemingway's politics transformed from vaguely national but certainly militaristic to cynical and anti-war. The fascists operated on war, a fact that became very apparent to Hemingway working as a journalist. And even non-fascist states like France were susceptible to the ideology's shadowy influence. As he reflected on World War I and observed the wars and politics of the decade, Hemingway arrived at the same conclusion as his protagonist Frederic Henry. The only approach to war was to stay out of it. This staunch anti-war approach would inform Hemingway's politics as he grew into the 1930s. Expecting another great European war, the writer would advise Americans based on the ethics of the soldiers who threw down their weapons at Caporetto or marched on Paris. When the war does come, stay out.

Chapter 2

The culmination of Ernest Hemingway's political growth during the '20s was a novel about desertion, but fascist war rallying and the global economic depression intensified the political arena of the 1930s and forced Hemingway to further develop and refine his political stances, especially as they pertained to desertion and the isolationism that had become so central to his beliefs. After a long decade of artistic growth and a widening political awareness, the writer seemed to have landed upon a strong claim regarding war and its relationship to fascism. War was perpetuated by faulty regimes, many of which anti-democratic, thus the only ethical choice to make in a war, Hemingway seemed to say in *A Farewell to Arms*, was to stop fighting. The 1930s presented a formidable challenge to Hemingway's stance on war, and once again he'd question the turbulent, explosive, massive conflicts and their relationship to regimes of fascism. Initially holding out on his isolationist stance, through study of revolutions, empathy and advocacy for veterans, and a growing consciousness of the importance of collective resistance, Hemingway would be forced to reconcile his isolationist stance and approach to antifascist politics.

The Bitter Isolationist and the Scholar of Revolutions

If the 1920s served to educate Ernest Hemingway on the complexities of European politics, the '30s were a decade that saw the writer utilize this education to produce far more scathing criticisms than his prior journalistic and subtle fictive work could. Additionally, Hemingway began to broaden the scope of his political observations, looking to Cuba and addressing the United States more intimately. In the early '30s Hemingway espoused a non-interventionist approach to war primarily aimed at American audiences. Drawing on his

knowledge of the aftermath of World War I and the governments that the war and subsequent decade had produced, Hemingway maintained the theme of his 1929 novel *A Farewell to Arms*. War was used by states with great domestic failings, he argued, pointing to Italy's efforts in East Africa or Hitler's near-religious desire for war in Europe. The writer cautions his readers against fanciful notions of combat and violence holding a line of isolationism. Inspiring his disdain for the state and its warring proclivities, Hemingway underwent a period of study in the early '30s. Still drawing on his '20s education, the writer set out to study revolutions. Hemingway's revolutionary study led him to various conclusions, one of which came to dominate his political thinking for much of the 1930s. Hemingway repeatedly argued that writers and critics newly enlightened by the Great Depression had missed the point in their efforts to politicize. In "Old Newsman Writes," Hemingway suggests that his own achievements as a journalist during the aftermath of WWI were more politically effective than the work of new journalist and writers of the '30s. Synthesizing the findings of his follow-the-money mindset of the early '20s and the revolutions he studied in the early '30s, Hemingway reiterates the conditions that lead to his cynical isolationist stance, only now with more bitterness and contempt for the newly enlightened. His contempt and isolationism in pursuit of truth is met with a returned criticism by this literary Left, represented by individuals like Robert Forsythe who said of Hemingway: "he is obviously suffering from the hallucination that he is God and thus able to pass final verdict on truth, justice and mankind" (*New Masses* 26). Hemingway's critics found his persistent individualism and refusal to tow the literary Marxist party line ego-driven, and evidence of a dogmatic god complex. Hemingway, for his part, denounced them as fakers.

Sometime in the early 1930s, Ernest Hemingway set out to better understand revolutions, how they succeed, why they fail, and who gets involved. In December 1933, Hemingway

claimed to have witnessed the Cuban revolution that a few months earlier had overthrown Cuban president Gerardo Machado. Discussing politics on the famous 1933 African safari chronicled in *Green Hills of Africa*, Hemingway, his wife Pauline Pfeiffer, and their guide—the white hunter Philip Percival—turn to revolutions. The conversation, while eventually settling on Hemingway’s proposed study, indicates Hemingway’s inconsistencies as, during the conversation, he expresses fatigue at revolutions. This fatigue would have been a fashionably unfashionable disposition at the time as the crunch of economic depression and persistent specter of conservatism in the form of fascist regimes continued to prod, poke, and provoke leftist proletarian response. Perhaps Hemingway, having written in protest to fascist Italy and France, while noting the harms of war in Greece, Turkey, Germany, and the United States throughout the 1920s felt a bit of disdain for the newly radicalized. Whatever the reason, the writer tells Percival “I’m sick of them” (*GHOA* 139). Characteristically, Hemingway’s attempted bitter detachment betrays his actual interests and he almost instantly reveals that he’d “been studying them a little” and that “I’m going to try to write a study of them” (*GHOA* 139). Hemingway’s resentment for revolutions paired with his heightened interest and desire to study them is indicative of much of his political behavior in the early ‘30s; disavowing party politics while simultaneously engaging very intentionally in political discussion and study.

Hemingway’s study of revolutions would eventually produce a short text focused on the political climate during and directly after World War I and fixated upon the macabre conditions that produce revolutionary successes. About a year after his discussion with Pauline and Percival, *Esquire* published “Old Newsmen Writes: A Letter from Cuba,” perhaps the culmination of Hemingway’s attempt to “write a study of” revolutions. The text is rapid and a little nauseating in the way it attempts to describe an enormous political spectrum in very little

time at all. The text flies at a sprinter's pace between the political climates of various European countries, contemporary history, and military history of the 19th century, while simultaneously refusing to retain a formal basis of critique (is Hemingway criticizing journalists or novelists? And what's the difference between the two?). Hemingway slips from dishing journalistic advice to advice for novelists—suggesting the writer's own conflation of the two types of writing further signifying the political relevance of his fiction. In just three pages, Hemingway flies through European history: “No country was ever riper for revolution than Italy after the war,” “France was whipped and ready for revolution in 1917,” “Germany had simply failed to win... and there was a peace made before there was a defeat of the kind that makes revolution,” “Spain got a revolution that corresponded exactly to the extent of her military debacle,” “Neither Austria nor Hungary were ever really defeated in the war in the sense that France was defeated in 1870” (*BL* 180-183). The observations on European politics are quick and incisive despite their brevity, all underpinned by Hemingway's rather depressing conclusion that revolutions, specifically communist revolutions, cannot succeed without the total crushing failure of the military and the state. Hemingway's conclusion was likely inspired by his time researching and writing *A Farewell to Arms*, a novel which prominently features the harrowing and mishandled defeat of the Italian military at Caporetto in October 1917. Having studied such a crushing defeat, Hemingway's assertion that “there can never be a Communist revolution without, first, a complete military debacle” remains consistent with his past observations (*BL* 180). Indeed, following his acknowledgement of this defeatism, Hemingway instantly references Caporetto.

Hemingway's consistent return to the political arenas of WWI and the post-war years is indicative of his individualist sense of truth and the importance of first-hand experience, but that very sense of truth is troubled by a profound interest in recorded history and its sustained

political efficacy. Referring to the conditions that produced revolutionary dissent in the late years of the war, Hemingway appeals to a sentiment he shared with Percival in December 1933: “It’s very hard to get anything true on anything you haven’t seen yourself because the ones that fail have such a bad press and the winners always lie” (*GHOA* 139). You can only trust what you see yourself, he argues. Yet, certainly Hemingway was not at Caporetto (having arrived in Italy in June 1918—almost eight months after the retreat), he was not in Paris when veterans marched against Clemenceau, nor in Germany; but through his work as a journalist he was able to gain strong impressions from the major players in these events and understand their motivations—to discover “who are merely the players and who are the owners”—or so he claims (*BL* 180). While there is a little room to argue for witness via proxy in the case of Clemenceau or Caporetto, Hemingway further complicates his own appeal to individualistic truth by drawing heavily from recorded history. For example, Hemingway’s interest in revolutions extends back to the Franco-Prussian war and the decisive defeat of French forces at Sedan. This defeat resulted in the capture of Napoleon III in 1870, and five months after Sedan the war concluded and the second French Empire was overthrown. Such revolutionary activity occurred some 29 years before Hemingway was born totally barring any opportunity for the writer to have seen and drawn conclusions for himself. Yet, the value of first-hand experience remains a sort of staple in his revolutionary thinking.

Hemingway’s approach to revolutionary politics as it appears in “Old Newsman Writes” returns to a familiar sense of individualism, but it fails to maintain the individuality touted. Slipping from discussions of journalism to the life of a novelist, Hemingway writes that “[Y]ou must be prepared to work always without applause. When you are excited about something is when the first draft is done. But no one can see it until you have gone over it again and again”

(BL 185). The life of a writer, Hemingway argues, is a very lonely one. He espouses a mistrust of politics and implies that writers who turn to political parties are taking an easy route, are afraid of real writing, and want friends. This assertion is potentially hypocritical, but certainly out of touch. Take for instance the communists in Italy who faced murderous violence from the Blackshirts by virtue of their political allegiance; should their alignment with a political party be considered shallow or a cop-out when it runs the risk of death? Hemingway, for his part, focused more on the literary retinue of left leaning writers who weren't caught up in the street warfare or prisons, and yet, a certain hypocrisy remains quietly relevant. Criticism of political involvement becomes peculiar when it comes from the writer who critiqued Poincaré and Daudet, wrote openly about the disintegration of Italy under Mussolini and fascism, and buried poignant and piercing political criticism in his fiction. What's more, the first half of "Old Newsman Writes" serves to boast Hemingway's political literacy and awareness. He critiques journalists for lacking real political understanding while implying that his journalistic endeavors had been potent and savvy—even political? In his criticisms of conservatism and fascism in the post-war years Hemingway generally located his sympathies with working classes: the working classes in Germany and France affected by the occupation of the Ruhr, the working classes who will face repercussions for the tenuous economic relationship between the fascists and the crown in Italy as well as the working classes identifying in socialist resistance who are murdered by fascist street gangs. His focus on proletarian concerns is maybe echoed in the left literary flank, but Hemingway asserts his own heightened authority on matters, both alienating and stand-offish. Granted, such a reading is a bit ungenerous as Hemingway, despite clear appeals to proletarian (and thus traditionally 'left' leaning politics) concerns, made his political critiques under no explicit banner or party and with little affiliation other than the publications paying for

his byline. While not the lonely lighthouse of political criticism that Hemingway casts himself as in “Newsman,” he remains far afield of the leftist literary wing that he criticizes. “Old Newsman” reveals the bitterness inherent in Hemingway’s individualism and the unstable ground on which it stands.

Hemingway’s isolationist stances, as derived from the 1920s, were grounded primarily on dissatisfaction and alienation from corrupt governing forces, and while these political realities persisted and worsened through the 1930s, he began turning criticism upon others in the literary world more openly—a bitter and thoroughly lonely development in his isolationism. Often the distance felt between Hemingway’s 1920s protagonists and the textual worlds they inhabit occurred outside of their control. Jake Barnes’ wartime castration creates a barrier between him and Brett; Frederic Henry—despite great efforts to escape to a new life with Catherine—loses his wife and child, ending the novel alone. Hemingway’s journalism from the early ‘20s illustrates his frustration with politics and with national responses to World War I and the treatment of the working class. His frustration appears in the icebergs of his ‘20s works and is often a key factor in his protagonist’s alienation. By 1934 Hemingway had internalized the alienation that stemmed from the previous decade, but rather than brood like Jake or Frederic, he criticized from his newfound vantages.

Much of Hemingway’s work in the early 1930s is nonfiction, and in these works he more openly critiques other writers and critics. Gone are Jake’s subtle observations about his gaggle of literary types (types he struggles to separate himself from), with Hemingway opting instead for more outright claims of literary superiority and political efficacy. Explaining that he had, as a ‘working journalist’ rather than a columnist, had to write about the devastation and aftermath of World War I while columnists wrote about “himself, his child, what he thought and how he

thought it,” Hemingway implies a long-standing authenticity over columnists who only recently taken “over the world’s troubles” (*BL* 179). Clearly, the suspicious isolation of Hemingway’s 1920s beliefs, usually aimed at governing forces, had found a new target in the popular politics of the literary left.

Although many characters and protagonists (one only needs to think of Nick Adams’ detached panic attacks and automatic ramblings in “A Way You’ll Never Be”) remain alienated in the writer’s ‘30s compositions, the alienation that typified his earlier work had begun to turn bitter. Instead of being forced apart from society, Hemingway attempts to draw a line between himself and other politically minded writers and critics. Perhaps no longer alienated, he seeks to set *himself* apart; to take control. This is evident in “Old Newsman” when he details the loneliness of writing and advocates for avoiding the shallow friendliness of politics. It is evident in his 1933 Safari. The Safari saw Hemingway try to prove his individualism through intense hunting scenarios, and yet he was never able to avoid the political/revolutionary/literary talk from which he tries to distance himself. His individualism is not, by any measure, devoid of politics. It does not deter him from criticizing fascism in Europe nor the New Deal and reform work in the United States. It does not restrict him from witnessing and taking interest in the Cuban revolution. With fascism growing in strength and the Great Depression squeezing the economy, writers, critics, hunters, and nations alike began to take sides in the early ‘30s; Hemingway, aiming to remain true to his isolationism, rejected the saber rattling.

The political dimensions of Hemingway’s isolationism were influenced by his antifascism, and in criticizing the warmongering of fascist regimes, Hemingway carries forward the thesis of *A Farewell to Arms* while attempting to prove the political efficacy of his isolationism—no matter how bitter it may be. Hemingway’s 1935 essay “Notes on the Next

War: A Serious Topical Letter” channels his bitter isolationism into contemporary settings both in Europe and in Africa. The letter provides a logical continuation of the ideals of separate peace and desertion espoused by *A Farewell to Arms* with warnings of the murderous realities of war and a logic that holds totalitarianism in utter contempt. Hemingway’s central argument in the ‘letter’ is that a general European war is coming very soon and Americans would do well—anyone would do well—to stay out of it. As is no surprise, Hemingway again unveils his apt political understanding and breaks down the two major causes of this coming war. He argues that the fascist despots helming Germany and Italy are failing to adequately govern their nations, and this mismanagement necessitates war. Italy would begin a war of aggression on 3 October, 1935 in Ethiopia, an African state meant to be protected by the League of Nations. Writing about a month before the invasion, Hemingway criticizes it—blaming Mussolini specifically: “he plans to use planes against a people who have none and machine guns, flame projectors, gas, and modern artillery against bows and arrows, spears, and native cavalry armed with carbines” (*BL* 207). Hemingway suspects that Mussolini is waging this war to stir patriotic fervor, and because it would be easier than instigating conflict in Europe. Indeed, the symbolic importance of the war for Mussolini’s fascist regime was clearly revealed when, on 15 October, 1935 Italian forces occupied the Ethiopian capital city Axum, looting cultural artifacts like the Obelisk of Axum which was displayed in Rome as a repulsive testament to Italian military strength and conquest.

Hemingway’s endorsement of individualism and isolationism produces a complicated nexus of nation-nation, subject-subject, and subject-nation relations that complicate his politics and ultimately point to an uncomfortable truth of isolationism. Although Hemingway writes of the next war as essentially inevitable, he contends that it may be held off if Italy remains tied up in Africa and provided something “happen to Hitler,” and yet regardless of when it arrives he

warns Americans to avoid getting “sucked in” to the war (*BL* 212). This document is perhaps one of Hemingway’s most explicit critiques against war, and it is consistent with past writings linking war to fascist governing. But, the text retains a strange frustration with itself that points to the uneasy conflicts that typify Hemingway’s politics in the early 1930s. Operating on two fronts, Hemingway appeals both to national sentiment and to the individual subjects who would be responsible for fighting the coming wars. The nation—for Hemingway, the United States—must stay out of the war. Thus, in a nation-nation relationship, each nation must remain isolated from the other. In this argument and following the logics of Hemingway’s politics as they have developed thus far, the nation becomes a symbol or supplement for the individual subject. Just as Hemingway opts out of politics and the friends it may provide, relying instead upon himself in the lonely act of writing what is ‘true,’ the United States must opt out of the politics of Europe, for “[N]o European country is our friend nor has been since the last war and no country but one’s own is worth fighting for” (*BL* 206). In this web of Hemingway ideology and politics, the individual is paramount, even in metaphor. Provided the national metaphor does not interest his readership, he appeals to individual men specifically. You will die, he seems to argue, and it will be bloody and painful and horrific, and all for nothing. Hemingway tells his readers that in dying for one’s country “there is nothing sweet nor fitting... You will die like a dog for no good reason” (*BL* 209). Hemingway’s logic becomes characteristically contradictory. The important throughline in the text, however, indicates the necessity of avoiding war in as many contexts and relations as possible. The brutal act of killing is manifested in a terrifying subject-subject relationship, Hemingway’s warning against dying for a nation implies a subject-nation relationship as well. In every instance, isolation for the sake of individualism is key. The nexus of isolation further complicates, but in doing so arrives closer to Hemingway’s apparent political

stances. The United States must not enter a foreign war and must remain alone; further, the American citizen must not be tricked into dying for his country—he must remain alone even from the nation. Here, clearly, the individual’s right to life and to choose not to fight are of central importance to Hemingway. It is a stance well in-line with the bitter isolationist he has become, and yet he, perhaps unknowingly, criticizes exactly where such an approach can lead.

The ultimate realization of the nation as an individual is, perhaps, embodied in the role of the dictator; a role within a regime in which one ruler *becomes* the state, controls it totally, operates in their own interest primarily—operates as individual. Hemingway, paradoxically, is well aware of this fact. Warning of Hitler’s fanatical desire for a war of revenge, Hemingway elaborates on the governments of Europe with an implicit endorsement of democracy: “France is a country and Great Britain is several countries but Italy is a man, Mussolini, and Germany is a man, Hitler. A man has ambitions, a man rules until he gets in economic trouble; he tries to get out of this trouble by war” (*BL* 209). How does the text contend with its uneasy disagreement with itself? It becomes a matter of settling the political tension Hemingway has constructed within himself. Having been attracted to the heroics of the Arditi as a young man, and romantically grafting righteous vigilante tendencies to them, a young Hemingway sought to satiate his belief in the efficacy of the individual in militarism. But, as he began to understand the conditions that produce war and grapple with his own horrific experiences in Italy, his romanticism gave way to alienation, which, in the early years of the ‘30s had produced an isolationism still bitterly holding on to the efficacy of the individual. He remains politically engaged, but refuses allies opting to sit atop and hoard his own observations and perspectives. Hemingway’s approach to politics may be as self-destructive as the fascist dictatorships he criticizes. He seems keen to criticize all, and his own rampant individualism cannot be sustained

if not for chastising critics and writers he deems fashionable or governments he cannot abide by. While his criticisms are frequently prescient and were often vindicated, Hemingway's inability to cultivate allies leaves him lonely in politics and, more importantly, lonely in resistance.

"Notes on the Next War" becomes indicative, then, of a different Hemingway iceberg; one which reveals the underside of his own thinking rather than that of a fictive subject. His endorsement of isolation and individualism is admirable, but dangerously romantic. Romantic especially in the face of the growing threat of fascism, an ideology sustained on conquest and so volatile that if allowed to proceed unchecked it is liable to rend the world into violence, war, and oppression. The individualism Hemingway espouses is democratic in character, within the contradictions of his beliefs is an appeal to every individual acting in their best interests, individual and free to choose. While blatantly ignoring the necessity of collective action to sustain liberty, Hemingway's insistence upon isolationism becomes self-destructive, and even enables the egotistical despots he condemns. As conflicts proliferated in the coming years, the bitter isolationist Hemingway had become would prove ineffective in the fight against fascism forcing the writer to rethink his politics and consider what lies outside the individual.

Defender of Veterans, Against Fashionable Politics

If Hemingway desired some sort of identification with any collective throughout his life, he likely sought identification with veterans, a diverse group of individuals that Hemingway imagined as class unto itself. Often in his discussion of revolutionary politics during World War I he cites veterans and active-duty soldiers as the disenfranchised and manipulated men who, tired of the unjust war, opposed their governments. Many of his fictive protagonists are veterans, including Nick Adams the quasi-autobiographical short story protagonist who is often used as a

vehicle for the author to interrogate and editorialize his own experiences. Unsurprisingly, Hemingway is fascinated by warriors and longs to see himself reflected in them. This fascination drives a sort of advocacy for veterans in Hemingway, and he defends them against government indifference while criticizing the corruption that produced them in the first place. For Hemingway the veteran as a warrior symbolizes the opposite of fashionable literary politics. While Hemingway's fascination with warriors does expand beyond just veterans, his association with their ability to endure hardship remains a fixed point in his political thinking in the early '30s. His awe of warrior-artist Luis Quintanilla, exemplified prepared introductions to Quintanilla's work in 1934, further reveals that, to Hemingway, the fighter is the figure who opposes the fashionable politics he so detests and gets to the real work of opposing tyranny. Hemingway's praise of Quintanilla, however, contradicts his assertions that there is no reason to die for one's country (a notion which, itself, goes against his assertion that the only country worth fighting for is one's own). While Hemingway's interest in real work opposing oppression signals a growing acceptance of the necessity to fight, his frequent victimization of veterans indicates a justified fear of the results of conflict. What's more, Hemingway's persistent alienation from the soldiers he admires and his continued criticism of the fashionable writers and critics leave him—still—in an isolationist position.

Taking aim at the critics of the literary left emerging in the new decade, Hemingway uses nonfiction works like *Green Hills of Africa* to stake out a space in his politics that accounts for 'truth', and the necessity to pursue it artistically. Hemingway felt revulsion when considering the popular political faction growing within the literary scene. Perhaps out of frustration, having been writing politically relevant material for a decade prior to the emergence of this faction, Hemingway distanced himself and *frequently* criticized the newly enlightened. Turning to

politics is a shortcut for writers, Hemingway argues writing that, “a writer can make himself a nice career while he is alive by espousing a political cause” and “anybody is cheating who takes politics as a way out” (*BL* 183). For Hemingway, good writing comes from writing what is true. While this necessitates a political dimension, Hemingway rejects it *as* political. Whether this is true or not is beside the point. It indicates that Hemingway is willing to discuss and portray politics as they affect subjects through his understanding of the real world; but he is wary of affiliation and movements. Hemingway subtly boasts his own long-held political knowledge while blasting critics warning future writers to not get sucked “in to start writing about the proletariat, if you aren’t from the proletariat, just to please the recently politically enlightened critics” (*BL* 184). The qualification ‘*recent*’ appears moderately petty—though not unjustified—and indicates that Hemingway’s political involvement is not so recent and, perhaps, more authentic. Only three years later, in his closest foray into the proletarian novel *To Have and Have Not* (1937), Hemingway continues to criticize the phony leftists, despite motioning towards a more collective notion of political action. Sections of the novel are dedicated to the ‘Haves’, a gaggle of tropes and caricatures meant to represent the types of literary crowds Hemingway had come to know and critique. Prominent among the cast is Richard Gordon, a writer who embodies “the hypocrisy Hemingway attributed to the politically motivated authors he bashed in *Green Hills of Africa* and assorted *Esquire* essays” (Curnutt xxxii). Perhaps based on a mistrust of newly political writers and critics, or frustrated with a lack of recognition for the political relevance of his earlier work, or even indicative of a deeper interest in working alone, Hemingway rejected the fashionable politics of the early ‘30s, instead attempting to throw in his lot with the veterans and revolutionaries he empathized with and encountered.

Hemingway's interest and advocacy for veterans would take the form of a scathing criticism of the United States Federal Government in response to the neglectful treatment of the Bonus Army and the mass death of these soldiers. From August 29 to September 10, 1935 the Great Labor Day Hurricane ravaged Florida and parts of the American South causing vast damage to reform projects, homes, and property. The damage was severe, and the storm is known as the most powerful Atlantic hurricane to ever make landfall in the United States (Henson). Of the many victims, groups of Veteran's camps established in southern Florida near Hemingway's beloved Key West were practically obliterated killing two hundred and fifty-nine veterans. It was a catastrophe; one that Ernest Hemingway found strikingly reprehensible and avoidable. By 17 September, 1935 Hemingway had penned a response entitled "Who Murdered the Vets? A First-Hand Report on the Florida Hurricane." Published in the Marxist magazine *The New Masses*, the article does not simply recount the event or attempt to eulogize the veterans caught in the storm. Instead Hemingway takes a political stance outright blaming the Federal government including President Roosevelt and Federal Emergency Relief Administration (FERA) director Harry L. Hopkins. Although they are rarely explicitly named, their actions charge "Who Murdered the Vets" with righteous anger and disgusted outrage.

Hemingway moves angrily and spitefully through the aftermath of the hurricane, questioning the choices that led to the catastrophe. He asks, "[W]ho sent nearly a thousand war veterans, many of them husky, hardworking and simply out of luck, but many of them close to the border of pathological cases, to live in the frame shacks on the Florida Keys in hurricane months?" (*HMF* 46). The answer, as Hemingway would know is that disenfranchised veterans had been plaguing Washington D.C., since the bonus marches of 1932 and 1933, and the government had been antsy to dispose of them. To deal with the transient veterans, the federal

government shipped them down to the Florida Keys to work on relief projects in the fall of 1934. The project, as referred to by Hemingway, did not provide much relief while the veterans earned “a top wage of \$45 a month” (*HMF* 44). Hemingway implies that this wage is unlivable, noting that one man may spend upwards of fifty-two dollars in one instance simply to try and preserve a boat—while the government endangers everyone by hatching down a ship merely with ring bolts ahead of the storm. Hemingway continues to ask questions implicating the federal government, staking out clear political ground but doing so for the veterans for whom he had long advocated.

Veterans in “Who Murdered the Vets” exist as a class unto themselves. Hemingway separates them from the “wealthy people, yachtsmen, fisherman such as President Hoover and President Roosevelt” who take advantage of the Florida Keys for recreation but avoid it during the dangerous hurricane season. There is an economic argument implicit in Hemingway’s reasoning and critique that aligns both himself and the veterans he is writing about with a popular wave of leftist politics cresting by 1935. But Hemingway does not give into the class of writers and critics who make up the popular left either. A bold position, as the report appeared in *New Masses* the communist journal. Hemingway argues that the fashionable writers of the proletariat would not stomach the work of recovering from the hurricane and implies that their only interest in the hurricane may very well be aesthetic. Detailing the horrific scenes left in the hurricane’s wake Hemingway sneers, “[A]nd you could make a note of it for your next novel and how is your next novel coming, brother writer, comrade s—t?” (*HMF* 47). The veterans Hemingway advocates for are not the politicians, uncaring and inept. They are not the rich tourists who can run away from the hurricane season, and they are not the literary leftists who

Hemingway scorns as weak, shallow, and unable to do real work. Through his advocacy for the veterans left to die in the Florida Keys, Hemingway identifies a class unto itself.

Veterans do not, of course, appear only in “Who Murdered the Vets,” though they are frequently portrayed as victims in Hemingway’s work. While Hemingway’s respect for veterans seems to come from their ability to work hard (fighting through cruel and grueling conditions, working underpaid manual labor, etc.), his portrayal of them as victims stems from an anti-war perspective. The excruciating conditions of war are what produce the types of veterans that Hemingway became acquainted with at Sloppy Joe’s (*HMF* 47).

The veterans in the Florida Keys were particularly victims in Hemingway’s eyes, and he once again colorfully depicted them in *To Have and Have Not*’s “nightmarish episode with the Matecumbe veterans” (Curnutt xlv). Set at the popular Freddy’s Bar, Hemingway’s terrifying portrayal of the veterans pushed down and abandoned on the Florida Keys is full of both Hemingway’s admiration for veterans and his fear of what results from war. In addition, just as he had portrayed veterans in “Who Murdered the Vets” as a class unto themselves and potentially opposed to the literary leftists, Hemingway drops faux proletariat writer Richard Gordon into the nightmare. The violent beat downs, aggressive drinking, conning, misogynistic rambling, and gruff impotent anger that is unleashed in Freddy’s Bar launch themselves at readers, and at Gordon, one after the other like a succession of punches until the reader is left against the wall cool and soaking it all in. The scene is crowded, palpably so. Dialogue is confused, with Richard Gordon as the focal point of the narrative bouncing between a conversation with three veterans— one of which is a communist named Nelson Jacks—and witnessing men get brutalized for alleged transgressions. Two veterans, a red-headed vet who

can ‘take it’ and another who dishes out punches dominate conversation and pester Gordon to buy them rounds of beer at alarming frequency.

Hemingway questions whether war attracts or produces the types who make up the veterans in the Keys, and his conclusions reflect the anti-war position he had taken up during the 1930s. *To Have and Have Not* is set prior to the Great Labor Day Hurricane, but these men are easily identifiable as those who would go on to perish in the catastrophe. Through the voice of communist Nelson Jacks Hemingway proposes a fundamental question: “whether only people like ourselves here are fitted to be soldiers or whether the different services have formed us” (205). Jacks seems to believe, perhaps ironically, that the men working the relief projects and terrorizing the Keys would’ve wound up much the same way without the war. Hemingway himself begged to differ, essentially saying so in “Who Murdered the Vets” referring to the veterans rather explicitly as “what you get after a war” (*HMF* 47). And so, traumatized, uprooted, disenfranchised by their military service and pushed from place to place by a neglectful government, the veterans in *To Have and Have Not*’s “only freedom is to beat each other up in gruesome effort to show who can take the most pain” (Curnutt 161). Hemingway’s portrayal of veterans as gruesome victims of the war is starkly anti-war. His victimization of soldiers is thus mostly in line with his isolationist beliefs as displayed in “Old Newsman Writes” and especially in “Notes on the Next War.” Depressingly, the violence of war—already violent events perpetuated by corrupt politicians in Hemingway’s thinking—creates violent and debilitating impulses in the veterans Hemingway holds in much esteem. While empathetic, this portrayal of victimization restricts Hemingway from acknowledging the value of violent resistance in political discourse.

Certainly his portrayal of the veterans in *To Have and Have Not* shows a more mature reflection on the effects of war than his young fascination with the Arditi ever could, yet the nightmare of Freddy's Bar strikes a dramatic and terrifying departure from even the lonely and alienated veterans of *The Sun Also Rises*, "Soldier's Home," "In Another Country" or *A Farewell to Arms*. Still, something of Hemingway's original fascination with soldiers and veterans remains close to his beliefs, knocking about and conflicting with his anti-war stances. Throughout the 1930s there was still an interest in conflict for Hemingway and a compulsory romanticization of the labor of combat. This quietly persistent interest in revolt expresses itself in Hemingway's admiration for Spanish painter turned revolutionary Luis Quintanilla.

In October 1934 political tensions in Spain reached a breaking point leading to several unions across the country—though notably in Asturias, a region in Northern Spain—revolting against the government. The revolution, as Hemingway himself notes in an introduction to Quintanilla's work written for an exhibition he helped to organize at New York's Pierre Matisse Gallery, was not a success. In Asturia, union members were summarily executed under the leadership of Eduardo López Ochoa. Francisco Franco, the future despot of Spain, was placed in charge of quelling the insurrection and supplied Ochoa with troops from Spain's colonial efforts in Morocco. Perhaps caught up in it, though likely involved much deeper, Luis Quintanilla, having ties to the left-leaning *Buffet Italiano*² and a member of the Revolutionary Committee was arrested in Madrid on 5 October, 1934. Artists responded in shock at the treatment of the painter; Hemingway and John Dos Passos began collecting signatures for an appeal to the president of the Spanish Republic and began organizing to showcase some of Quintanilla's art.

² The *Buffet Italiano* refers to a group of Spanish intellectuals who frequently met at the *Buffet Italiano* restaurant and would go on to become the political leaders of the Spanish Republic at the time of Franco's insurrection; apocryphally, Hemingway is said to have witnessed the drafting of a Spanish constitution while dining among this group.

The introduction Hemingway wrote to the 1934 exhibition of Quintanilla's work describes Quintanilla's revolutionary activities. Hemingway references the revolutionary activity that led to the abdication of the Spanish monarchy in 1931 and praises Quintanilla's courage, writing that it was "Quintanilla in whose apartment the arms were stored when it was not known that it would be a bloodless revolution that sent out [Spanish King] Alfonso [XIII], Quintanilla who raised the republican flag over the royal palace, climbing up and running it up with his own hands" (*HMF* 32). For Hemingway, Quintanilla represents the reality and the hard work that the followers of fashionable leftist politics consistently fall short of.

The opposition that Hemingway reads between Quintanilla's actions and those of popular leftists is heavily reliant upon Hemingway's interest in authenticity, in action and in art. Recounting his invitation to a sort of posh literary tea engagement, Hemingway describes "a man who, since two years, cannot write fifty consecutive words without using the word revolution" (*HMF* 31). The arrogance of the literary tea party attendees speaking about revolution with little experience in the dangers involved becomes strikingly offensive to Hemingway, especially in light of Quintanilla's imprisonment. He proposes a tax on the word *revolution* so that only those who had "paid for the privilege" would be allowed to use it, since, like Quintanilla, those doing the good work of revolutions don't have much need to tout the word around (32). No, for Hemingway, Quintanilla lives the reality of revolution—not just in resistance, but in art as well. Quintanilla rises above other painters like Diego Rivera as his great frescoes contain "no symbols of capitalism, or any symbols in them" (*HMF* 32). Quintanilla's, Hemingway argues, work is *real*. It possesses no symbols, only presenting the truth of what is depicted. Perhaps an interpretive fallacy, suggesting that art can become truth, it is, no doubt, nevertheless what Hemingway aspires to in his writing. Here the aspiration to truth becomes an explicitly

revolutionary act in relation to Quintanilla. The pursuit of truth in art is, then, revolutionary, but it is certainly not the most dangerous act of revolution that Hemingway describes in the Introduction. Hemingway criticizes, “all those who write the word [revolution] and never have shot nor been shot at; who never have stored arms nor filled a bomb, nor have discovered arms nor had a bomb burst among them; never have gone hungry in a general strike, nor have manned streetcars when the tracks are dynamited,” and so it goes (*HMF* 32). Readers may leave the text with the idea that Hemingway himself participated in such acts. Whether this is true or not—and works like Nicholas Reynolds’ *Writer, Sailor, Soldier, Spy: Ernest Hemingway’s Secret Adventures, 1935-1961* and Peter Moreira’s *Hemingway on the China Front: His WWII Spy Mission with Martha Gellhorn* have offered compelling evidence that Hemingway was on several occasions drafted into genuine spy work—Hemingway’s point is clearly that real revolutionary activity happens in the real world, not just on the page.

Hemingway’s identification with Quintanilla and the violent action of revolution is not dissimilar to his attempted identification with veterans, though it introduces the importance of artistic resistance. For most of his life Hemingway had sought after some identification with soldiers. As a young man he was infatuated with the Arditi, the Italian shock troops of World War I. While this infatuation grew hollow with his recognition that governments led men to war for corrupt, ridiculous, and futile reasons, Hemingway’s veteran protagonists throughout the 1920s indicated a prolonged fascination with soldiers and a desire to identify with them. Much like his advocacy for the Metacumbe veterans, Hemingway’s defense and admiration for Quintanilla springs from the painter’s capacity to endure hardship and is linked to the authenticity of action and artistry needed for successful revolution-making. The Metacumbe veterans, as portrayed by Hemingway, oppose the popular leftists and corrupt governments by

nature of their condition. Hemingway portrays them as victims, and while his interest is derived from a place of empathy, it necessarily lacks targeted resistance. The veteran communist Nelson Jacks sums up Hemingway's portrayal of veterans aptly, telling Richard Gordon that, "it's tough to try to do anything with [veterans] because we have been beaten so far that the only solace is booze and the only pride is in being able to take it" (206). Quintanilla, as an artist and freedom fighter, opposes corruption and popular politics far more actively and through means more available to Hemingway. His own appeals to writing what is true and authentic mimic his assertion that Quintanilla's work possesses no symbolism; it presents reality and struggle and resistance. And yet, while the artistic resistance of Quintanilla is a praxis far more available to Hemingway, his discussion of bombs, shootouts, and hunger strikes hint at a grim desire to witness and revere authentic struggle through violent means. Thus, Hemingway's politics in isolation maintain an ambivalence typical of his thinking.

Treating Quintanilla, Hemingway associates artistic authenticity with violent insurrection and yet his portrayals of veterans, stemming from anxieties surrounding war and its outcomes, restricts him from totally endorsing violent revolution—despite the mounting military oppression of European fascists. The ambivalence gridlocks Hemingway. He attempts to defend the position of his art as political while persistently jabbing at 'phony' liberals but is naggingly alienated from the conflict he macabrely hints as necessary in revolution. While he clearly recognizes the threats of fascism, as evident throughout his work in the '20s and clearly outlined in "Notes on the Next War," he retains a political ambivalence concerning the means of resistance. Regardless of this internal disparity, Hemingway continues to differentiate himself from the popular leftists of his time remaining bitterly isolated. Hemingway's persistent alienation from soldiers, veterans, and revolutionaries blocks any meaningful identification for

the writer with those he seems to long to be among. Although his embrace of Quintanilla signals a growing space for necessary violence against oppression, his anxieties surrounding war and his isolationist stances remain restricting.

To Hemingway, veterans symbolize the opposite of fashionable politics, especially those of World War I who fought, sometimes without even believing in the fight. Hemingway may still wish to identify with the veterans but remains ultimately alienated. Despite the potential fear of war and its results implied by his frequent victimization of veterans, Hemingway's interest in freedom fighting reveals a widening space in his politics for violent intervention. This small space for freedom fighting stands in opposition to his usual isolationist stances, though, in the early '30s, he seems to still hold back from endorsing military intervention completely. While Hemingway's criticism of fashionable politics and continued alienation from veterans necessitates a prolonging of his isolationist stances, it was only a matter of time before he'd see the failings of one man alone.

No Man Alone Now

1936 would prove to be a tumultuous year for Hemingway as he battled depression and anxiety over his work, completed *To Have and Have Not*, and grew distracted with the revolt of Spanish nationalists that sparked off the Spanish Civil War. Nearing a decade since his last novel, Hemingway worked as he traveled to finish *To Have and Have Not*, a novel that, in theory, would have bridged and grappled with such a complexity of contemporary issues that scholars often refer to it—as Hemingway initially conceived it to be—as “a *War and Peace* in miniature” (Reynolds, *the 1930s* 233). The original text would have treated the titular ‘haves’ with much more depth, but sweeping cuts and edits barred this version of the text from reaching

publication. Dinner parties, a more in-depth reflection on the petty infidelity of the wealthy, an entire section depicting the ‘haves’ travelling across the Gulf of Mexico to deliver TNT for a Cuban bridge blowing mission was scrapped. Hemingway, typically frustrated with the retinue of ‘phony’ literary types surrounding him, stocked these early versions of the novel with unsympathetic portrayals of real people sparking some concern with Max Perkins, who was fresh out of a libel suit with Tom Wolfe. With libel concerns and distracted interests, the final product was a stripped down shell of Hemingway’s initial plans—though the striking downward spiral of protagonist Harry Morgan’s individualist code indicated some kind of sea change in Hemingway’s thinking. Despite the sweeping cuts to the novel’s contents, it remains politically charged, maybe one of Hemingway’s most explicitly political works of fiction. As such, the novel retains some of the internal conflicts that typified Hemingway’s political thinking in the first half of the 1930s. Depicting a literary crowd that is lazy, self-centered, petty, and thoroughly out of touch with the plight of the working class, Hemingway remains consistent with his revulsion toward the followers of fashionable politics. Yet, conveys a thesis so unlike Hemingway’s righteous individualism. Through the terrible fate of Harry Morgan, Hemingway had begun to realize that his bitter lonely stand—the isolation he had insisted upon—may very well spell doom in the face of fascism.

While narrators and perspectives shift in a rather eclectic but artful way, *To Have and Have Not* features Harry Morgan as very nearly the novel’s protagonist. Morgan, introduced in the 1934 short story entitled “One Trip Across” (a short story which would go on to serve as the first chapter of the finished novel), is much like any other Hemingway protagonist upon first glance. He is mostly cool under pressure, witnessing a bloody shootout on the streets of Havana and going on to work almost uncaring, save the brief acknowledgement that the whole event

made him “feel pretty bad” (*THHN* 8). Throughout Part One of *To Have and Have Not*, Morgan seems collected, on top of the situations he finds himself in, and mostly, alone. He makes decisive choices quickly, exemplified by his brutal killing of the Chinese human trafficker ‘Mr. Sing.’ Harry Morgan is not a rich man and, after being conned out of money by a comparatively rich tourist, he takes shady jobs to get the money together in order to sail the Gulf and make it home. While Harry has the winning determination of some of Hemingway’s most beloved protagonists, very quickly Hemingway reveals the slow wave of the depression encroaching on his freedoms.

While Morgan becomes the literal speaker of Hemingway's turn away from isolation, his own politics are deeply conflicted. Staunchly independent, Harry’s only intimate friendship is with his wife, Marie. His independence is exacerbated through the traffic of the ships under his command. In Part One he allows eleven Chinese immigrants aboard his ship, but almost immediately kicks them off. After being hired by Cuban revolutionaries to aid in escaping after a bank robbery, Harry murders the the revolutionaries within hours of their boarding. Nobody stays on Morgan’s ship for very long. He is a loner, practically habitually. While listening to Emilio, one of the Cuban revolutionaries he’d soon kill, Morgan thinks to himself “F— his revolution.... All I got to do is make a living for my family and I can’t do that. Then he tells me about his revolution. The hell with his revolution” (168). Lost in the storm of the depression, Morgan wants desperately to care for himself and his wife (maybe to a lesser extent his daughters, who are frequently the brunt of jokes and insensitive language on the part of Harry and his wife), but he cannot see the political ramifications that restrict him achieving that goal. Harry Morgan’s insistence on the efficacy of individualism, on doing things his way, is starkly contrasted by his final words motioning, downright declaring, the need for collective resistance.

Beaten down and suffering from a fatal gunshot wound to the stomach, Harry Morgan attempts to share his epiphany in his final moments of literary lucidity. Stumbling over his words and struggling to speak for pages, he finally utters the words clearly and becomes the bearer of Hemingway's message for the text. Lying on a Coast Guard ship and close to death, Harry explains, "No matter how a man alone ain't got no bloody fucking chance" (225). Harry suddenly rejects the individualism he has lived by throughout the novel. Of course, in many ways, it is an ideology that has led to his death, though his situation was certainly exacerbated by the economic crisis of the Great Depression. While scholars differ on interpretations of the declaration, the Coast Guardsmen who watch over Morgan interestingly cannot understand him. Maybe patronizingly, Hemingway seems to suggest that the message Morgan carries is strange, difficult, and ultimately inaccessible to the average man. Perhaps it is a projection. Hemingway, having been disappointed, alienated, bitter, and isolated had taken a long time to realize the words he places upon Harry Morgan's tongue. The message, then, hard earned, becomes profound for the writer.

Harry Morgan is a clear inversion of typical Hemingway tropes and signals an earnest effort to grow and rethink the writer's approach to both his craft and the world around him. *To Have and Have Not* suggests that the heroic, bitter, strong, and independent protagonists that had fascinated Hemingway for over a decade could not survive the changes that the '30s brought on. Hemingway spent much of the '30s arguing—perhaps rightly—against the emerging political consciousness of the western literary scene. His staunch independence was a behavior rooted in his desire to produce good work certainly, but its petty manifestations occasionally indicate a counterproductive egotism that walled off the writer, preserving himself from political rot. Harry Morgan, as the subversion of a nearly classic Hemingway trope, indicates serious change

in the writer's approach. While his embrace of Quintanilla indicated a growing acceptance of the possibility for violence in the fight against tyranny, the realization that no man alone can succeed opens up the chance for the writer to engage in real cooperation against the fascists he had spent the last fifteen years critiquing.

Chapter 3

The Spanish Civil War is sometimes viewed as the event that awoke political sentiment in an otherwise apolitical Ernest Hemingway, however, a close look at the development of his political beliefs reveals that the war instead sparked passionate explosions of beliefs he had long-held and long-expressed. While Hemingway held an isolationist stance and avoided party affiliation, especially in the face of the fashionable politics of the literary left, he was never really apolitical. Thus, his political stances, developing at least since his formative experiences on the Italian front of World War I in 1918, were not composed entirely upon the battlefield of the Spanish Civil War. Rather, the political and ethical beliefs that Hemingway possessed prior to the Spanish Civil War were intensified and forced to passionate but characteristically ambivalent conclusions. Remaining at the center of Hemingway's political beliefs is his staunch opposition to fascism. Acknowledged in his essay for *Esquire* "Notes on the Next War," Hemingway was aware of a growing intensification of fascist instigated warfare in Europe and Africa. In 1935 he criticized Italian colonial efforts in Ethiopia and cautioned against further agitating conflict by meeting the fascists on the battlefield. But agitation from Italy, Germany, and Spain continued to ripple through European politics making it increasingly difficult for Hemingway to isolate himself from prospective political allies and the necessity of violent resistance. While the explosion of tensions that caused the Spanish Civil War, then, forced Hemingway's political development into a massive crescendo that may appear like a political awakening, acknowledging it as a continuation of Hemingway's political beliefs reveals shocking developments for the writer. Rather, it was the next stage of long held beliefs. Hemingway circumvented religious and familial conflicts of interest following a perhaps deeper held impulse to combat fascism with the means available to him. Hemingway was closer to the frontlines of a

war than he'd been since his time in Piave, and his proximity to death drove him to consider the ethical complications of killing. His reflections on killing are rooted in an ethical system influenced by hunting experiences, and manifest in his hunter heroes like Robert Jordan and Anselmo. Reflecting on the war, Hemingway writes to life a small community of freedom fighters—comfortably associated with but distanced from the government—all possessing various political behaviors and beliefs. These freedom fighters are engaged in a tangled web of truths and bias but united by the greatest necessity of all: to defeat fascism. The Spanish Civil War was not the conflict that produced Hemingway's politics; rather, it represents for the author a culmination of them.

Entering the War - A Period of Decisions

The Spanish Civil War was a complicated conflict that involved many moving parts, some of which presented barriers to Hemingway's involvement early on. On 17 July, 1936 a military revolt began across Spain in opposition to a recently elected government. The government held a precariously narrow majority, and while jailing individuals at-risk of staging a coup, it was not enough to stave off the impending conflict. The revolt against this new democratically elected government brought together soldiers, land owners, Catholics, and others under a nationalist fascist cause. Spearheaded by General Francisco Franco and the Falange, the revolt instigated a bloody and brutal civil war in Spain claiming around 500,000 lives. Franco had gained serious military experience and recognition for his efforts in the Rif War (1921-1926), a colonial war in Morocco. Once the youngest captain of the Spanish army, Franco had ascended to full command of the Spanish Foreign Legion by 1923, at the age of 31. While the uprising against the Spanish leftist popular front began in July 1936, Francisco Franco would be

selected as the head of the freshly formed Nationalist regime a few short months later in October. He would not release his position of leadership until his death in 1975. While the formal party known as the Falange had not been formed by Franco, his decree combining the Falange and Carlist parties into a single political party under his control in 1937 resulted in his name being widely associated with the movement. Further, Franco's nationalist forces received substantial aid from fascist states like Italy and Germany—unsurprisingly, as the Falangist employed fascist ideology and tactics encouraging quick allyship with other conservative dictators in Europe. Ernest Hemingway, having adored Spain and been opposed to fascism for over a decade by 1936, was devastated. Signing a contract with the North American Newspaper Alliance, Hemingway traveled to the front of the Spanish Civil War. His experiences during this conflict encouraged rapid political development of ideals he had long held. Troubling his involvement, however, was Hemingway's own Catholic faith and his anti-war stances. Thus, a number of motivations contended for his sympathies, placing Hemingway bizarrely in an arbitrary position to either choose his antifascism over his Catholicism, or just the inverse. Before he could draw from his experiences and discover the next phase of his antifascism, Hemingway needed to overcome his Catholicism and his devotion to anti-war politics.

Catholicism presented a barrier for Hemingway's involvement in the Spanish Civil War, though to what extent is debatable. While it may appear to have posed only a slight roadblock in Hemingway's path to political involvement in the Spanish Civil War, because of his attachment to his in-laws the Pfeiffers' and the religion, Catholic support of the Falange represented a barrier for the writer. Hemingway's own relationship with Catholicism is unique, and as Morris Buske argues, far more personally significant to him than the mere nominal understanding that is implicated in his marriage to Pauline Pfeiffer. Buske locates Hemingway's impulse to

Catholicism in his veneration for grandfather Earnest Hall's Episcopalian beliefs. These beliefs were predicated on a very personal and very spiritual relationship with the Christian god, and, according to Buske, led Hemingway to reject the harsh Protestantism of his father for Roman Catholicism while recovering from his mortar wounds in Italy. The nuance of tracking Hemingway's psychological development through childhood and relating this development to religious affiliation presents some difficulties. To what extent Earnest Hall's religious beliefs affected Hemingway is difficult to ascertain, but Buske's intervention does locate Hemingway's conversion far earlier than his marriage to Pauline, a significant point. Hemingway's Catholicism was apparently very personal, and this personal shielding may have allowed for his involvement in the Spanish Civil War without totally betraying his beliefs.

The politics of Spanish Catholicism are deep and complicated, but they grew more divisive as the Nationalists coopted the religion and Soviet involvement categorized Loyalists as 'godless'. Attempting to summarize some of the conflict and disconnect in an all-to- neat manner, Robert Jordan thinks to himself that "Spain has never been a Christian country. It has always had its own special idol worship within the church... The people had grown away from the Church because the Church was in the government and the government had always been rotten" (*FWBT* 362). Religion presented a frustrating divide in Spain during the civil war with the masses caught in between. While the consolidation of the Falange presented one development solidifying religious divides in the war, the involvement of the Soviet Union aiding the Republic and Spanish loyalists further strengthened the religious boundaries. The involvement of communists, battling once again their fascist foes, made Catholic involvement in Franco's nationalist cause even more politically necessary. The nationalists now fought to "return to the 'old order' and believed they were defending Christianity against the threat of

‘godless communism’” (Guill 30). It seems likely, then, that due to the explicitly religious politics of the Spanish Civil War and Hemingway’s supposedly personal attachment to Catholicism he possessed some level of conflict over the religious turmoil attached to the war.

The religious politics playing out in the Spanish Civil War were further exacerbated by reports that loyalist factions were responsible for brutally murdering Catholic clergy members and priests throughout Spain. The rear-guard atrocities and murders playing out across the country were—in fact—perpetrated by both loyalists and nationalists alike, but this did not belay the fact that “government supporters in the Republican held areas killed an estimated 49,000 people, including over 6,000 members of the Catholic clergy” (Guill 30). While Hemingway had once claimed to his mother-in-law that he needed the structure of the Catholic church, he quickly made the choice to support the Republic, meaning that in the wildly complex political spectrum of the Spanish Civil War, he had tossed in his lot with the Catholic-murdering loyalists. This choice was influenced by Hemingway’s long held antifascist beliefs and his deep attachment to Spain. He had criticized the dictatorship of Miguel Primo De Rivera, moved Republican propaganda through the country, and supported Luis Quintanilla in the aftermath of the leftist revolts in 1934. Despite his supposedly personal attachment to Catholicism and defensive letters to in-laws, Hemingway’s devotion to antifascism was deeply held and drove him to the aid the Republic.

In truth, the personal character of Hemingway’s Catholicism allows him a sort of individualism that usefully accounts for his ability to side with the Republic. Buske productively argues a distinction in Hemingway’s religious thinking that mirrors his approach to the popular literary left arguing while “Hemingway seems not to have felt close to the Catholic Church” that “Catholic belief is another matter” (86). Similar to his past staunch individualist politics,

Hemingway likely kept a distance between his inner religious life and the organized structure of the church. This distinction shielded him and allowed for the ambivalent contradictions of his interests in the Spanish Civil War to rest alongside each other, thus making space for Hemingway to side with the Loyalists, even if they had been criticized for the murder of Catholics. Fascinatingly, by disavowing the organized religious structure of Catholicism for an individualist personally spiritual relationship with the faith, Hemingway allows for himself to join the Soviet-led Loyalist forces—a political move out of line with his past isolationist withdrawals.

Remaining consistent with the politics Hemingway had developed covering the street warfare between the Italian communists and the fascist Blackshirts in the early '20s, as well as with the conclusions drawn from his prior studies of revolutions, Hemingway sides with working classes. Declaring his position and taking an important step into the political dimensions of the Spanish Civil War, Hemingway wrote to the Pfeiffer family that, “[T]he Reds may be as bad as they say but they are the people of the country versus the absentee landlords, the moors³, the Italians and the Germans” (*SL* 458). Despite his own personal conflicts, Hemingway had crossed out of isolationism and taken a side in the Spanish Civil War, but the writer still held onto his anti-war beliefs.

³ Hemingway’s mention of Moors is likely a reference to Moroccan fighters in Franco’s military force. This provides a bizarre link back to Spanish colonial efforts in Morocco, efforts exacerbated by the Rif War (1920-1927). While Hemingway had been critical of Spanish colonial efforts in the '20s, his positioning of Moroccan soldiers against ‘the people’ is interesting, especially as he indicates no recognition of the atrocities Moroccans had suffered under leaders like Franco.

The barrier to entry that Hemingway's anti-war stance presented would quickly fold as he became enmeshed in producing propaganda for the Loyalists and maintained Soviet hegemony in Spain. By 16 March, 1937 Hemingway had arrived in Madrid on his first trip to Spain during the civil war. With a contract from NANA and the intention of writing anti-war journalism, Hemingway lived out of the Hotel Florida in Madrid while traveling out to the front lines with Martha Gellhorn, an accomplished writer and journalist as well as Hemingway's newest lover, and Joris Ivens, a filmmaker with connections to the upper ranks of the Soviet military forces in Spain. Although he had made his choice to side with the loyalists by February 1937, Hemingway was still dedicated to the anti-war sentiment he espoused in "Notes on the Next War," specifically his belief that the United States should stay out of European wars. As Anton Nillson includes in "Ernest Hemingway and the Politics of the Spanish Civil War," Hemingway wrote to friends and family that he intended to "write anti-war correspondence that would help to keep [the Americans] out of it when it comes" (qtd. in text, 82). However, by the time Hemingway left Spain, arriving in Paris in May 1937, he had agreed to write and narrate Ivens' propaganda film *The Spanish Earth*. The film had the express purpose of garnering support for the loyalists, and Hemingway and Gellhorn would present the film to the Roosevelt administration, urging the American government to send military aid to the Spanish Republic. In other words, they urged them to get involved. Yet, the United States would not get involved in the conflict, nor would governments in the United Kingdom or France, despite the urgent warnings from journalists.

Hemingway was not radicalized by his experiences in Spain so much as his experiences reinforced political beliefs that had been building in the writer for much of his life. Witnessing the human toll of World War I and its aftermath, Hemingway's antifascism had been

predominantly contingent upon anti-war stances. Avoiding fascism, as detailed in “Notes on the Next War” played a key role in his thinking, but it was an idea formed on a privilege. Having traced Hemingway’s anti-war stances in the 1930s most explicitly from the themes instilled in *Frederic Henry*, Hemingway’s opting out of war is not so easily achieved. For every *Frederic Henry* the text presents there are at least three others who could not escape down the Tagliamento; who were murdered by the Carabinieri. Thus, Hemingway’s assertion that the best way to subvert fascism is to deny it the satisfaction of war is unsustainable and the Spanish Civil War proved that fascism could not be so easily ignored. And so, shifting away from the anti-war stances he had retained, Hemingway worked closely with the International Brigades and Soviet forces in Spain, garnering support, securing ambulances and medical gear, and producing propaganda.

Hemingway’s involvement with Soviet forces allowed the writer to take an important political stance in his career, but his obsession with thwarting fascism formed blind spots to some of the very dangers of political partisanship he had once criticized. Early in the war, the Republic military was comprised of militias, but this organizational structure was converted into a more centralized Popular Army. The structuring of this Popular Army was overseen by Soviet military intelligence personnel “ensuring the Kremlin’s lasting influence over the Republican war machine and state” (Nilsson 84). While overly simplified, the success of communism militarily and ideologically played a large role in the Soviet Union’s interest in Spain. With this in mind, the Servicio de Información Militar (SIM) was formed in 1937 as a “response to internal strife and aimed mainly at neutralizing opponents of the Communists” (Nilsson 87). Hemingway includes SIM in both *For Whom the Bell Tolls* and his play *The Fifth Column*. In the play, Philip Rawlings is a spy for SIM seeking fifth columnists—secretive fascists attempting

to steal information posing as loyalists. The play largely celebrates SIM operations, a choice that some scholars, such as Nilsson, have found troubling considering the purge of alternative leftist ideologies by SIM that was taking place. Hemingway's willingness to characterize fascists in reductively evil terms and imply that they walked among the loyalists of Madrid was, perhaps, reckless. The play's disinterest in specific political discussion while implying conspiracy is easily co-opted to neutralize competing leftist factions.

While fascism remained the greatest threat of all, Hemingway made troubling decisions in order to combat it in Spain. Acknowledging the terrible rear-guard violence enacted by loyalists in a long narration by Pilar in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, Hemingway—through Pilar—portrays Anarcho-Syndicalists as dangerous and reckless; they are poison to the movement. The portrayal of the Anarchists as dangerous reflects Hemingway's willingness to turn a blind eye to Soviet ideology in order to combat fascism. Similarly, Philip Rawlings is prepared to give his entire life to SIM and countering fascism, declaring to his accomplice Max that "We're in for fifty years of undeclared wars and I've signed up for the duration" (FC 80). Philip's bitterly romantic dedication to antifascism, especially in the context of SIM's leftist purging, tows the party line. It signals a dramatic shift from prior Hemingway political beliefs that had avoided party affiliation as often as possible. Still, there is a bitterness hidden in Philip's tone. He is forced to break off his relationship with his lover Dorothy, and his involvement in the 'undeclared wars' seems very nearly against his will. Hemingway's portrayal of Philip as willing to serve Soviet military goals to the bitter end is not solely unique to him either, as Pilar's portrayal of Anarchists in *For Whom the Bell Tolls* reflects a continued interest in soviet battlefield hegemony. In the nexus of conflicting opinions and various biases that the heroes of *For Whom the Bell Tolls* possess, they almost all unanimously agree that those in the red-and-

black scarves are fools, with Pilar going so far as to suggest that in “another revolution I believe they should be destroyed at the start” (130). While Hemingway had emerged into the politics insofar as he had selected a specific party to support in the Spanish Civil War, his unwavering dedication to antifascism did inspire a dangerous appeal to alternative forms of power and contributed to a disintegration of leftist solidarity on the Spanish front under Soviet hegemony.

While not the political emergence that it may appear, Hemingway’s involvement in the Spanish Civil War required the breakdown of religious and anti-war barriers and ultimately gave way to Hemingway’s involvement in a Soviet propaganda machine. These developments were navigated by the quick and important decisions Hemingway had to make when initially engaging with the war. While retaining some internal conflicts over his religious faith, Hemingway’s antifascist beliefs took precedent and he aligned himself with the Spanish Republic. Initially intending to write journalism that would discourage American involvement in the Spanish Civil War, by the end of his first two months in Spain, Hemingway was writing narration to a film asking for international support in the Republican cause. The Spanish Civil War, as politically complicated and brutal of a conflict as it was, presented Hemingway with more challenges than any of the past political disagreements and contests of the ‘30s could. While his early decisions set the tone of his political involvement for the next few years, some questions remained unanswered, especially that of the ethics of killing.

The Hunter and Ethics of Killing

Hemingway had taken a side in the Spanish Civil War, coming down from his isolationist perch and calling on the United States to aid in the fight against fascism, but by recognizing the necessity of war he implied the need to kill. This stance occupied an uncomfortable position for

Hemingway, who wrestled with questions of death and murder in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*. For the first time since his days in Italy during World War I, Hemingway was up close and personal with war once again. While the writer had sustained opinions on killing for several years, he remained disgusted by the act, frequently condemning it by implication with his various gruesome descriptions of it, especially in war. However, just as Hemingway's religious politics and isolationist stances were deeply challenged by the provocations of the Spanish Civil War, the conflict instigated a rush of contemplation on killing, forcing developments in beliefs that had been forming since, at least, his famous 1933 safari. Hemingway's lived experiences hunting inform the ways he writes hunter characters, which becomes pertinent in the case of Anselmo in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*. Anselmo is, in many ways, the moral consciousness of the novel who most often speaks out against killing and believes in the ability of education to right the wrongs of fascism. He is an idealist who will hold his own in debates with Pablo and follow Robert Jordan's orders to the letter. In addition to all his admirable characteristics, Anselmo is also a hunter, reflecting the ethical values that Hemingway associated with the craft.

Although sometimes claiming the opposite, Hemingway had not killed another human being by 1937; instead, his experiences with the intimate act of killing a living thing derive from his life as a hunter. Introduced to hunting by his pious father when he was as young as four years old, Hemingway spent his childhood hunting and fishing in upper Michigan. The young man was at home while on the hunt. Hemingway identified with other hunters up to a point, detesting competition for competition's sake. In *Green Hills of Africa*, Hemingway admires hunters and uses the skill as a sort of social demarcation. Within the makeup of this value system there are those who are hunters and those who are "obviously not a hunter" (*GHOA* 190). Men who excel in the hunt are distinguished in the text, like Droopy, the African hunter

who guides Hemingway. Comparing Droopy to another hunter named M'Cola, Hemingway writes, "Droop was a better man than he was. More of a hunter, a faster and cleaner tracker, and a great stylist in everything he did" (*GHOA* 41). Being a good hunter becomes a condition of being a better man. Thus, in Hemingway's ethical framework, the hunter represents a dignified position.

While Hemingway distinguished between killing humans and animals, his approach to hunting reflects a disdain for killing animals that was forming as early as 1933 and continued to grow throughout his life. Hunting is, necessarily, an act of killing—it is the murder of a living creature. Hemingway was, as Ryan Hediger argues in "Hunting, Fishing, and the Cramp of Ethics in Ernest Hemingway's *The Old Man and the Sea*, *Green Hills of Africa*, and *Under Kilimanjaro*," aware of the gravity of hunting and the life that is necessarily obliterated in the practice. As such he disdains to take hunting lightly. In *Green Hills of Africa*, during a particularly obsessively passionate run-in with a sable bull, Hemingway becomes a little carried away with hunting and wanting to best his competition. He had wanted "damned badly" to kill the sable bull, and this feeling later turns into embarrassment as he "feels sick about the intensity of his desire because it is ungentlemanly" (Hediger 39). It is ungentlemanly to want to kill something so badly and for such a bad reason, according to Hemingway. The great desire taints the act and may even expose the vileness of its necessary destructive conclusion. Hemingway's reaction to his heated desire to kill the animal indicates that it is an action that cannot be taken lightly; it hints at a muted disdain for killing in general, although Hemingway still believes in the necessity of hunting. His ethics of hunting does not deny the necessity to kill wholesale, really "Hemingway is fully aware of the fact that eating requires killing" (Hediger 38). Clearly this assumption denies the vast human cultures that do not eat meat, but Hemingway believed that

eating required killing and thus it is pertinent to consider in developing an ethic surrounding his hunting.

For Hemingway, then, a good man is a good hunter and a good hunter is one who does not take undue pleasure in the act, operating instead out of necessity. The trophy hunting of *Green Hills of Africa* may deny this conclusion, but really it is not so simple. Engaged in murdering wildlife on an African safari for trophies—not for food—Hemingway appears to fall short of his own ethical position. Indeed, he might, but by the end of the 1933 safari, Hemingway’s opinions on trophy hunting had shifted. Near the end of *Green Hills of Africa* Hemingway takes some time to consider his next safari, seeming to intend not to kill anything at all, instead embracing his perception of truth and intimacy. He expresses a yearning to understand the land “and get to know it as I knew the country around the lake where we were brought up,” and fantasizes about seeing “the buffalo feeding where they lived, and when the elephants came through the hills we would see them and watch them breaking branches and not have to shoot” (*GHOA* 199). This desire reveals Hemingway’s growing interest in sparing the animals, in avoiding the killing. A good hunter in Hemingway’s hunter ethics then, is one who hunts for food and not for trophies and seeks intimacy with the ecosystems and lands around them. What’s more, hunting becomes an entry point for Hemingway to consider “a whole system of regard for place, inhabitation, and animals” (Hediger 40). Thus, characters described as hunters in Hemingway’s fiction take on new significance. In Hemingway’s hunter-ethical complex, they must occupy near-righteous positions.

Killing animals and killing humans is not frequently held to be morally equivalent, and often—as is the case with Hemingway—this is because animals are considered a vital element of human food chains and sustenance. Indeed, Hemingway certainly allows for the ethical killing

of animals for the sake of food. At the risk of sounding redundant, humans are not often characterized as eating each other and cannibalism is a taboo subject in a majority of human cultures. The asymmetrical measurement of value placed upon human and animal life complicates the applicability of Hemingway's hunter-ethics to the serious act of killing another human being. However, Hemingway's own fascination and identification with animals suggests a conflation of value that allows the ethics to travel from hunter to soldier in his work. Robert Jordan and Anselmo—both hunters and soldiers—discuss animal and human difference when Anselmo recalls shooting a bear. Anselmo remarks “ ‘the hand of a man is like the paw of a bear.’ ‘So is the chest of a man like the chest of a bear,’ Robert Jordan said... ‘Yes,’ Anselmo said. ‘The gypsies [sic] believe the bear to be a brother of man’” (*FWBT* 40). The conversation begins with physical comparisons, but switches to more psychological, or even spiritual connections. Anselmo later refutes the similarities, doing so on the basis of vindicating his hunting while condemning killing humans. He states, “To me there is a great difference between the bear and the man... No. I am against all killing of men” (*FWBT* 41). Implied in Anselmo's statement is the ethical behavior of killing the bear. Thus, human and animal cannot be collapsed into one value-category, and yet Anselmo admits to having killed a man before and to the likelihood of doing so again.

While Anselmo denies the relevant similarities between man and animal, Hemingway himself seems to have yearned for an interconnectedness with environments that assumes mutual value in all things. His musings on watching, but not shooting, the elephants in his next safari signal this desire. By 1953 Hemingway was appropriating traditional Masai hunting practices, hunting alone at night in bare feet and wielding no firearms—only a spear. These experiences, while occurring some twenty years after his first safari, supplied Hemingway with “a clearer

sense of himself as another animal” (Hediger 36). For Hemingway, the appropriation of Masai hunting practices stripped of conventional modernizing elements allows him to access the environment around him with more intimacy. While his experience and interest in the practice seems to imply a misguided and westernized understanding of indigenous cultures and the environment as collapsible categories, the experience does signify a collapse of these boundaries for Hemingway specifically. Immersing himself totally in his environment indicates a yearning for true identification with animals and this identification contributes to Hemingway’s ethic of killing and collapses the value of animal-man. This collapse is poignantly addressed in “The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber,” a story which details the killing of a lion from the lion’s perspective. The painful imagery of the lion suffering from a trophy hunter’s rifle shot “reminds us that humans and animals are one and the same” (Voeller 68). Clearly, Hemingway was concerned with ethics of killing and his relationship to environments and animals indicate that his hunting beliefs carry significant weight in determining his opinions on the act. But, in war, killing becomes commonplace and Hemingway, abandoning the isolationist stance that could fall in-line with his aversion to killing, had taken a stake in the conflict.

The Spanish Civil War forced Hemingway to draw from his ethical beliefs on the act of killing to make important decisions involving his political stances. Killing another human being forces an impossibility on subjects according to Hemingway’s ethics. How does a subject vindicate the irredeemable: that is, how can a human being justify murdering another human being under the ethical system derived from hunting? Hemingway had accounted for the killing of animals as a means to provide sustenance, but the same argument could hardly be made for human beings—be they fascist, loyalist, communist, or otherwise. Hemingway displays, in all its indecisiveness, the process of wrestling with this discomfort in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*.

Although many of the characters discuss killing and its moral implications, the text privileges the perspectives of Robert Jordan and Anselmo—two of the text’s hunters.

Robert Jordan’s indecisiveness in killing is a mental roadblock in his professional life, his inability to reconcile the act signals the intrusion of political necessity in Hemingway’s hunter-ethics. As a saboteur he has been responsible for numerous killings. They become a fact of life, but he struggles to vindicate his actions. After murdering a fascist on patrol, Jordan dives into a neurotic meditation on the ethics of killing, even in war: “It is right, he told himself, not reassuringly, but proudly. I believe in the people and their right to govern themselves as they wish. But you mustn’t believe in killing, he told himself. You must do it as a necessity but you must not believe in it. If you believe in it the whole thing is wrong” (*FWBT* 309). What Robert Jordan asks of himself is technically impossible. He must commit an act that he does not believe in. He struggles to reassure himself of his moral position clearly indicated to readers simply with ‘*not reassuringly*’. Robert’s assertion that a subject must not enjoy killing is reminiscent of Hemingway’s own embarrassment at wanting badly to kill the sable bull in 1933. It is the overwhelming desire to kill that rots the act. To Robert Jordan, killing is necessary to defend freedom, but this does not make the decision ethically correct. It is an action made necessary by political realities and betrays the ethical system that Robert operates within; a system largely informed by Hemingway’s own experiences as a hunter.

Anselmo’s use of the hunter-ethic leads him to imagine a utopian society in which class distinctions are collapsed through education and equality. Anselmo, while accounting for the need to kill animals, is staunchly opposed to killing humans, yet does so out of necessity harboring a deep guilt of the action. Anselmo wishes to educate the fascists to understand truths he finds self-evident. Responding to the potential for massive purges after a hypothetical

Republican victory, Anselmo states, “That we should win this war and shoot nobody,” and “we should govern justly and that all should participate... And that those who have fought against us should be educated to see their error” (*FWBT* 290). Anselmo’s faith in education is, unfortunately, a romantic notion. It is quickly rejected by Agustín, but is representative of the hunter-ethic unperturbed by political reality. Anselmo longs for a sort of utopian society in which all “participate in the benefits according as they have striven for them” (*FWBT* 290). Class distinctions are collapsed in his imagined society and Anselmo’s assertion that ‘all should participate’ creates a vast intermeshing of individuals similar to Hemingway’s assimilation as ‘another animal’ while hunting in 1953. Regarding classes, there is no bourgeoisie nor proletariat, rather, individuals enjoy mutual benefits requisite to their input. The notion echoes Hemingway’s interest in the collapse of the animal/human in order to attain a romantic assimilation with the African wilderness. Hemingway understood this assimilation as a truth-finding endeavor which is conveyed in Anselmo’s utopian musing. Anselmo’s appeal to education implies his strong faith in his beliefs—if one were simply educated enough they’d see things the same way as him and one might say they’d see the truth. Anselmo’s educational appeal to truth sounds dangerously similar to the rigid sense of reality that fascist ideology espouses, but this is troubled by Hemingway’s employment of truth both in his hunter ethics and in *For Whom the Bell Tolls* as a network of subject-specific recontextualizations only perceived through collectives. Within each framework truth is not retrievable as a singular entity, it is derived from assimilation within a system that is diverse and troubles distinctions. For Hemingway, appropriating Masai hunting traditions, it comes from his assumption of a vulnerable role and feeling of one-ness in the dangerous and varied landscape. For Anselmo, distinctions between classes collapse making his truth based upon a utopian equality inspired by

socialist beliefs. Thus, despite rejecting the collapse of animal/human, Anselmo's approach to killing seems informed by Hemingway's hunter-ethic. He admits to some need for killing, but cannot in good conscience truly endorse it, and underlying his beliefs is a desire to integrate wholly in a system that represents a perceived truth in which conventional distinctions are troubled. And yet, he has killed and expects to kill again.

Hemingway clearly associates the ethics of killing with the act of hunting, and his hunter characters—namely Robert Jordan and Anselmo—reflect very particular remorse for the necessary killing of war as it pertains to an idealism that fascism restricts. The necessity of killing is provoked by the specter of fascism, a strikingly political infringement upon Hemingway's idealistic ethic of environmental integration. What's more, Hemingway's long-standing characterization of fascism as the political tool of liars—the ideology begins to represent 'a lie' wholesale for the writer—causes deeply embedded oppositions between Hemingway's hunter-ethics and fascism. In his desire to assimilate with an environment and see it 'truly'—become one with it—Hemingway is characteristically pursuing his perception of truth. The corruption of fascism denies Hemingway the ability to achieve this assimilation, proliferating lies and necessitating murder. Robert Jordan and Anselmo reveal the political need to fight fascists and to kill, though they experience intense guilt and struggle to vindicate their actions consistently. Regardless, Hemingway could not abide fascism; "its imperial ambition and violence against civilians repulsed him" (Solow 112). Thus, in the early days of the war Hemingway was faced with overcoming his religious politics and reconciling his isolationist stances. But, more than this, the political necessity of the threat of fascism required complacency with radical internal conflicts pertaining to Hemingway's ethical position on killing, a position informed by his experiences as a hunter and his pursuit of truth. In reflecting

on this radically transformative period, Hemingway wrote the novel *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, a text retaining a nexus of conflicting perspectives and truths all manifested in the actions of some of Hemingway's most complicated heroes: the Guerillas.

No Man Is an Island - Soldiers and Guerillas

Quoting John Donne, Ernest Hemingway opens his triumphant 1940 novel *For Whom the Bell Tolls* with a slice of wisdom echoing the lessons of Harry Morgan: "No Man is an *Iland*, entire of it selfe; every man is a peece of the *Continent*, a part of the *maine*" (*FWBT*). The words resonate with Hemingway's apparent realization that true resistance to the fascist threat could not be achieved from the perch of his isolation. While Donne's appeal to fraternity and human life is emphasized through Hemingway's human portrayal of fascists in the novel, the point is perhaps best accentuated by the guerilla bands that aid—and are aided by—Robert Jordan. The guerilla fighters in Hemingway's novel are brave, complicated, fearful, and caring. While retaining a complexity that accounts for bias and fault, the heroics of the guerillas cannot totally avoid Hemingway's warring romanticism—yet the community cultivated through their trials and misunderstandings is strikingly unique in comparison to the alienated soldiers and heroic vigilantes of Hemingway's past work. The Guerilla fighters, with their backs against the mountainside and oppressors at the gates, are Hemingway's response to years of thoughtful observation and interest in war and the threat of fascism. While maintaining the legacy of Hemingway's infatuation with soldiering, these fighters do so out of necessity and with strong bonds to one another symbolizing Hemingway's realization that to fight the fascist threat, both on the battlefield and in ideology, one man alone hasn't got a chance.

While Hemingway had criticized the disillusionment and forced fighting of World War I, the Guerilla fighters of *For Whom the Bell Tolls* embody just resistance, fighting to defend their

home and democratic ideals. The Guerilla fighters of Pablo's Band and El Sordo's Band are unique fighters in Hemingway's fiction for many reasons, but notably their reason for fighting. As opposed to soldiers drafted or enlisted by large national entities to die for national causes, these warriors fight for their existence against the existential threat of fascism. They work alongside the Republican government, occasionally espouse its ideals, but reject joining Republican forces more formally, opting to migrate to Gredos after the Segovia offensive. They are not the "men who are enslaved into the bearing of arms and are taught to be more afraid of sure death from their officers if they run than possible death if they stay" (*BL* 210). Although the Guerilla are forced to fight by Franco's nationalist aggression, they are not 'enslaved' like the soldiers Hemingway witnessed on the Italian front, or heard of all over the battlefields of World War I. Espousing the ideals of Passini and the other socialist mechanics of *A Farewell to Arms*, the Guerilla defend their home at their home.

Comparing the soldiers of *A Farewell to Arms* with the Guerillas of *For Whom the Bell Tolls* reveals both the interconnected nature of the bands in the mountains, as opposed to the Italian regiments, and Hemingway's own increased willingness to join in the fight accentuated by the assimilation of Robert Jordan. The soldiers, priests, and ambulance drivers of *A Farewell to Arms* are certainly, as Alberto Lena argues, worth further investigation; yet, the many faces—from the Captain to Aymo—seem to come and go indicating a sort of interchangeable character to their portrayal in the novel. Passini, an important political voice of the novel is abruptly murdered early on, and the men who carry Frederic to safety after the shelling are hardly present in the rest of the text. The shifting characters in Frederic's life are contrasted with Catherine, his constant, dependable lover. What's more, in the face of the Caporetto retreat, soldiers begin executing each other. Frederic murders a man for desertion, a tragically ironic move. Aymo is

shot and killed by terrified Italian soldiers antsy and firing at whatever they can. The bonds formed in the conflict are hollow, the soldiers resent the combat and are, as Hemingway would later point out in “Notes on the Next War,” practically enslaved to the military and trained to fear death from their commanding officers as punishment for desertion. This fear is further characterized in “A Way You’ll Never Be” when Nick Adams is instructed to shoot two men for every group of soldiers who won’t “go over” (Hemingway 73). The soldier, as described by Hemingway, is made dispensable by commanding forces and made to fight in causes they may have no stake in. This forced combat contains an implicit criticism of power that is in line with Hemingway’s distrust of government and political parties. Distant powers have no stake in the individual costs of war, therefore the moral grounds to justify combat can be determined based upon the chain of command. This chain of command, while complicated, is shortened for the Guerilla fighters of *For Whom the Bell Tolls*. The Italian generals Hemingway recalls from his youth may have ordered soldiers abandoning the fight to be shot, but this type of behavior is a far cry from the commands of Pilar, Pablo, or Robert Jordan. While Hemingway may have endorsed avoidance and isolationism wholesale before the Spanish Civil War, the logics of his disdain for war cause the Guerillas to occupy a unique space for Hemingway’s warriors. As a small, intimate band of fighters engaged in a battle for their home, Hemingway is able to better endorse their fight, despite having cautioned against participating in war only a few years prior.

Comparing the perspectives of Frederic Henry to Robert Jordan reveals Hemingway’s shifting approach to conflict, endorsing coalition rather than the stanch isolationism that had characterized his earlier political involvement. Frederic Henry is a man alienated from the explosive and confused world that destroys itself in front of him. The men he works and fights alongside change, die, and pass into obscurity as the text rolls on leaving Frederic alone. He is

bitter, a little ironic, and individual. After Harry Morgan—and, to some extent, Hemingway’s own—realization of the importance of cooperation in the face of injustice, a hero like Frederic Henry becomes privileged and politically impotent. His anti-war stance is bold and revolutionary in its own right, but it lacks the ability to reconcile the conservative regimes that Hemingway would criticize throughout his career, and is founded on the lucky position of being able to walk away. While Harry Morgan recognizes this failure of the individual, Hemingway was, perhaps, not able to see an effective way to implement the lesson. Just as the world of Frederic Henry is blasted apart and devoid of hope, Hemingway illustrates the world of *To Have and Have Not* with “disdainful, dismissive portraits of radical writers, New Deal bureaucrats, and governmental relief” that “brand every attempt at social change as hypocritical and compromised by self-serving motives” (Curnutt 184). While *A Farewell to Arms* and *To Have and Have Not* retain the dread and cynicism typical of an earlier Hemingway, Robert Jordan’s interaction and assimilation with the Guerillas signals a defiant optimism and a realization of Harry Morgan’s lesson.

For Whom the Bell Tolls is not an uplifting story, but it is defiant. It is rife with suffering, death, helplessness, bad luck, and fear—yet, there are moments of hope and even the most fearful of the Guerillas retain a belief in their mission. There is hope in dedication and a twisted comfort in the families that form in war. While Frederic Henry may have escaped the Italian front and abandoned the war thinking “I was not against them. I was through,” Robert Jordan lays down his life aiding in the escape of Pablo’s Band to Gredos and thinks of the Guerillas fondly, lovingly thinking to himself:

Anselmo is my oldest friend. I know him better than I know Charles, than I know chub, than I know Guy, than I know Mike, and I know them well. Agustín, with his vile

mouth, is my brother, and I never had a brother. Maria is my true love and my wife.

(*FTA*, 218) & (*FWBT*)

Somehow, despite the overwhelming odds and the narrative hindsight of the outcome of the Spanish Civil War, Robert Jordan—and to some extent Hemingway—find comfort in the small band of warriors hidden away in Segovia engaged in an existential war against the fascists. Somehow, the alienation that has typified Hemingway's protagonists gives way. Somehow, the identification he has longed for in warriors finds a home that is not the pseudo-fascism of the Arditi or the bitter isolation imposed upon the soldier or veteran. Narratively, the intimacy of the Guerillas mixed with Robert Jordan's assimilation into their ranks is symbolic of Hemingway's own growth away from his bitter isolationism. But, beyond narrative, the form of the text and Hemingway's use of third person imply a broader, more open nexus of political understanding.

While the third-person narration of the text primarily focalizes on Robert Jordan, many of the primary Guerillas are visited by the text revealing a complicated network of information and opinion unrestricted by one perspective. While communication breakdowns do occur, the intermingling narration illustrates the sheer achievement of the band's cooperation allowing them to maintain individuality but coalesce to Donne's *continent*. The narrative framing becomes unfixated and slightly unstable, almost liquid flowing from one character or scenario to another and conforming to its needs like water in a beaker transferred to a shallow basin. In this fluidity Hemingway hoped to capture the many sides of the war, sides that were so complex that he was initially totally overwhelmed working as a war correspondent for the North American Newspaper Alliance (NANA). In a letter to the Russian literary critic Ivan Kashkin, Hemingway describes the aims that produced the expansive narrative voice: "I try to show all the different sides of it... examining it from many ways... But it is very complicated and difficult to write

about truly” (SL 480). The complexity that Hemingway employs in *For Whom the Bell Tolls* is, perhaps, more reminiscent of Virginia Woolf than Hemingway’s past works. Even the point of view becomes complicated as extended mental visits leave the text in extended yet temporary first person. The reader is denied a simple protagonist and information is consistently recontextualized depending upon the individual in focus. This liquid narration is, in essence, an antifascist form. As Zira Box explains in “The ‘corporealization’ of the nation: notions of the unclean and viscosity in the nationalist discourse of Spanish fascism” the central values of a fascist state are those “that could easily be expressed and condensed in an appeal to the rectitude and verticality of a straight line” (2). Hemingway’s refusal to center solely upon one character, one version of the truth, even one linear narrative in *For Whom the Bell Tolls* indicates not only an artistic triumph, but a refutation of fascist ideology at the specific level of form itself. This expansive writing and politics of form would not be possible without Harry Morgan’s epiphany nor without the band of Guerillas come to life in the pages of the novel.

The complexity of the narrative voice Hemingway employs weaves together a form of truth that is not restricted by a single interpretation and can only be found through the recontextualization of a confluence of perspectives. The narrative voice’s construction of a collective truth is usefully illustrated in the discussions surrounding the killing of Pablo early in Robert Jordan’s stay with the mountain warriors. Robert Jordan’s arrival sparks some frustration for Pablo, a once cruel but horrifyingly effective leader, as Jordan’s bridge blowing project necessarily places him and his band in immediate danger. While the majority of Pablo’s fighters (perhaps more accurately Pilar’s fighters) support Jordan’s bridge blowing, Pablo cannot abide by it, leading to a tense moment that implies that Robert Jordan was expected to shoot and kill Pablo. While Jordan does not, the fallout of the situation spirals in several directions. Pablo

remains alive and proves essential in the later combat, though not without trouble. Rafael, the Romanian, pesters Jordan, persuading him to kill Pablo. The next morning Pilar and Agustín discuss in private the important role Pablo will likely play retreating after Robert Jordan has succeeded in his mission, signifying to readers the importance of Robert's hesitance in committing the act. What's more, Robert Jordan realizes after the fact that had he invited a shootout in the cave base of the Guerillas he may have endangered everyone around him as his dynamite had been hidden nearby. The information that contextualizes and recontextualizes the tense moment in which Pablo is nearly killed does not arrive totally sequentially or through a single subject's perspective. Motioning toward truth, Hemingway's methods refute the linearity and fixity of fascist ideology through a necessary plurality of voices in the novel. What's more, Pablo's indispensable assistance in blowing the bridge is narrative proof of Hemingway's adherence to the novel's epigraph. Like the bee swept out to sea leaving Europe all the lesser, had Pablo been killed, the entire band may very well have perished.

The Guerillas of *For Whom the Bell Tolls* indicate political growth for Hemingway both symbolically and in the form in which they are presented. Carrying on the lineage of Hemingway's fascination with soldiers, they embody a form of fighting starkly opposed to fascism while retaining the grit and work-ethic Hemingway associates with veterans and other freedom fighters. In form, Hemingway's willingness to guide the text away from a single character's thoughts culminates in a complex network of bias, care, and politics—the realization of Harry Morgan's lifelong lesson. Despite their flaws, the Guerillas symbolize the necessity of the fight against fascism. They provide a grim, yet endearing, example of the importance of coalition. While Hemingway acknowledged the importance of cooperation in *To Have and Have Not*, he was unable to provide examples of real political change. With *For Whom the Bell Tolls*

readers are shown a true synthesis of the many hard-earned lessons the writer had gained over two decades of ideological opposition to fascism. A small band of freedom fighters, honest, fair, and democratic to one another, is the embodiment of antifascist resistance.

Conclusion – Pursuit as Happiness

Ernest Hemingway's political beliefs underwent significant change throughout the interwar period; beginning as a childish infatuation with war, turning to an isolationist and deeply anti-war stance, and finally arriving on the eve of World War II advocating for foreign involvement in the Spanish Civil War. These broad strokes motion towards an understanding of Hemingway's political beliefs and their development, but they do not encompass them. For every shift, every change in perspective, there are innumerable details. There are cynical, quiet, blink and you miss it comments delivered by Jake Barnes or references to workers' revolts buried under the rubble of a mortar strike in *A Farewell to Arms*. Hemingway's attention to detail was obsessive. He studied cultures, terrain, history, governments, wildlife, people. Any topic that interested him, he made himself the authority on. Perhaps it is this drive to understand that inspired Hemingway's political beliefs.

When he turned away from the popular politics of the literary left in the early 1930s, Hemingway frequently justified doing so with an appeal to artistry. He was dedicated to writing what was true, as he put it. Denying those popular politics, Hemingway sought to “write well and truly of something”—it was his most intimate goal (*GHOA* 108). This truth seeking appears in his early work, certainly, and is, perhaps, indicative of the journalistic spirit that he never gave up. Covering wars and revolutions throughout the years, Hemingway, ironically the great exaggerator in conversation, internalized the goal of any journalist worth their salt: find and report the facts. He lived intensely in legend and in fact, seeking experiences and truths to mold into the many now-classic novels (and not-so-classic novels) of his oeuvre. In considering Hemingway's pursuit of truth, we have no need to qualify his findings. Did Hemingway really discover ‘truth’? It's hard to say, but I'd be more than surprised to find that he had; the question too tenuous, the specificity too innumerable. No, it is not whether Hemingway discovered truth,

it is that he wanted badly to find it. His perception of truth is more important than whatever ineffable absolute resides on the edge of his musings. But, not only this, the pursuit of truth for Hemingway is a deeply antifascist matter, casting his work—really all of his work—as an antifascist project engulfed in stubborn artistry and a myth more massive than the monument of a man attached.

In a speech delivered on 4 June, 1937 entitled “Fascism is a Lie,” Hemingway carried forward an old observation made about fascism. “For fascism,” Hemingway said, “is a lie told by bullies” (*FWBT* 479). The sentiment is strikingly similar to the January 1923 article for the *Toronto Star* entitled “Mussolini, Europe’s Prize Bluffer.” Hemingway, despite his many changes in course, had remained consistent. Fascism was a lie, it was fueled by undue violence against innocents, it was propagated by bullies, anyone striving for truth could not live under fascism. It is clear, one of the most clear political statements Hemingway could ever make, that he and fascism are diametrically opposed. And their opposition is beyond the politics of communist, anarchist, Trotskyite, Stalinist, Republican, Democrat, or any of the titles and factions in between. This stance, Hemingway’s pursuit of truth against the barrage of fascism is implicated in the very form of his writing. He at once, for better or for worse, politicizes the very form of his writing. Every chosen word, every setting, every character, every detail—major and minor—that contributes to his desire to write truthfully is an act of defiance to the ideology of fascism. For Hemingway, then, the stakes of art are perhaps higher than any recently-enlightened critic of the literary left could have possibly imagined.

Hemingway’s pursuit of truth would not end with the Spanish Civil War, nor would it conclude with World War II and the supposed defeat of fascism it brought with it. Rumors circulate of a career in spywork, certainly a delightfully ironic twist: defending truth in a career

of secrecy? Who other than Hemingway. His frequently problematic but intense love of Eastern Africa would further encourage criticisms of colonialism, even while he appropriated African culture both in life and literature. And, of course, Hemingway continued to write. His artistry was political, and he'd continue that work until his death in 1961.

Hemingway's politics retain inconsistencies, but a few core elements could not be divorced from his beliefs. Aiming to expose corruption and reject totalitarianism, Hemingway sought his own understanding of truth. It is a truth deeply tied to artistry. Perhaps Hemingway's politics could only really be described as that of an artist: an artist politic. But could such a concept ever be impersonal enough to constitute a demographic? To compose a voter base, a resistance, a constituency, a coalition? Maybe not. Maybe this is why Hemingway struggled to accept those who would have otherwise been his political allies for much of his life. It's lonely work. The truth of that matter, whatever it may be, is likely only found in the pursuit of itself.

Works Cited

- Baldwin, Marc D. "'To Make It into a Novel... Don't Talk about It': Hemingway's Political Unconscious." *The Journal of Narrative Technique*, vol. 23, no. 3, 1993, pp. 170-187.
- Box, Zira. "The 'corporealization' of the nation: notions of the unclean and viscosity in the nationalist discourse of Spanish fascism." *Journal of Spanish Cultural Studies*, vol. 18, no. 1, 2017, pp. 1-19.
- Curnutt, Kirk. *Reading Hemingway's To have and have not : glossary and commentary*. Kent, Ohio, The Kent State UP, 2017.
- Foley, Barbara and Peter Gardner. "Retrospective Radicalism: Politics and History in Ernest Hemingway's 'A Farewell to Arms'." *College Literature*, vol. 44, no. 1, 2017, pp. 1-29.
- Forsythe, Robert. "In this Corner, Mr. Hemingway." *New Masses*, vol 13, no. 9, pp. 26, 1934.
- Guill, Stacey. "The Red and White Terrors: Civil War and Political Savagery in Ernest Hemingway's *For Whom the Bell Tolls*." *The Hemingway Review*, vol. 40, no. 1, The Ernest Hemingway Foundation, 2020, pp. 29-52.
- Hays, Peter L. "Hemingway as Social and Political Writer." *The Hemingway Review*, vol. 34, no. 2, Ernest Hemingway Foundation, 2015, pp. 111-117.
- Hediger, Ryan. "Hunting, Fishing, and the Cramp of Ethics in Ernest Hemingway's *The Old Man and the Sea*, *Green Hills of Africa*, and *Under Kilimanjaro*." *The Hemingway Review*, vol. 27, no. 2, The Ernest Hemingway Foundation, 2008, pp. 35-59.
- Hemingway, Ernest. *In Our Time*. New York, Scribner, 1925.
- . *A Farewell to Arms*. Pennsylvania, The Franklin Library. 1975.

- *By-Line: Ernest Hemingway: selected articles and dispatches of four decades*. New York, Scribner, 1967.
 - *Ernest Hemingway, Dateline: Toronto: Hemingway's Complete Toronto Star Dispatches 1920-1924*. Edited by William White, New York, Scribner, 1985.
 - *For Whom the Bell Tolls*. New York, Scribner, 2019.
 - *Green Hills of Africa*. New York, Scribner, 1998.
 - *Hemingway and the Mechanism of Fame: statements, public letters, introductions, forewords, prefaces, blurbs, reviews, and endorsements*. Columbia, University of South Carolina Press, 2006.
 - *Selected Letters, 1917-1961*, New York, Scribner, 1981.
 - *The Complete Short Stories of Ernest Hemingway: The Finca Vigia Edition*. New York, Scribner, 1998.
 - *The Fifth Column and Four Short Stories of the Spanish Civil War*. Mary Hemingway, 1969.
 - *The Letters of Ernest Hemingway: Volume 1, 1907-1922*. Cambridge, Cambridge UP, 2011.
 - *The Letters of Ernest Hemingway: Volume 2, 1923-1925*. Cambridge, Cambridge UP, 2013.
 - *The Letters of Ernest Hemingway: Volume 3, 1926-1929*. Cambridge, Cambridge UP, 2015.
 - *The Letters of Ernest Hemingway: Volume 4, 1929-1931*. Cambridge, Cambridge UP, 2017.
 - *The Sun Also Rises*. Edited by Michael Thurston, New York, Norton, 2022.
 - *To Have and Have Not*. New York, Scribner, 1970.
- Henson, Bob. "Remembering the Labor Day Hurricane of 1935 in the Florida Keys." *Weather Underground*, 7 Sept, 2015,
<https://web.archive.org/web/20160829042410/https://www.wunderground.com/blog/JeffMasters/remembering-the-labor-day-hurricane-of-1935-in-the-florida-keys>.

“Italian Army Suppresses Revolt in Turin.” *Today in World War I*, 2017, <https://today-in-wwi.tumblr.com/post/164582435548/italian-army-suppresses-revolt-in-turin>.

Lena, Alberto. “The Many Faces of Defeat: Italian Ideological Contexts in Frederic Henry’s Caporetto.” *Hemingway and Italy*, Gainesville, University of Florida Press, 2017.

Marinetti, Filippo Tommaso. “The Founding and Manifesto of Futurism 1909.” *Modernism: An Anthology of Sources and Documents*. Edited by Vassiliki Kolocotroni, Jane Goldman, and Olga Taxidou, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1998, pp.249-253.

Mussolini, Benito. *Mussolini as Revealed in his Political Speeches, November 1924-August 1923*. Translated by Bernardo Quaranta di San Severino, 2020.

Nilsson, Anton. “Ernest Hemingway and the Politics of the Spanish Civil War.” *The Hemingway Review*, vol. 36, no. 1, The Ernest Hemingway Foundation, 2016, pp. 81-93.

Oğuz, Çiğdem. “‘Reality of the Magic of the East’: Hemingway on the Greco-Turkish War and the Refugee Procession in Eastern Thrace.” *Diacronie: Studi di Storia Contemporanea*, vol. 40, no. 4, 2019.

Pedrocini, Guy. *Les mutineries de 1917*. Paris, Publications de la Sorbonne, Presse Universitaires de France, 1983.

Reynolds, Michael. *Hemingway: The 1930s*. New York, Norton, 1998.

.—*Hemingway: The Final Years*. New York, Norton, 2000.

.—*The Young Hemingway*. New York, Norton, 1998.

Stephens, Robert O. “Hemingway’s Political Thought: Mourner of Lost Revolutions.”

Hemingway’s Nonfiction, University of North Carolina Press, 1968.

Stoneback, H.R. *Reading Hemingway’s The Sun Also Rises: Glossary and Commentary*. Kent, Kent State UP, 2007.

Solow, Michael K. "A Clash of Certainties Old and New: *For Whom the Bell Tolls* and the Inner War of Ernest Hemingway." *The Hemingway Review*, vol. 29, no. 1, 2009, pp. 103-122.

Voeller, Carey. "'He Only Looked Sad The Same Way I Felt': The Textual Confessions of Hemingway's Hunters." *The Hemingway Review*, vol. 25, no. 1, The Ernest Hemingway Foundation, 2005, pp. 63-76.

Thompson, Mark. *The White War: Life and Death on the Italian Front 1915-1919*. New York, Basic Books, 2010.

Vita

Mackenzie Doebler was born in 1998 to Ross and Angel Doebler who raised Mackenzie to love books and the outdoors. Travelling from the Outer Banks of North Carolina to the Appalachian Mountains, Mackenzie loves hiking and discovering new ‘truths’ in the natural beauty of the high country. Mackenzie earned their bachelor’s degree in arts at Appalachian State University in 2021, and went on to pursue their Master’s Degree at Appalachian that Fall. With a focus on Modernism, Gender Studies, Queer and Trans theory, and Coalitional Resistance, Mackenzie aims to pursue a P.h.D. and hopes to contribute to the critical antifascist theory and literature that so inspires them.

Mackenzie lives comfortably with their cat in Boone, NC. For how long, time will tell.