

Masculinities in Hemingway's *To Have and Have Not*

University of Tampere
School of Modern Languages
and Translation Studies
English Philology
Pro Gradu Thesis
Spring 2007
Ari Ikonen

Tampereen yliopisto

Kieli- ja käännöstieteiden laitos

Englantilainen filologia

IKONEN, ARI: Masculinities in Hemingway's *To Have and Have Not*

Pro Gradu –tutkielma, 72 s.

Kevät 2007

Pro Gradussani tutkin sitä miten maskuliinisuutta rakennetaan Hemingwayn romaanissa *To Have and Have Not*. Keskityn erityisesti kirjan päähenkilöön Harry Morganin ja siihen kuinka hänen edustamansa kovaksikeitetty maskuliinisuus asetetaan vastakkain toisenlaisten maskuliinisuuksien kanssa. Pyrin osoittamaan kuinka nämä muut alisteiset maskuliinisuudet avustavat ja rakentavat Morganin edustamaa hegemonista maskuliinisuutta, mutta myös kyseenalaistavat sitä ja osoittavat sen heikkoudet.

Ensimmäisessä luvussa esittelen aluksi hegemonista maskuliinisuutta ja maskuliinisuuden tutkimusta sekä teen katsauksen siihen kulttuuri-ilmapiiriin, jossa Hemingway varttui ja omaksui käsityksensä maskuliinisuudesta. Toisessa alaluvussa käsittelem ihonvärin ja rodun merkitystä valkoisen miehisen identiteetin rakentamisessa. Lopuksi keskityn Hemingwayhin ja hänen maskuliinisuuskäsityksiinsä.

Toisessa luvussa tarkastelen Harry Morganin perhettä ja hänen ystäviään pyrkien osoittamaan tekijöitä joista hänen mieheydensä rakentuu ja sitä millaista mies- ja naiskuvaa romaani näyttää tukevan. Samalla etsin merkkejä mahdollisista repeämistä tuossa mieskuvassa. Merkille pantavaa on kuinka itsestäänselvänä naisten vähempiarvoisuus miehiin nähden esitetään ja se että harmonisen avioliiton edellytyksenä nähdään miehen ylivalta.

Kolmannessa luvussa pääosassa ovat miehet, joiden tulkitsen edustavan vaihtoehtoisia maskuliinisuuksia, jotka asettavat Morganin individualistisen ja itseriittoisen miehuusihanteen kyseenalaiseksi. Luen romaania niin, että nämä miehet voidaan nähdä kritiikkinä väkivaltaista, muista piittaamatonta maskuliinisuutta kohtaan. Nostan esille myös sen kuinka kirjassa maskuliinisuus näyttäytyy projektina, joka vaatii jatkuvaa kyvykkyyden osoittamista ja erottautumista ihannetta uhkaavista ”Toisista” kuten mustista, aasialaisista, naisista ja ”naismaisista” miehistä.

Asiasanat: Hemingway, maskuliinisuus, miestutkimus, sukupuoliroolit, afroamerikkalaiset, valkoiset

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	1
1.1. Hegemonic Masculinities	1
1.2. Whiteness	7
1.3. Hemingway	10
2. Harry Morgan in Focus	16
2.1. Wife and Family	17
2.2. Harry Morgan and His Friends	25
3. Alternative Masculinities	38
3.1. A Writer, A Professor and the Veterans	38
3.2. Black Men and the Chinese	52
4. Conclusion	65
Bibliography	70

1. Introduction

The aim of this thesis is to study how the masculinities in Hemingway's *To Have and Have Not* are depicted and constructed, the focus being on the main character Harry Morgan. I will explain the topic of the thesis in more detail towards the end of this chapter.

In the first subchapter of this introduction I will discuss hegemonic masculinity and the history of the study of masculinity. I will also look at the historical situation where Hemingway was raised and the attitudes towards masculinity and gender in American society in the early 20th century. The second subchapter deals with the idea of whiteness and how non-white people are used to construct white identity. In the third subchapter I will discuss Hemingway and his relationship to masculinity. I conclude the chapter by introducing the aims of my thesis.

1.1. Hegemonic Masculinities

The study of men and masculinities as a new orientation separate from women's studies was born in the early 1970s when American men started to study masculinity from new viewpoints. Some perceive it as a reaction to the expansion of feminist movement in the late 1960s. In the USA the school is known as 'men's studies' and in Europe usually as the 'study of masculinity'.

There were three different groups in men's movement in the USA depending on their attitudes to women and feminism; 'profeminists' who accepted feminist views, 'antifeminists' who objected feminist views and a 'pro-male' group that wanted to create a new masculinity just between men. Only two of these groups, 'profeminists'

and ‘pro-males’ are involved in ‘men’s studies, but the ‘pro-male’ group is not very influential and the mainstream of ‘men’s studies’ is clearly profeminist.¹

In the 1960s the dominant paradigm in social sciences was role theory, which was adopted also by feminists and women’s studies. In the 1970s when men’s studies were born, the concept of ‘sex role’ was used also to study and explain masculinity. It soon became clear that it was not possible to describe all the variety of different ways to be a man by using only one male sex role. There were more than one masculinity and so it was necessary to develop new concepts to discuss the different masculinities and their mutual relationships.²

In 1985, criticizing sex role theory, Tim Carrigan, R.W. Connell and John Lee published an article entitled “Toward a New Sociology of Masculinity” where they introduced the concept of ‘hegemonic masculinity’. R.W. Connell has later developed the concept further.³ To put it briefly, according to Connell, hegemonic masculinity is a way to legitimise patriarchy and the dominant position of men.⁴ Since then ‘hegemonic masculinity’ has been a central construct in men’s studies but it has also been criticized as too simplistic.⁵

In the 1990s there emerged in the United States a new trend in the study of masculinity that wanted to concentrate on the dominant masculinity, that is, the white heterosexual men. Putting it bluntly, it claimed that because white men had had so much

¹Jorma Sipilä and Arto Tiihonen, eds. *Miestä rakennetaan - maskuliinisuuksia puretaan* (Tampere : Vastapaino, 1994) 17.

²Arto Jokinen, ed. *Yhdestä puusta : maskuliinisuuksien rakentuminen populaarikulttuureissa* (Tampere University Press, 2003) 11.

³Arto Jokinen, ed. *Yhdestä puusta : maskuliinisuuksien rakentuminen populaarikulttuureissa* (Tampere University Press, 2003) 12.

⁴R. W. Connell, *Masculinities* Berkeley : (University of California Press, 1995) 77.

⁵Jorma Sipilä and Arto Tiihonen, eds. *Miestä rakennetaan - maskuliinisuuksia puretaan* (Tampere : Vastapaino, 1994) 28.

power it had not been possible to see them without that power and as just “men” or as a gender.⁶

R.W. Connell has later developed the concept of hegemonic masculinity in his book *Gender and Power*. In the first place the concept of hegemony was borrowed from Antonio Gramsci who used it to describe class relations. Hegemony in this context means a socially dominant position that has been “achieved in a play of social forces that extends beyond contests of brute power into the organization of private life and cultural processes”.⁷ In other words, it means that hegemony does not destroy the alternatives. Rather, it means domination by subordination. Other masculinities, the non-hegemonic ones, can exist because a “balance of forces” is reached between them and the hegemony.⁸

Also Jopi Nyman, in his book *Men Alone*, has the view that hegemony is a matter of consent, a result of negotiations between groups. He sees that hegemonic and non-hegemonic masculinities have different distinctive functions: “hegemonic masculinity is normative and normalizing, non-hegemonic masculinities are in a critical relation to it”. This does not mean that non-hegemonic views have to be politically critical.⁹

It may seem odd that the subordinated masculinities are willing to compromise with the hegemonic views. But this becomes understandable when you consider the benefits that hegemonic masculinity grants all men. Even men who belong to subordinate groups can feel superior to women. More generally it is a question of

⁶ Bryce Traister, Academic Viagra: The Rise of American Masculinity Studies *American Quarterly* (2000 Volume 52, Number 2) 274-281.

⁷ R. W. Connell, *Gender and power : Society, the Person and Sexual Politics* Stanford, (Calif. : Stanford University Press, 1987) 184.

⁸ Connell, 1987, 184.

⁹ Jopi Nyman, *Men alone : Masculinity, Individualism, and Hard-Boiled Fiction* (Amsterdam : Rodopi, 1997) 52.

power; all kinds of men are willing to support models of masculinity that are distortions of the reality because it gives them a portion of the hegemonic power.¹⁰

Although all men can at least to some extent feel privileged, hegemony means necessarily that there are masculinities that are subordinated. An example of this and in Connell's view the most important case, is the dominance of heterosexual men and subordination of homosexual men in Europe and America.¹¹

One can see that hegemonic masculinity in its present form is obviously necessarily heterosexual. But heterosexual men can also be subordinated if they do not seem to fulfil the requirements of hegemonic masculinity. Like homosexuals subordinated heterosexual men are seen as more feminine than masculine.¹²

There are also other important dividing lines between masculinities. Class and race influence the way different masculinities relate to each other.¹³ Both concepts are significant to my thesis as they have an essential role in the way Hemingway's *To Have and Have Not* describes men and their relationships with each other and how white masculinity is constructed in the novel. R.W. Connell points out how black masculinity is used in constructing white gender. A black sport star in the United States can be an example of masculine toughness and thus of hegemonic masculinity. But this goes only for individuals, not black men in general.¹⁴ Black masculinity may also be a threat; among the white a black man can be seen as a potential rapist.¹⁵

But hegemonic masculinity does not always need to have the same appearance. When gender relations change, a different kind of masculinity may win the hegemonic

¹⁰ Connell, 1987, 185.

¹¹ Connell, 1995, 78.

¹² Connell, 1995, 78-9.

¹³ Connell, 1995, 80.

¹⁴ Connell, 1995, 80-1.

¹⁵ Connell, 1995, 80.

position.¹⁶ In fact hegemonic masculinity is itself dependent on those that it wishes to subordinate and it cannot exist alone because it “is always constructed in a relation to various subordinated masculinities as well as in relation to women”.¹⁷ Hegemony is possible because men in general are willing to support it even if it does not give a true picture of them. As Connell puts it, “Few men are Bogarts or Stallones, many collaborate in sustaining those images”.¹⁸

Indeed, the heroes of popular culture can have a strong influence on how we see masculinity and what the qualities are that we expect from a man. In my youth I was a devout reader of Jerry Cotton books and I believe that their influence on my view of how a man should behave may still linger somewhere in my unconscious.

Fiction is a powerful medium that can shape our thinking and ideals. According to R.W. Connell, “hegemonic masculinity is naturalized in the form of the hero and presented through forms that revolve around heroes: sagas, ballads, westerns, thrillers”. What this means is that fictional heroes justify the privileges of ordinary men.¹⁹ Hegemony creates models that do not much resemble majority of men, but are fantasy figures.²⁰ In my thesis I intend to show how Harry Morgan’s fate in *To Have and Have Not* can be read as criticism against the heroic ideal of tough individualistic masculinity.

In trying to understand Hemingway and his writing and his ideals of masculinity I am going to look at the historical situation where he was raised and where he started to write. More specifically, I want to see what the attitudes towards masculinity and gender were in American society in the early 20th century and whether those attitudes had any effect on the representation of masculinity in contemporary literature.

¹⁶ Connell, 1995, 76.

¹⁷ Connell, 1987, 186.

¹⁸ Connell, 1987, 185.

¹⁹ Connell, 1987, 249.

²⁰ Connell, 1987, 184-5.

In her book *XY. De l'identité masculine* Elisabeth Badinter describes how towards the end of the 19th century there was a widely expressed concern in the USA about “Europeanization” and it was feared that as a consequence, American culture and the American man would become feminised.²¹

David Greven argues that Andrew Jackson, President of the United States (1829-1837), epitomized the new ideal of American masculinity and influenced authors like Nathaniel Hawthorne and James Fenimore Cooper. He describes Jackson as “a symbol for a newly American form of male identity, one predicated on the purgation of effeminacy, weakness, cultivation, one that represented a decisive break with the European model, now viewed as decadent, artificial, moribund.”²² This Jacksonian ideal also stressed self-control and self-reliance²³ like R. W. Emerson did in his essays a little later.

According to Badinter, American masculinity had had plenty of opportunities to assert itself with the conquest of the West and the territorial expansion, but industrialization changed the situation. Work became less independent, more mechanised and routinized and the workers lost their say over how the work was done.²⁴ Men were losing their status in the workplace and women started to adopt new roles. American women challenged the traditional women’s role by establishing women’s clubs, putting their daughters to college and working outside the home. They also wanted the right to divorce and to vote.²⁵

Men felt more and more insecure as women’s demands grew. They claimed that women were being egoistic and threatening home and family life, and when divorce rate

²¹ Elisabeth Badinter, *Mikä on mies?* (Tampere : Vastapaino, 1993) 37.

²² David Greven, *Men beyond desire : manhood, sex and violation in American literature* (New York : Palgrave Macmillan , 2005) 4.

²³ Greven, 2005, 4.

²⁴ Badinter, 1993, 37.

²⁵ Badinter, 1993, 38.

climbed dramatically and birth rate declined, Theodore Roosevelt went as far as to warn in 1903 that the American race was committing suicide.²⁶

The reason for the situation was not seen to be so much in women but in the feminisation of culture. Boys were not tough enough, but there were means to make them more masculine. Boys were made to play rough games like football and go to scout camps in order to save them from the bad influence of urban culture.²⁷

But according to Badinter, there were still no answers to the problems of modern masculinity. When reality did not provide opportunities for heroism, literature offered substitutes by creating fictive heroes. The Wild West was rediscovered and the cowboy became the ideal of true masculinity. Edgar Rice Burroughs created Tarzan in 1912 and his books were sold by millions to the middle classes.²⁸

1.2. Whiteness

The fact that the hero in *To Have and Have Not* is white seems obvious enough, almost to the degree that it is invisible. All the other main characters are white and so are most of the lesser characters in the book; whiteness is the norm, the black and the Chinese are a deviation. Dyer points out that in Western society: “Whiteness generally colonises the stereotypical definition of all social categories other than those of race. To be normal, even to be normally deviant (queer, crippled), is to be white.”²⁹ Still, there are different shades of whiteness and some people are whiter than others. Dyer uses the term “hegemonic whiteness” and argues that “For much of the past two centuries, North

²⁶ Badinter, 1993, 38-9.

²⁷ Badinter, 1993, 39.

²⁸ Badinter, 1993, 40.

²⁹ Richard Dyer, *White* (London : Routledge , 1997) 12.

European whiteness has been hegemonic within a whiteness that has none the less been assumed to include Southern and Eastern European peoples. . . .”³⁰

But do the blacks and the Chinese in the book exist only for the sake of verisimilitude, or do they have some more important function in the novel. I suspect that they indeed serve also another purpose; namely as a contrast or a background against which the white characters, and especially the main character, are posed. What it is to be white, and more specifically what it is to be a white male, is constructed by using the blacks and the Chinese to show what it is not.

I find Toni Morrison’s term “American Africanism” a useful tool in discussing the meaning of race in *To Have and Have Not*. Morrison does not offer a strict definition of “American Africanism”. She speaks eloquently about how blackness has been used in American literature as a symbol that enables the white writers to take up various difficult matters that are essential for the American identity.³¹ For my own purposes I will take some aspects from Morrison’s broad definition and use them as I examine how hegemonic – and therefore necessarily white – masculinity is constructed.

Morrison claims that American literary research has supposed and held self-evidently true that African-Americans have not affected in any way the traditional American literature.³² According to her, the prevailing view among the literary critics is that because white males have mainly written American literature, there can be no connection between it and the black people.³³ Morrison claims that this is not true and that the black population has been an important but hidden influential factor.

³⁰ Dyer, 1997, 12-3

³¹ Toni Morrison, *Playing in the Dark: Whiteness and the Literary Imagination* (New York : Vintage Books, 1993) 6-7.

³² Morrison, 1993, 4-5.

³³ Morrison, 1993, 5.

The African-Americans have offered a sort of background against which the white have been able to define themselves; Morrison talks about the “racial other”.³⁴ My interpretation is that this “Other” is a like a vessel that holds the non-white properties. Even when Africans are not visible in literature they are present implicitly and help to build white American identity. Immigrants in the USA saw their Americanism as the antithesis of the black population and this is reflected in their literature; to be American is to be white.³⁵

The new American nation needed to create an identity and its own culture and felt it had to distinguish itself from the Old World. The New World was different from the Old in its alleged freedom but there was also a similar dividing line inside the forming nation; the freedom of the white and the lack of freedom that was felt by the African slaves. This division between the powerful and free white population and the powerless and enslaved black population marked also the division between Americans and non-Americans.³⁶ “Africanism” that was seen to represent barbarism and brutality was essential for the construction of American identity.³⁷ In a similar way white American literature uses “Africanism” as a tool to construct the “American Self”, making dichotomies such as free and enslaved, strong and weak, desired and repugnant and assigning the negative qualities to Africans.³⁸

According to Morrison, American literature wanted to construct an American that was new, white and male.³⁹ The main themes became independence, authority, novelty and difference and absolute power for which ‘barbaric’ “Africanism” offered a

³⁴ Morrison, 1993, 46.

³⁵ Morrison, 1993, 47.

³⁶ Morrison, 1993, 48-9.

³⁷ Morrison, 1993, 44.

³⁸ Morrison, 1993, 52.

³⁹ Morrison, 1993, 39.

suitable background.⁴⁰ Morrison uses the life of William Dunbar, a plantation owner who lived in the 18th century, as a real life example and sees his story as a good depiction of the process that formed the American as “the new white male”. To put it bluntly, Morrison claims that in the New World man was able to feel more of a man because he had an absolute power over ‘barbaric’ and ‘brutal’ black slaves.⁴¹

Interestingly, Morrison sees Hemingway as an author whose works the ideological development of the 19th century has not affected and therefore they lack a certain sensitivity making his works a good example of how “Africanism” is used in literature. “Africanist” presence affects Hemingway’s text distorting it, creating contradictions in it but all the same making it dependent on that presence.⁴²

Morrison gives an example of how, a black man is used in Hemingway’s novel *To Have and Have Not* to give the reader an impression that a white man, Harry Morgan, is a moral, courageous and masculine man.⁴³ I will use this analysis as a model for my own discussion of how race is used in construction of various masculinities in the novel.

1.3. Hemingway

Ernest Hemingway’s name inevitably brings to mind things that are closely linked to an image of a certain kind of heroic masculinity: war, bullfights, boxing, big game hunting and deep-sea fishing. He certainly had some experience of all these manly enterprises, though the extent to which he was involved in them is sometimes debatable.

During the World War I Hemingway drove a Red Cross ambulance in Italy and was badly wounded. He showed courage by carrying a wounded Italian soldier to safety

⁴⁰ Morrison, 1993, 44.

⁴¹ Morrison, 1993, 43-4.

⁴² Morrison, 1993, 70.

⁴³ Morrison, 1993, 70-6.

in spite of his own injuries and was awarded a medal.⁴⁴ Later he would tell many differing stories about his wounding and admitted himself that all of them were not true.⁴⁵

Hemingway was a bullfight enthusiast, had an expert knowledge in it and took part in some kind of amateur bullfighting in 1920s.⁴⁶ In his book about bullfighting, *Death in the Afternoon*, Hemingway describes this spectacle of violence and death, both themes that were essential to Hemingway's writing. It had the same "sweet smell" of blood that came from hunting, boxing, bulls, wounds, accidents".⁴⁷

There is one common denominator in Hemingway's sporting interests: violence. Meyers goes as far as to say that Hemingway liked killing and that war was to him just another sport, the greatest of them all.⁴⁸ He was a keen hunter and shot animals for trophies, which was totally acceptable at the time, but there was a streak of sadism in his eagerness to kill animals without any sensible reason, just for the fun of it, as it seems.⁴⁹ This attitude was no doubt something he had learned already in his childhood when he hunted with his father: "if it moved, they killed it".⁵⁰

All these activities were important parts of his public image that he actively sought to keep up, and they also offered him material for his writing, but Hemingway was not only keeping up appearances for the public's sake. Masculinity and the moral code that should go with it were deeply important matters to Hemingway, matters that he struggled with throughout his life.

One could possibly say that Hemingway's life and career were a project aimed at fulfilling a certain ideal of being a male and all his writing deals with how to be a

⁴⁴ Jeffrey Meyers, *Hemingway: a Biography* (London : Macmillan, 1986) 30-1.

⁴⁵ Meyers, 1986, 33.

⁴⁶ Meyers, 1986, 119.

⁴⁷ Meyers, 1986, 117.

⁴⁸ Meyers, 1986, 117.

⁴⁹ Meyers, 1986, 281-5.

⁵⁰ Meyers, 1986, 12.

man and tries to define what the ideal masculinity is like. This makes him a very obvious target for research that deals with masculinity.

It is supposed to be common knowledge that Hemingway and his heroes were tough guys, used to violence, acting not talking. As far as Hemingway is concerned, this is of course at odds with his role as a man of letters, someone who works with words and ideas. It is also questionable if Hemingway was such a war hero, as he liked to portray himself⁵¹ and he certainly was not a bullfighter though he may have tried it.⁵² Much of what he told about himself was invented in purpose to enhance his heroic public image that helped to sell his books.⁵³

As to Hemingway's fictional heroes, it is certainly true that on the surface they appear tough and even callous, but inside they experience fear and uncertainty as they struggle to follow their code, which they feel necessary in order to be able to maintain their sense of moral integrity. Hemingway described this code as "grace under pressure", which according to Philip Young "is made of the controls of honor and courage which in a life of tension and pain make a man a man and distinguish him from the people who follow their random impulses".⁵⁴

Jeffrey Meyers claims in his biography that the heroic image, which Hemingway helped to create, was not relevant to the real Hemingway.⁵⁵ As I understand it, Meyers means that the image was not true, and beneath it there was something hidden that was the real Hemingway, who did not own up to the distorted public image. But it seems that the image was necessary to Hemingway and in that sense very relevant. After all, he mythologized himself to such extent that it is hard to believe it was only for

⁵¹ Meyers, 1986, 239.

⁵² Philip Young, *Ernest Hemingway : A Reconsideration* (University Park : Pennsylvania State University Press , 1966 (1976)) 63.

⁵³ Meyers, 1986, 239.

⁵⁴ Young, 1966, 63

⁵⁵ Meyers, 1986, 238.

commercial purposes. Meyers states that “he not only helped to create myths about himself, he also seemed to believe them”.⁵⁶ On the other hand, even early on in his career, Hemingway used his own experiences in his writing and “tried to distill the essence of the experience so that what he made up was truer than what he remembered”.⁵⁷ There seems to be a curious overlap between reality and fiction in Hemingway’s works and life; he put his life in his fiction and his fiction in his life.

One feels that there had to be some more compelling reasons, some deep-seated need or insecurity that made him tell embellished stories about himself in order to appear more masculine. Gertrude Stein, who came to know Hemingway well during his stay in Paris in the 1920s, said of him "He had compensated for his incredibly acute shyness and sensitivity by adopting a shield of brutality".⁵⁸ Meyers comes to the same kind of conclusion: “[Hemingway] concealed his innate sensitivity under the mask of a man of action”.⁵⁹ There was a conflict between his artistic self, which appreciated culture and intellect, but which he felt was effeminate, even homosexual, and the demands of more conventional tough masculinity of his father.⁶⁰

As a boy Hemingway was keenly interested in wars and heroes. He admired Teddy Roosevelt who had fought in the Spanish-American War (1898) and who later as a president expressed his concern of what he saw as effeminising of American men at the beginning of the 20th century. Jeffrey Meyers points out the many similarities between the two men.

Both men had tremendous energy, personal magnetism, boastful self-confidence and a boyish joy in ordinary experience. Both advocated the strenuous life, and placed great emphasis on bodily fitness and physical strength. Both were pugnacious and belligerent, and became experienced boxers. Both were keen naturalists who hunted big game in the American

⁵⁶ Meyers, 1986, 238.

⁵⁷ Meyers, 1986, 98.

⁵⁸ Meyers, 1986, 241.

⁵⁹ Meyers, 1986, 241.

⁶⁰ Meyers, 1986, 17.

West and in East Africa. Both were men of letters who became men of action, and heroes who generated considerable publicity. Hemingway, following in the tradition of his grandfathers and of Teddy Roosevelt, went to five wars: in Italy, Turkey, Spain, China and France.⁶¹

Also Michael Reynolds stresses the great influence that Roosevelt's ideals had on Hemingway. A man should be self-reliant, physically fit and ready to fight to defend himself. Turning the other cheek was deemed cowardliness.⁶²

Hemingway grew up in a time when masculinity was facing new challenges as the industrialization began to change the society. Old virtues of frontier, independence, courage and stamina were not needed anymore in cities, where men worked in factories and had less freedom to make decisions over their work. This caused fear among men of losing their masculine identity and the reaction was to cling to old values. Hemingway tried to live according to those values. This was at least to some extent possible to him because as an artist he was free from the restrictions that hinder most of us who make our living in more conventional ways.

In this thesis, I aim to study how masculinity is represented in Ernest Hemingway's novel *To Have and Have Not* (1937). I will mainly concentrate on Harry Morgan, the protagonist of the novel and examine what his character and his relationship with other characters can tell about the construction of different masculinities in the novel. In the course of the novel people of both sexes and with different social and ethnic backgrounds come into contact with Harry's story. By studying these contacts I want to look at Harry's masculinity from different angles and demonstrate how it is defined in contrast to other, frequently subordinate gendered and ethnic positions. Especially I want to examine whether Harry's tough character has any cracks or ruptures that point to a possibility of a different kind of masculinity.

⁶¹ Meyers, 1986, 3-4.

⁶² Michael Reynolds, *The Young Hemingway* (Oxford : Blackwell , 1986) 27-8.

Through my reading of the novel I aim to make claims about the extent to which Harry Morgan attempts to fulfil the demands of hegemonic masculinity. In that attempt he relies too rigidly on a certain code of behaviour and perishes because of that, while other male characters can be perceived as alternative ways to cope with the same demands. I will describe the masculinity that Harry is trying to live up to and the other masculinities in the book and compare them with each other. Furthermore I will show how these other masculinities are used to define Harry's masculinity. My question will be: is it possible to read the novel as a critique of hegemonic masculinity?

2. Harry Morgan in Focus

Harry Morgan is the protagonist of *To Have and Have Not*. In his former life he has been a police officer in Miami but when the novel begins he lives in Florida's Key Islands and owns a fishing boat that he rents to tourists taking them out to sea from Cuba for deep-sea fishing. Morgan lands in trouble when his customer does not pay the rent for the boat and loses his earnings that he has planned to support his family for the next months. Even with a full knowledge of the risks he is taking he decides to smuggle some Chinamen from Cuba to the United States.

When the depression comes the charter boat business disappears and Harry starts to smuggle alcohol on his boat. During one of these trips he gets shot and as a consequence loses his right arm. The customs officials take his boat and Harry feels he has lost everything but his masculinity and that is his pride. As his last effort to get back on his feet financially he makes a contract to smuggle Cuban revolutionaries from the Key Islands to Cuba after they have robbed a bank. The Cubans kill Harry's friend Albert when they get on the boat. Later out on the sea there is a gunfight on the boat where all the Cubans are killed and Harry is fatally wounded.

In this chapter I will concentrate on Harry Morgan and the different aspects of his life. I will study how he builds his masculinity in these different areas and what kind of masculinity he is trying to maintain. I will also try to find any possible signs that point to any weaknesses on the tough surface of his masculinity.

I will first look at Harry's family life and examine his relationship with his wife and daughters. In the second section I concentrate on Harry's relationship with his friends.

2.1. Wife and Family

Harry Morgan has a wife, Marie, and three daughters whose names are not mentioned and whose ages are not told, either. They live in their own house in Florida's Key Islands; Marie does not work, she is a housewife and takes care of the children while Harry runs his charter boat business and stays in Cuba during the deep-sea fishing season.

We do not learn much about Marie's past; there are only a few hints that she has been a prostitute. There is a scene in the novel where Marie and Harry have sex.

Afterwards Marie muses on her relationship with Harry and reveals that she has had a lot of affairs. "There ain't no other men like that. People ain't never tried them don't know. I've had plenty of them".⁶³ Towards the end of the book, when Harry lies deadly wounded in his boat, he is worrying how Marie would manage without him and states quite plainly: "Marie, she'll run something. She's too old to peddle her hips now". (Thahn p. 130) So it is obvious that Marie has sometime in her life been selling herself and that Harry knows about it but does not mind. He has married her, has three children with her and takes pride in being able to support them. He boasts to his friend Albert: "my kids ain't going to have their bellies hurt" (Thahn p.74) and later: "my family is going to eat as long as anybody eats" (Thahn p.75) which shows that he cares for his family but it also shows an ethos that essentially says that in order to be man one must be able to work and earn a living.⁶⁴

Jopi Nyman, among others, argues that *To Have and have Not* is hard-boiled fiction and I agree with that. According to Nyman, one of the features of hard-boiled men is that they "tend to consider sexually active women as a threat because their

⁶³ Ernest Hemingway, *To Have and Have Not* (London : Granada, 1982) 88. Hereafter abbreviated in the text as *Thahn*.

⁶⁴ Skeggs, Beverley "Theorizing Masculinity." *Mieheyden tiellä : maskuliinisuus ja kulttuuri*. Ed. Pirjo Ahokas, Martti Lahti & Jukka Sihvonen. Jyväskylä : Jyväskylän yliopisto , 1993, 13-35.

behaviour blurs traditional gender roles and hints at perversity or nymphomania”.⁶⁵ This seems to be at least somewhat at odds with Harry’s attitude towards Marie. Marie has been a prostitute and she very obviously likes sex. “Christ, I could do that all night if a man was built that way. I’d like to do it and never sleep. Never, never, no, never. No, never, never, never”. (Thahn p. 88) She can also be the one who takes the initiative.

Lying still in the bed he felt her lips on his face and searching for him and then her hand on him and he rolled over against her close.

'Do you want to ?'

'Yes. Now.' (Thahn p. 86)

It seems that Harry does not feel threatened by Marie’s open sexuality but rather appreciates it. When Marie hints to her questionable past, Harry reassures her in a way that seems to praise expressly her sexual performance. “I’ve had that thing.' 'That don't make no difference when a woman's any good.’” (Thahn p. 86)

The reason why Harry is not offended by Marie’s promiscuous past could be that he believes she is faithful to him. It may even be flattering to Harry that a woman who has such an appetite for sex and who has so much experience with men thinks that he is man enough for her. The situation serves to emphasize Harry’s exceptional masculinity. He is capable of satisfying sexually a woman whose needs are greater than those of an ordinary woman.

The sex scene described in the novel between Harry and Marie occurs after Harry has lost his arm in amputation. According to Nyman, in hard-boiled fiction a healthy white male is set as an ideal and other kind of bodies are neglected.⁶⁶ That would mean that when Harry loses his arm, he is no longer a hard-boiled hero in a sense that Nyman means. In the novel though Harry’s manliness is not doubted. It is true that Harry is worried that Marie may find his arm stump unpleasant. “Listen, do

⁶⁵ Nyman, 1997, 138.

⁶⁶ Nyman, 1997, 96.

you mind the arm? Don't it make you feel funny?" (Thahn p.86) But Marie claims she does not mind, on the contrary. "You're silly. I like it. Any that's you I like." (Thahn p.86) Marie does not seem to question Harry's masculinity because of his disability. In fact his stump becomes an object in their sexual play when Harry compares it to a turtles flipper. This leads Marie to question about the turtle's mating which hints again to her appetite for sex. "Do they really do it three days? Coot for three days?" (Thahn p. 86) It is like thinking Harry's stump actually arouses her, as if it has become a sexual fetish. "Go ahead. Go ahead now. Put the stump there. Hold it there. Hold it. Hold it now. Hold it." (Thahn p.87) It seems that in the eyes of Marie, Harry does not lose any of his masculinity because of his disability. On the one hand, this could be interpreted as a possibility for another kind of masculinity that can admit weakness without a loss of worth, but, on the other hand, it could be interpreted as a confirmation of Harry's hard masculinity; the fact that Harry passes for a man after his body is not whole anymore, serves to emphasize his exceptional masculine strength.

Harry's lost arm can be seen as a symbol for vulnerability that he can either accept or reject by clinging to the ideal of a self-reliant tough guy. There are occasions when Harry cannot avoid to face his disability and need for help. It is almost comical when a man who takes pride in being able to make it alone must ask her wife to cut the meat for him. "When the girls were out of the room he said to Marie, 'Cut it up, will you?' 'Sure, Honey.' She cut the meat as for a small boy." (Thahn p.95) Harry must humble himself to be helped like a child but he cannot do it before her daughters, he waits until they have left the room. He can show his weakness only to his wife and it hurts his pride to do so. "Thanks,' Harry said. 'I'm a hell of a goddamn nuisance, ain't I?" (Thahn p.95)

The inability to cope with such a simple task as cutting meat makes Harry feel helpless and threatens his self-image making him doubt his manliness. Beverley Skeggs states that “Within masculinity the body is a vehicle of capability, it has to continually measure up to the standards, performance and judgement of others. . . .”⁶⁷ It is significant that after apologizing for being a nuisance Harry continues without a pause and starts talking about their children.

Those girls aren't much, are they ?'
 'No, Hon.'
 'Funny we couldn't get no boys.'
 'That's because you're such a man. That way it always comes out girls.'
 'I ain't no hell of a man,' Harry said. (Thahn p.95)

The helplessness that he feels because of his lost arm brings to his mind another weakness that his body seems to have, making him doubt his worth as a man; he has not been able to have sons. Jopi Nyman has pointed out that Harry’s values in this respect remind those of patriarchal systems where ability to produce sons is held in high esteem.⁶⁸ It seems that Marie shares the same values because she agrees with Harry that girls are not as valuable as boys, which also means of course that she diminishes her own value as a woman and accepts that men are more valuable.

Marie takes a role of a caregiver or a mother when she cuts the meat for him “as for small boy” and consoles him when he doubts his worth as a man. Seidler points out how the competitiveness of the world outside home forces men to hide their doubts and fears and seek support from their wives. He notes: “Often this means being a 'strong adult' at work while being a little boy who wants to be cared for and protected at home.”⁶⁹

⁶⁷ Skeggs, 1993, 26.

⁶⁸ Nyman, 1997, 130.

⁶⁹ Victor J. Seidler, *Recreating Sexual Politics :Men, Feminism and Politics* (London : Routledge , 1991) 22.

Marie seems fully to comply with the patriarchal values that expect a woman to put men's needs first. But there is a peculiar twist in her interpretation of Harry's knack of turning out only girls. Contrary to the patriarchal view, which claims that true men produce boys, she tells Harry that he has girls just because he is so manly. Is it possible that what she really wants to say is that girls are valuable too or is she only trying to support Harry's self-image or could it be both?

Later in the novel there is a scene that reveals that Marie really does not much appreciate her daughters. Harry has died and Marie, grieving and worried about her future, is trying to think how she can make her living from now on.

I don't know, Marie Morgan was thinking, sitting at the dining-room table, I can take it just a day at a time and a night at a time, and maybe it gets different. It's the goddamned nights. If I cared about those girls it would be different. But I don't care about those girls. (Thahn p.187)

Marie feels it would be easier for her to get over her grief, if she cared about her daughters, but she does not. She seems to have totally internalised the idea that women are not equal to men and to support patriarchal values. When Harry says that the girls are not worth much she does not protest but instead agrees with him.

Being economically dependent on Harry, Marie must feel that she has no choice but try to maintain his self-confidence thus and his ability to support the family. Harry's feeling of self-worth is connected to his masculinity so Marie has to convince him that he is still a man even with only one arm and no male offspring.

Harry does not accept Marie's explanation that his qualities are the reason they have only girls but thinks that it is the woman whose qualities decide the sex of the child. "Those damn girls. That's all that old woman and I could get with what we've got. Do you suppose the boys in her went before I knew her?" (Thahn p.96)

Harry does not want to take the blame of being responsible for their failure to get sons. When the demands of hegemonic masculinity become too heavy for him to bear he attempts to maintain his sense of worth by defining his masculinity in a different way. He wants to break the connection between masculinity and the ability to produce male descendants and save his self-respect but this comes with a cost to hegemony; masculinity loses the power to determine the sex of the children and transfers it to women.

Factually Harry is wrong of course; the scientific fact is that male chromosomes determine the sex of children. But more to the point, what he fails to understand is that it is not important who is responsible for the sex of the children and that man's worth does not depend on having children or what sex they are.

R.W. Connell claims that “‘Hegemonic masculinity’ is constructed in a relation to various subordinated masculinities as well as in relation to women.”⁷⁰ Because as a man, Harry continues to define himself in relation to women and feels that his worth depends on the view that masculine is more valuable than feminine, he cannot adopt the view that would make him free. If he could see that masculine and feminine have equal value and if he could appreciate his daughters, he would not have to feel ashamed of not having sons.

The doubts Harry has concerning his manliness open up a possibility to redefine his masculinity in a way that could give him more freedom from the restrictions of patriarchal values and let him become genuinely autonomous in his views and actions instead of being guided by a masculine code. According to Beverley Skeggs, “the direct articulation of vulnerability is not seen to be a prerogative of masculinity”. I have shown above that Harry Morgan does in fact reveal his weakness and doubts to his wife,

⁷⁰ Connell, 1987, 183.

but only very briefly and in a way that does not lead to any deeper discussion. As Jopi Nyman notes, “To be talkative is to be non-masculine, to betray the gender-based hierarchical value system”.⁷¹ To be able to show that a hero controls his feelings the author must make those feelings become visible to the reader somehow. One way is to use inner monologue and Hemingway does give us glimpses of Harry’s thoughts. “What chance have I to enjoy my home? Why am I back to worse than where I started? It’ll be all gone too if I don’t play this right. The hell it will.” (Thahn p.96) It is obvious from this quote that Harry is confused and has doubts, but it is impossible, really, to say how he feels about his situation. It seems as if the code that forbids the hero to show his vulnerability must be obeyed even in thoughts. The reader must fill in the omitted feelings or some other character in the book must reveal them somehow to the reader.

Victor Seidler claims that the way masculinity has been connected to rationality has made it difficult for men to talk about their feelings and emotions and that therefore men have relied on women to interpret their feelings.⁷² I think this is clearly seen in Harry’s and Marie’s relationship. In the following, I try to show how Harry’s feelings become visible through Marie’s behavior and how she thus enables Harry to appear to the reader as a stoical hero who does not convey his feelings. The hero must suffer and not show it, but the reader must know it somehow because there would be no heroism without pain that must be endured.

In two occasions Marie starts to cry when she sees or thinks of Harry’s face. The first time is when Harry is leaving for his last fatal trip. “His goddamn face,’ she thought. ‘Every time I see his goddamn face it makes me want to cry.’” (Thahn p.97) The second time this happens when Marie sees Harry’s dead body. ”He didn’t suffer at

⁷¹ Nyman, 1997, 157.

⁷² Victor J. Seidler, *Rediscovering Masculinity : Reason, Language and Sexuality* (London : Routledge , 1989) 61-5.

all, Mrs Morgan,' the doctor said. Marie did not seem to hear him. 'Oh Christ,' she said, and began to cry again. 'Look at his goddamned face.'" (Thahn p.187) The reader's attention is directed at what the doctor says. His statement is a conventional consolation to a grieving relative claiming that Harry did not suffer but the reader knows this is not true. Hemingway could have left it there but instead he uses Marie's reaction to make Harry's suffering visible. In effect Marie cries the cry that Harry was forced to conceal.

It is never explained why Harry's face should make her cry. It would be understandable if the given reason for her crying were that she was afraid because Harry was leaving for a dangerous trip or on the latter occasion because she grieves Harry's death. This could be a possible reading but for the fact that Marie says that she wants to cry "every time" she sees his face. There is an occasion elsewhere in the novel where Harry's face provokes a different kind of reaction from another woman. "Oh, he had a beautiful face,' the wife said. 'Like a Tartar or something. '" (Thahn p. 103) This is a more understandable reaction and one that builds Harry's image as a man attractive to women. But Marie's reaction does not convey sexual attraction but compassion or pity. My view is that Marie cries because she is able to see what Harry feels. For Marie Harry's face symbolizes his inner self, his feelings, personality and suffering. A woman must express what the masculine code forces the hero to conceal. On another level the reader is used in a similar way to feel what Harry cannot. It seems that the novel supposes a reader that shares the masculine code and can therefore identify with Harry Morgan. Through the reader's eyes Harry Morgan watches himself suffering, dying and being wept for which gives the novel a sense of self-pity.

2.2. Harry Morgan and His Friends

Harry Morgan is a man who believes in self-reliance; he wants to make it alone which makes him a typical hero of hard-boiled fiction who represents masculine ideals of individualism and toughness. “The hard-boiled character feels that he has to try to survive or die alone, to decide alone for his own action and future.”⁷³

Self-reliance is a concept central to American individualism. Ralph Waldo Emerson defined it in his famous 1841 essay “Self-Reliance” in a way that has exerted a great influence on American ideology and literature. Harry Morgan can be seen as an example of this Emersonian individualism. Bluntly said Emerson’s ideal seems to be a man who relies only on himself and does not listen to others and sees them as a threat to his freedom.

Society everywhere is in conspiracy against the manhood of every one of its members. Society is a jointstock company, in which the members agree, for the better securing of his bread to each shareholder, to surrender the liberty and culture of the eater. The virtue in most request is conformity. Self-reliance is its aversion.⁷⁴

But there are limits to what a man can manage alone and on some occasions Harry must rely on others. In this section I will examine how Harry’s masculinity is constructed in relation to the men that assist him.

Harry has hired Eddy, who is an alcoholic, to help him on his fishing boat. When Harry refers to him he most often uses a disparaging word “rummie”. When Eddy first appears in the novel it is Harry who describes him. “Then, as I looked up, I saw Eddy coming along the dock looking taller and sloppier than ever. He walked with his joints all slung wrong.” (Thahn p. 13) The attention is on Eddy’s drunken appearance; he is untidy and his bodily movements are clumsy, both characteristics suggesting that

⁷³ Nyman, 1997, 32

⁷⁴ Ralph Waldo Emerson, *Selected Essays* (Harmondsworth, Middlesex : Penguin Books New York, N.Y , 1982) 178.

he has lost his self-control. Self-control is an important part of masculine code and lack of it throws a doubt on one's manliness. This is especially true in hard-boiled fiction, as Nyman points out.⁷⁵

Just a few moments earlier both Harry and Eddy have witnessed a gunfight where four men have been shot. Harry who is the narrator gives an account of the incident that is laconic and lacks emotion. Only once does he admit any feeling: "I took a quick one out of the first bottle I saw open and I couldn't tell you yet what it was. The whole thing made me feel pretty bad." (Thahn p. 12) He admits that he was so confused by what he saw that he did not recognize what it was he drank and that he felt "pretty bad". I take it that feeling "pretty bad" is meant to be a tough understatement indicating that the gunfight did unsettle him but he is capable of keeping his feelings under control. Harry's restraint is in contrast with Eddy's openly shocked reaction.

Eddy looked pretty bad. He never looked too good early in the morning; but he looked pretty bad now.
 'Where were you ?' I asked him.
 'On the floor.'
 'Did you see it ?' Johnson asked him.
 "Don't talk about it, Mr Johnson,' Eddy said to him. 'It makes me sick to even think about it.'

The masculine code has been made clear here by showing two different ways of coping with a stressful situation. Harry has proven his masculinity by being able to maintain his cool, nonchalant attitude while Eddy's comes under suspicion.

Eddy's presence in the boat seems somewhat odd, as there is not much for him to do there. Harry tells that he had to hire Eddy because he is indebted to him as it was Eddy who found the customer, Mr. Johnson, who chartered Harry's boat. Harry thus paints a picture of himself as a man who does the just thing although reluctantly. On the

⁷⁵ Nyman, 1997, 122

other hand, Eddy's presence also gives Harry a background against which he can make a favorable impression.

When Harry's customer Mr. Johnson leaves without paying, Harry has no means to support his family for the next months, and in order to earn money he accepts the offer to smuggle Chinese workers from Cuba. Eddy comes to play an important and complicated role in the events: He is not supposed to be on the trip because Harry does not think he needs any help, but Eddy has hidden himself in the boat. When Harry finds him, he decides that he has to kill him because he cannot trust a drunk.

Because he's a rummy he'll talk when he gets hot. I sat there steering and I looked at him and I thought, hell, he's as well off dead as the way he is, and then I'm all clear. When I found he was on board I decided I'd have to do away with him (Thahn p. 49)

The quotation above deals with the moment when Harry has already shown he is capable of extreme violence having killed a man, but still the ease with which he speaks of killing someone he knows closely is remarkable. The regret he expresses is incredibly lame. "I was sorry for him and for what I knew I'd have to do. Hell, I knew him when he was a good man." (Thahn p.38)

When Eddy tries to convince Harry that he still is a "good man", Harry answers rudely. "You're a rummy. . ." (Thahn p.40) Being "a good man" is linked with capability or skill. Harry says that "Eddy was a good man on a boat once, before he got to be a rummy, but he isn't any good now". (Thahn p.20) When we consider the following quote where Eddy is able to give Harry advice on how to steer the boat, it becomes clear that skill is one of the crucial criteria of a good man. "'Get up forward,' I said to Eddy. 'You can't hit anything on that side,' he said. 'The reef's on the other side as you go in.' You see, he'd been a good man once." (Thahn p.42) According to Nyman, ". . . professionalism is a form of mastery and masculine power and control,

too.”⁷⁶ In a similar way Alice Ferrebe remarks, “Though continually couched as rational, independent and isolated, masculinity as a project in fact involves an intense level both of emotional investment and of public performance and validation.”⁷⁷

Throughout the boat trip that Harry and Eddy make together, Eddy’s weakness forms a background to Harry’s masculine power. But Eddy’s presence does also undermine Harry’s masculinity. The ideal that Harry strives for requires him to survive alone but now he must depend on someone he does not trust, a “rummy” who lacks self-control and independence and is therefore not truly masculine.

No reason is given why Harry suddenly decides that he now needs Eddy’s help. He just states: “I’m going to need him now.” (Thahn p. 39) Harry is supposed to transport twelve Chinese men illegally from Cuba to a place where they should wait for a ship to take them away. But the Chinese have been betrayed. Mr. Sing who has arranged the transport tells that there is no ship and that Harry can land the men wherever he wants to. The trip is dangerous; if Harry were caught he could get a ten-year sentence and he is also worried that the Chinese could have weapons. They would also probably be furious to learn they have been cheated and therefore dangerous. Consequently, Harry has prepared for violence and has several firearms with him. Harry must have begun to doubt how he can manage the situation by himself and sees Eddy as a welcome reinforcement.

Harry is an expert using guns having been a policeman in Miami but Eddy in contrast has to be told how to use a rifle. A pump shotgun would be too difficult for Eddy to use and Harry doubts and ridicules even his skills with a rifle.

Do you know how to use the pump-gun?
'No. But you can show me.'

⁷⁶ Nyman, 1997, 122.

⁷⁷ Alice Ferrebe, *Masculinity in Male-Authored Fiction 1950-2000 : Keeping it Up* (Basingstoke : Palgrave Macmillan , 2005) 9.

'You'd never remember. Do you know how to use the Winchester?'
 'Just pump the lever and shoot it.'
 'That's right,' I said. 'Only don't shoot any holes in the hull.' (Thahn p. 41)

To be masculine is to be able and willing to use violence. R.W. Connell has pointed out
 “. . . the classic hero is usually a specialist in violence”.⁷⁸ Once again Harry’s qualities
 are shown to be superior to Eddy.

As already pointed out above, self-control is an important feature of the
 masculine code. Eddy is dependent on alcohol suggesting that he lacks willpower and
 thus self-control. Alcohol affects also directly one’s ability to control one’s body and
 mind. It diminishes one’s ability to rational thinking and, as Skeggs notes, rationality is
 essential to masculinity.⁷⁹

Jopi Nyman has pointed out that Harry Morgan is a Hemingwayan “code hero”,
 meaning among other things that he can control his courage.⁸⁰ Eddy can control his
 courage but only when he is drunk enough. Therefore it is in fact Harry who has the
 control because he rations out rum to Eddy, making sure he is sufficiently intoxicated;
 just enough for him to be brave but not to lose his ability to function. “I’m going to
 give you a couple more in a little while,’ I told him. ‘I know you haven’t got any cojones
 unless you’ve got rum. . .’” (Thahn p. 40) It is also notable that when Harry speaks here
 about courage, he uses the word “cojones” which is Spanish for testicles. This clearly
 shows that he thinks courage is a gendered characteristic, that only men can have
 courage.

As the narrator Harry repeatedly makes remarks about Eddy’s drunkenness and
 the effect that alcohol has on his behavior. “It certainly was wonderful what a drink
 would do to him and how quick.” (Thahn p. 42) The reader has no possibility to miss

⁷⁸ Connell, 1987, 249.

⁷⁹ Skeggs, 1993, 16.

⁸⁰ Nyman, 1997, 109.

the point: Eddy needs rum to keep his courage up and every time he takes a drink he suddenly becomes excessively daring and quarrelsome. When the Chinese are forced to leave the boat on the Cuban coast, he threatens them with a gun shouting racist insults. “‘You yellow rat-eating aliens’ Eddy said, ‘get overboard. ‘Shut your drunken mouth,’ I told him.” (Thahn p. 48) Eddy seems to enjoy too much the power that a gun gives him and also breaks the code by talking too much. Talkativeness is considered non-masculine in hard-boiled fiction.⁸¹ A man must prove his worth by acting, not talking.

Eddy tries to act according to the hard-boiled masculine code but manages only to turn it into a caricature which Harry does not like at all. Eddy’s tough talk sounds like a parody of a hard-boiled fiction character and inadvertently ridicules Harry’s masculine ideal. Talking about how masculinity is constructed in hard-boiled fiction Jopi Nyman has pointed out how:

. . . Hemingway’s novel makes explicit the contrast between an ideal masculine character and a loser by setting up the conceptions of strict self-control and the principles of individualistic behaviour as criteria for masculinity.⁸²

But it seems that the contrast between Harry and Eddy, the hero and the loser, cuts both ways here; on the one hand, it shows Harry in a favorable light but, on the other hand, it also makes him appear ridiculous thus undermining the masculine ideal that he represents.

It could also be argued that through tough acting Eddy makes Harry see only too clearly what he himself is like; a violent man who mistakes fear for respect and who wants to make an impression on others. That is why he tells Eddy to shut up.

To sum up, the relationship between Harry and Eddy is a means of constructing an ideal masculinity by showing what it is and what it is not. But there are signs that

⁸¹ Nyman, 1997, 157.

⁸² Nyman, 1997, 122.

point to problems in the ideal. I argue that it is possible to offer an alternative reading of their male bonding showing that Eddy's drunken toughness acts as a parody of the ideal and creates doubts of its validity. These two readings are not exclusive but can co-exist, making the novel ambiguous in its attitude towards hard-boiled masculinity. Also pointing to a crack in the ideal is that self-reliance is put in doubt, as Harry is unable to manage alone but has to accept help from someone who does not fulfill the masculine code.

Next I will concentrate on Harry's friend Albert whom Harry chooses as a helper for his last fatal trip. Albert first appears as the narrator in the first chapter of the third part of the novel. As also Harry is used as a narrator in the novel, it is possible to compare their styles. As I have mentioned above, masculine code considers talkativeness as a weakness. Albert as a narrator seems to use longer sentences than Harry whose style is more laconic, but when they talk as characters in the novel, their styles do not seem to differ that much and in fact Harry talks more than Albert. The men have known each other for a long time and have worked together in Harry's boat. Albert says "I always liked him all right and I'd gone in a boat with him plenty of times in the old days. . . ." (Thahn p. 75) It is difficult to decide if their relation could be called a friendship – the masculine code they both obey does not allow any show of male bonding – but there is another occasion when Albert says he likes Harry, although there seems to be some reservation. "He was a bully and he was bad spoken but I always liked him all right". (Thahn p. 76) The fact that Harry has no male friends seems to suggest that he finds close male-to-male relationships threatening. Harry's tough talk may be seen as a strategy to fend off too close intimacy between men in the fear that it

could interpreted as homosexual. Haralson notes how Hemingway uses brusqueness in order to stifle “the drift of male bonding into gay meaning. . . .”⁸³

Albert’s view of Harry as a bully – someone who coerces others by force and fear – seems to confirm what I have claimed above, namely that Harry mistakes fear for respect. Albert himself does not qualify as a tough guy. When Harry considers whom he might take with him on his final trip transporting Cuban revolutionists, he describes Albert: “He’s soft but he’s straight and he’s a good man in a boat.” (Thahn p. 81) Albert lacks toughness and is therefore not an ideal partner on a dangerous trip but he comes close enough; he does not drink and he is a professional.

Although Albert sees the negative side of Harry, he thinks Harry is all right and approves of his toughness. In the first chapter I have already cited R. W. Connell’s claim how many men are willing to support the ideals of hegemonic masculinity that they do not themselves fulfill because those ideals grant them permission to subordinate women.⁸⁴ At least in Albert’s case the strategy seems to fail almost comically as we can see from the next quotation.

He drops me in front of where we live and I go on in and I haven't got the door open before my old woman is giving me hell for staying out and drinking and being late to the meal. I ask her how I can drink with no money and she says I must be running a credit. I ask her who she thinks will give me credit when I'm working on the relief and she says to keep my rummy breath away from her and sit down to the table. So I sit down. The kids are all gone to see the baseball game and I sit there at the table and she brings the supper and won't speak to me. (Thahn p. 80)

If we compare Harry and Marie’s relationship to Albert and his wife’s, we can see a clear difference. Marie does not question Harry’s decisions or blame him for his failures and drinking but seems to totally accept Harry and his even dangerous way of life. Her attitude is subservient, putting Harry’s wishes always ahead of her own and complying

⁸³ Eric L Haralson, *Henry James and Queer Modernity* (Cambridge : Cambridge University Press , 2003) 194.

⁸⁴ Connell, 1987, 185.

with patriarchal values. Albert's wife, on the other, hand does not show similar respect for Albert. Judging by patriarchal ideals of hegemonic masculinity, Albert fails to meet the criteria of manliness because he cannot establish his superiority over women. Here again we can see how hegemonic masculinity is being promoted by contrasting it against another supposedly inferior one.

It is interesting how harmonious family life and patriarchal hierarchy where a wife is willingly subordinate seem to be linked in the novel. By "willingly subordinate" I mean that Harry does not use any force to make Marie comply; she voluntarily accepts Harry's authority. R.W Connell has pointed out that "It is the successful claim to authority, more than direct violence, that is the mark of hegemony. . ." ⁸⁵

Marie should have plenty of reasons to complain about Harry's behavior. Mr. Johnson swindles him out of his pay because of his credulity, he commits criminal acts and takes great risks and, consequently, loses his arm and his boat, which further weaken his ability to support his family. Despite of all this, his wife does not blame him. Albert, on the other hand, is rebuked although he acts responsibly and tries to support his family by more conventional and less hard-boiled heroic means. Having lost his regular job because of the Depression Albert works on the relief "Digging the sewer. Taking the old streetcar rails up". (Thahn p. 73)

Working on the relief is humiliating to Albert because it is poorly paid and feels like living off charity. He feels guilt of not being able to support his family properly like a true man should. Harry plays on this when he succeeds to persuade Albert to assist him to smuggle someone to Cuba in his boat. What he does not tell is that they will be carrying Cuban revolutionaries who have robbed a bank and that the trip is much more

⁸⁵ Connell, 1995, 77

dangerous than what he lets Albert to understand. Albert does not want to get in any trouble but Harry mocks him using his children to make him feel guilty.

'What worse trouble you going to get in than you're in now?' he said.
 'What the hell worse trouble is there than starving ?'
 'I'm not starving,' I said. 'What the hell you always talking
 about starving for?'
 'Maybe you're not, but your kids are.'
 'Cut it out,' I said. 'I'll work with you but you can't talk that way to me.'
 (Thahn p. 76)

Harry is able to manipulate Albert using his masculine code of honor.

Harry wants Albert to believe that he can get someone else to assist him if Albert refuses but in fact Harry desperately needs him. Harry is beginning to realize his limitations and that he has to rely on other people in order to manage even if it is against his ideals. "But I can't tell him or he wouldn't go into it and I got to have somebody by me. It would be better alone, anything is better alone but I don't think I can handle it alone." (Thahn p.81)

Harry Morgan's ideal is a man who does not need others. In the end however he has to accept help from other men that he does not appreciate because they do not have the qualities he expects from true men. He has to acknowledge his own limits.

The key to understand the dead end that Harry Morgan's ideal of masculinity leads him to, is the scene where he lies in his boat bleeding to death after his foolish attempt to single-handedly kill four Cuban revolutionaries. It is solely Harry's arrogance that puts him in the situation that he cannot handle. Although he does not plan to face the situation alone, but takes his friend Albert with him, he obviously does not count on Albert to help him with the Cubans. His preparations with the submachine gun show that he intends to kill them and the fact that he does not tell Albert of his intentions implies that he plans to do it alone without Albert's help. So when Albert is killed even before the boat trip begins and Harry is left alone against the Cubans it does

not really make any difference. Harry takes the risk to transport the Cubans knowing that they will probably try to kill him and believing he can fight them and win.

Harry takes his belief in self-reliance to the extreme and pays for it dearly. When he lies wounded and bleeds slowly to death he begins to see his foolishness. He had calculated everything so carefully and still it was not enough. "Jesus Christ. One thing to spoil it. One thing to go wrong. God damn it. Oh, God *damn* that Cuban bastard. Who'd have thought I hadn't got him?" (Thahn p. 128) He reconsiders his choices and sees that maybe something less heroic like working in a filling station would have been better for him and his family. (Thahn p. 129) Harry's last words show that he sees the bankruptcy of his ideals; the time for heroic individualism and self-reliance is over.

'A man,' Harry Morgan said, looking at them both. 'One man alone ain't got. No man alone now.' He stopped. 'No matter how a man alone ain't got no bloody chance.'
He shut his eyes. It had taken him a long time to get it out and it had taken him all of his life to learn it. (Thahn p. 165)

If we compare Harry Morgan to another Hemingway's hero, namely Robert Jordan in a later novel, *For Whom the Bell Tolls*,⁸⁶ we see a similar kind of situation where the hero is nevertheless able to maintain his heroic pose. The novel is placed in the Spanish Civil War in 1937 where Jordan fights with a Spanish guerilla band on the side of the Loyalists against the Fascists. Jordan is an expert on explosives and the action centers on a plan to blow up a bridge in order to prevent the Fascists to get reinforcements when the Loyalist attack begins. They manage to destroy the bridge, but when a tank begins to fire at them forcing them to flee Jordan is badly wounded and must be left behind. Jordan knows that he has no chances to survive; the Fascist troops will soon come and find him. Jordan decides to try and help his escaping comrades by

⁸⁶ Ernest Hemingway, *For Whom the Bell Tolls* (1940; New York : Scribner , 1968) Hereafter abbreviated in the text as FWBT

ambushing the Fascists and killing as many as he can before he himself is killed.

(FWBT pp. 445-69)

Although there are similarities between them, Morgan and Jordan are rather different to each other as heroes. They both show that they are able to endure great pain, thus fulfilling the requirements of Hemingway's code, but where pain does not take away Morgan's will to live – he only regrets that he foolishly put himself in a situation that he could not handle and must therefore die – there Jordan has doubts about his strength and when his pains get unbearable he contemplates suicide.

His leg was hurting very badly now. The pain had started suddenly with the swelling after he had moved and he said, Maybe I'll just do it now. I guess I'm not awfully good at pain. (FWBT p. 469)

Jordan is able to resist the temptation to shoot himself long enough because just as his will-power is fading, the enemy soldiers come in sight and he can die heroically instead.

Both Jordan and Morgan die a violent death after they have cold-bloodedly killed other human beings. They are cruel men who do not have many doubts about killing and Jordan even admits he likes it as he tells to himself: "Stop making dubious literature about the Berbers and the old Iberians and admit that you have liked to kill as all who are soldiers by choice have enjoyed it at some time whether they lie about it or not." (FWBT p. 287) The crucial difference between the two men is in how they see their lives when they are ending. Morgan is full of doubts and finally sees how the tough and individualist masculinity that strives for total self-reliance has been a mistake. "No matter how a man alone ain't got no bloody chance." (Thahn p. 165) Jordan, on the other hand, does not regret his choices.

I have fought for what I believed in for a year now. If we win here we will win everywhere. The world is a fine place and worth the fighting for and I hate very much to leave it. And you had a lot of luck, he told himself, to have had such a good life. (FWBT p. 467)

Jordan believes that he has fought for a worthy cause unlike Morgan. He does not see that there is anything wrong in his code of masculinity, which is very similar to Morgan's. They both value courage in the face of death, ability to endure pain, self-control, expertise in handling guns and professionalism in general. Their difference is in their attitude towards fellow men. Morgan is a loner who does not much care about others, the only exception being his family whereas Jordan, on the other hand, believes that he fights for a political cause and feels he is doing it for the whole world. One can obviously doubt the genuineness of his idealism and see it only as an excuse because of the fact that he actually likes killing and because the need to prove his bravery is at the very core of his masculinity. It could be claimed that, at the bottom his motives are purely narcissistic and that his will to fight does not stem from his solidarity towards the Spanish people.

Robert Jordan's death is shown as heroic and meaningful and it does not in any way make questionable the ideals that he exemplifies. Jordan is a masculine hero who has doubts not about his values but rather about his ability to live up to them and there is nothing in him that subverts the ideal of tough masculinity. When we look at Harry Morgan we see a totally different picture, for his death is a meaningless result of a foolish and criminal enterprise that has no grander cause than to earn money. In the end there is nothing heroic in him and he himself sees the hollowness of his ideals. The point of his failure is not that he is not tough enough but that it is not possible to be tough enough for anyone. No one can make it alone no matter how tough and how much pain one is able to endure and that makes the whole project of masculine toughness and self-control futile.

3. Alternative Masculinities

In this chapter I will first discuss men that are not in contact with Harry but who serve as a kind of counterpoints to him and his ideals. My aim is to show that they can be interpreted to represent alternatives to Harry's tough and self-relying masculinity.

Finally in the second subchapter I will take up the matter of ethnicity and analyse how it is used to define white masculinity.

3.1. A Writer, A Professor and the Veterans

Richard Gordon is a writer whose specialty is banal novels with fashionable leftist ideas of the time and an emphasis on false social conscience. His caricature-like character becomes clear when we consider the following two quotations. In the first we see him planning a chapter in his next novel.

He was writing a novel about a strike in a textile factory. In today's chapter he was going to use the big woman with the tear-reddened eyes he had just seen on the way home. . . He would compare her to the young, firmbreasted, full-lipped little Jewess that had spoken at the meeting that evening. It was good. It was, it could be easily, terrific, and it was true. (Thahn p. 131)

The second quotation shows him talking with a mentally unbalanced man in a bar.

Are you writing a new book ?'
 'Yes. About half done.'
 'That's great,' said Spellman. 'What's it about?'
 'A strike in a textile plant.'
 'That's marvellous,' said Spellman. 'You know I'm a sucker for anything on the social conflict.'
 'What?'
 'I love it,' said Spellman. 'I go for it above anything else. You're absolutely the best of the lot. Listen, has it got a beautiful Jewish agitator in it ?' (Thahn p. 145)

It is obvious that Gordon's plots are very predictable and full of fashionable clichés, and if Spellman is not mocking Gordon, at least his mental state makes his appreciation of Gordon's works suspect.

Carlos Baker has pointed out that Hemingway created Gordon's character to underline Harry Morgan's masculine virtues.⁸⁷ The two characters do not meet at all but their fortunes form two tangent stories inside the novel. The "big woman with the tear-reddened eyes" Gordon refers to, in the quotation above and whom he is going to use as a contrast to the "young, firmbreasted, full-lipped little Jewess" in his book is Harry's wife Marie. "The woman he had seen was Harry Morgan's wife, Marie, on her way home from the sheriff's office." (Thahn p. 131) Gordon thinks that he can see what kind of woman Marie is and imagines her relationship with his husband.

Her husband when he came home at night hated her, hated the way she had coarsened and grown heavy, was repelled by her bleached hair, her too big breasts, her lack of sympathy with his work as an organizer. . . . He had seen, in a flash of perception, the whole inner life of that type of woman. Her early indifference to her husband's caresses. Her desire for children and security. Her lack of sympathy with her husband's aims. Her sad attempts to simulate an interest in the sexual act that had become actually repugnant to her. (Thahn p. 131)

Gordon of course gets it totally wrong as we can see from my discussion earlier of Morgan's relationship with his wife. The passage quoted above, not only makes fun of Gordon's delusions about his abilities as a judge of people and a writer, it also underlines rather heavy-handedly the good quality of Morgans' relationship by describing something almost exactly opposite.

The connection between Harry Morgan and Richard Gordon is indirect and depends on Gordon's decision to use Marie Morgan as a model for the wife of a character in his novel. However, this decision and his malicious description of her makes the reader start comparing Gordon's and Morgan's marriages. Gordon's own marriage is breaking down and he is losing his wife Helen to another man. Helen has a great deal to complain about him: ". . .you're as selfish and conceited as a barnyard

⁸⁷ Carlos Baker, *Hemingway The Writer as Artist* (Princeton : Princeton University Press , 1973) 204-5.

rooster. Always crowing, "Look what I've done." (Thahn p. 135) Compared to Harry Morgan who is a man of action, Gordon who is only a writer and, unlike Hemingway, does not have such manly hobbies as hunting and bullfighting, looks like a non-masculine boaster. Gordon lacks also moral integrity and is not to be trusted as Helen scathingly tells him: ". . .bitter, jealous, changing your politics to suit the fashion, sucking up to people's faces and talking about them behind their backs." (Thahn p. 138) This is very different from Harry Morgan whom is shown to be able to live according to his code even in the face of death. Gordon's sexual ability comes also under suspicion when Helen complains how she had to try to ". . .give you your little explosions and pretend it made me happy. . . ." (Thahn p. 138)

Helen compares Gordon unfavorably with Professor MacWalsey whose character is portrayed sympathetically in the novel although he has no tough hard-boiled features. "He's a man. He's kind and he's charitable and he makes you feel comfortable and we come from the same thing and we have values that you'll never have. He's like my father was." (Thahn p. 138) To Helen Gordon her father is an admirable figure that represents positive masculinity. When Richard Gordon calls MacWalsey a drunk, Helen counters: "He drinks. But so did my father." (Thahn p. 138) Drinking in itself is not a fault; it is how one behaves when intoxicated. MacWalsey is not a "rummy" although Gordon calls him that because MacWalsey does not lose his self-control when he is drunk unlike Gordon himself.

As I have already noted above, MacWalsey is not a tough character in a sense that he would use violence, which makes him different from Helen's father. ". . .he liked to fight when he drank, and he could fight when he was sober." (Thahn p. 138) Helen obviously does not think that violent behavior is reprehensible in a man at least when it is called "fighting" which seems to connote a fair struggle with some rules.

Also by saying that her father “could” fight seems to imply that she speaks of an ability to defend oneself, and that this is desirable in a man. Even if MacWalsey seems to lack the willingness to fight, he appears to be capable of facing a possibility of violence without fear, which is of course one of the necessary features of a true man in hard-boiled fiction. Gordon and MacWalsey meet in a bar where fights are very usual. MacWalsey tells that he has never been in trouble in the place and seems to just fearlessly observe his surroundings where drunken veterans have fights with each other. (Thahn p. 159) When Gordon tells him that he had been in danger of getting beaten up he reacts calmly.

'A couple of friends of mine wanted to beat you up a couple of minutes ago.'
 'Yes.'
 'I wish I would have let them.'
 'I don't think it would make much difference,' said Professor MacWalsey in the odd way of speaking he had, 'If I annoy you by being here I can go.' (Thahn p. 159)

I would claim that it is possible to make a reading where MacWalsey is seen as an alternative male ideal to a violent tough guy. Jopi Nyman has pointed out that Professor MacWalsey “. . . takes over the role of the second hero towards the end of the novel.”⁸⁸

MacWalsey does not resemble a usual Hemingway hero because his lack of tough posturing; furthermore he does not follow Hemingway’s own model of an educated man, who compensates his “soft” intellectual identity by tough manly activities. Nevertheless, MacWalsey is shown to be able to act fearlessly, which shows that his refusal to fight is not cowardice, proving his manly credentials according to the masculine code that the novel adopts. Contrary to Harry Morgan, MacWalsey is capable of empathy, as is shown in his attempt to take care of his drunken rival Gordon.

⁸⁸ Nyman, 1997, 288.

MacWalsey's answer to a taxi driver is telling: "Is he your brother?' 'In a way,' said Professor MacWalsey." (Thahn p. 162) Compared to this, Morgan's attitude is merciless. Albert describes Morgan as follows: ". . . since he was a boy he never had no pity for nobody. But he never had no pity for himself either. "(Thahn p. 76) This reveals an attitude that is highly significant: what a man is capable of demanding from himself, justifies him to demand the same from others as well, regardless of their capabilities. Strength is only for yourself; it is not used to help others.

MacWalsey seems to represent a softer male ideal but not so soft as to lose his masculinity. It is also clear that the alternative masculinity he suggests goes only so far. If we look closer how Helen Gordon compares MacWalsey to her father we can see that her view of him betrays very conventional and patriarchal attitudes. Helen Gordon thinks that she and MacWalsey, who resembles her father, have same kind of values that are different from Richard Gordon's. (Thahn p. 138) Helen thinks her father a good husband because he kept up appearances for his wife's sake. "He went to mass because my mother wanted him to and he did his Easter duty for her and for Our Lord, but mostly for her, and he was a good union man and if he ever went with another woman she never knew it." (Thahn p. 138) A man is allowed to keep other women if only he does not let his wife know about it. Furthermore, a good man does not commit adultery from "wrong" reasons like Richard Gordon.

He didn't do it out of curiosity, or from barnyard pride, or to tell his wife what a great man he was. If he did it was because my mother was away with us kids for the summer, and he was out with the boys and got drunk. He was a man. (Thahn pp. 138-9)

The sexual drive of a man is irresistible and the more irresistible it is the more masculine he is. It is notable that Hemingway has chosen a woman to deliver this absolution of male promiscuity. The temptation for the reader to see this kind of

masculinity acceptable and only natural is strengthened by the fact that its apologist is a woman who uses it to criticize a man who has wronged her.

If we are to believe Helen Gordon, like her father, Professor MacWalsey is capable of being unfaithful to his woman just like Richard Gordon is; the difference between them being only that MacWalsey would keep it secret. Harry Morgan, on the other hand, is faithful to his wife, but the reason seems to be that his wife satisfies his sexual needs. I would venture to claim that all these three men – or four, counting also Helen Gordon’s father – share the same values regarding marital fidelity: a man has a right to have extramarital affairs if his wife cannot satisfy him. But the masculine code of honor demands secrecy and that is where Richard Gordon falls from grace.

Considering further the differences and similarities between Morgan, MacWalsey and Gordon, the use of violence is one feature that divides them into two groups. As I have already noted above, Professor MacWalsey refuses to use violence, which comes clear when Gordon urges MacWalsey to have a fight with him. “‘Come on and fight,’ he said brokenly. ‘I don’t fight,’ said Professor MacWalsey.” (Thahn p. 162) MacWalsey categorically states that he does not fight at all, instead of saying that it would be unfair to fight Gordon because he is drunk. MacWalsey detests violence, unlike Gordon and Harry Morgan, who is an expert in guns and violence and does not even hesitate to hit his drunken friend Eddy. “I hit him in the face and he stood up and then climbed up on to the dock.” (Thahn p. 34) Helen Gordon describes MacWalsey as “kind” and “charitable” which I interpret to suggest that she thinks he would not use violence towards women. (Thahn p. 138) Richard Gordon, on the other hand, slaps his wife when she confesses to not loving him anymore. “‘And you don’t love me any more?’ ‘I hate the word even.’ ‘All right,’ he said, and slapped her hard and suddenly across the face.” (Thahn p. 139) Harry Morgan does not hit his wife but he seems to

have no objections to the use of violence in domestic quarrels. His advice to Albert whose wife has told him off because he had some drinks and was late for supper proves this.

'I was afraid to go home to see my old woman. She gave me hell this noon like it was me had laid off the relief.' 'What's the matter with your old woman?' asked Harry cheerfully. 'Why don't you smack her?' 'You smack her,' Albert said. 'I'd like to hear what she'd say. She's some old woman to talk.' (Thahn p. 108)

Although the tone of the conversation is light and humorous and the suggestion is given partly as a joke, it reveals an attitude that takes it for granted that it is a man's right to use physical violence against women who resist his authority.

I claim that it is possible to interpret Professor MacWalsey as representing an alternative to a violent hard-boiled hero; a non-violent educated man who can feel empathy for others but whose values do not differ so much from the masculine code that the novel advocates to render him an effeminate loser.

Where Harry Morgan and Professor MacWalsey can be seen to represent two different possibilities to fulfill the appropriate masculine code, Richard Gordon becomes an example of a failure. I have already pointed out in the previous chapter how professionalism and skill are appreciated as a token of masculinity. In this test Richard Gordon's is found wanting. His talents as a writer are ridiculed; his novels are conventional, the characters shallow and the plots predictable.

Masculine code also demands a man to maintain his integrity and to stand up for his values but Gordon has been ready to change his views in order to gain success. When it comes to sexual ability Gordon is again shown to be inferior to the other two men or at least to Harry Morgan whose sex life appears to be satisfactory both to him and his wife. We do not hear much about MacWalsey's prowess in this field except that Helen Gordon describes him as "a man", which may or may not refer to his qualities as

a lover. To her husband Helen Gordon reveals that she has only pretended to enjoy sex with him. Gordon is shown thinking how another woman questioned his manliness just that same afternoon. He is making love to Helen Bradley when her husband peeps in smiling, then closes the door and goes away. Gordon is unable to continue and Helen Bradley is furious.

'You must,' Helene had said. He could feel her shaking and her head on his shoulder was trembling. 'My God, don't you know anything? Haven't you any regard for a woman?'

'I have to go,' said Richard Gordon.

In the darkness he had felt the slap across his face that lifted flashes of light in his eyeballs. Then there was another slap. Across his mouth this time.

'So that's the kind of man you are,' she had said to him. 'I thought you were a man of the world. Get out of here' (Thahn 140; italics original)

When Gordon slaps his wife he does it not only because she is leaving him; he is also partly trying to revenge the humiliation that another woman, Helen Bradley, has caused him. The act underlines his powerlessness; because he cannot revenge Helen Bradley he cowardly resorts to making someone else to suffer. He cannot even prevent his wife from leaving him by using violence; slapping her is just an outburst of frustrated anger and a sign of weakness. Also the fact that he is in effect shown to repeat or imitate the slaps that Helen Bradley gave him makes him look effeminate.

After the scene when he realizes that his wife is leaving him Richard Gordon goes to a bar and gets drunk. The bar is full of veterans⁸⁹ of the First World War drinking and having fights. Entering the bar Gordon sees two veterans fighting outside.

⁸⁹ The economic downturn that started in 1929 and lasted until about 1939, known as the Great Depression, had naturally an impact on the literary world in the USA. Writers became more interested in politics and social questions and this was also what many of the time's literary critics expected from authors. Carlos Baker goes even as far as to claim that: "Writers began to be judged according to a politico-economic scale of values". (Baker, 1973, 202.)

According to Meyers Hemingway's was not on good terms with the critics in the mid-thirties. His 1935 novel, *The Green Hills of Africa*, was not well received by critics, who were accusing him of escapism and of not paying attention to the burning political questions of the Depression. Hemingway himself had not really helped the relations by earlier describing critics as "lice who crawl on literature". (Meyers p. 266) Baker seems to interpret Hemingway's reluctance to commit himself politically as a

. . . a man came hurtling out of the open door, another man on top of him. They fell and rolled on the sidewalk, and the man on top, holding the other's hair in both hands, banged his head up and down on the cement, making a sickening noise. (Thahn p. 148)

When a sheriff tries to stop them, the man that has been manhandled protests: "Leave my buddy alone,' he said thickly. 'What's the matter? Don't you think I can take it?' 'You can take it, Joey,' the man who had been hammering him said." (Thahn p. 148)

Between their habitual fights the two men get along well, in fact they seem to be friends, which makes it hard to understand their recurrent resort to mutual violence. A possible reason could be the fear of eliciting homoerotic innuendoes because of their friendship. Phillips notes how in groups such as the military, that prohibit homosexuality, even touching each other may be interpreted as a sign of sexual interest. "Once a society defines homosexuality as effeminacy and masculinity as violence, any homoeroticism, any touch at all, provokes the need to re-prove masculinity by more fighting."⁹⁰

defence of his artistic integrity and argues that Hemingway thought of the politicising of the contemporary literature mainly as a negative phenomenon. (Baker, 1973, 198-206.) Meyers, on the other hand, does not glorify Hemingway's motives but claims that Hemingway, whose values were bourgeois and who was not interested in social theories, just saw politics as boring. (Meyers, 1986, 296.) Nevertheless, it is true that Hemingway was certainly not without social conscience and though his values and life-style may have been bourgeois, he had some leftist leanings in the thirties. In 1932 he was a supporter of a socialist candidate for President and in 1935 he wrote a passionate article for the journal *The New Masses*. (Meyers, 1973, 109.) According to Klehr, *The News Masses* was not a Communist paper, contrary to what Meyers claims, but had mostly liberal views and little sympathy for the Communist agenda. (Harvey Klehr, *Heyday of American Communism : The Depression Decade* (New York : Basic Books , 1984) 71.) The article "Who Murdered the Vets?" was a reaction to a natural disaster that devastated the Florida Key islands where Hemingway was living at the time. A hurricane hit the islands in September 1935 and killed 450 war veterans of the Civilian Conservation Corps that were stationed there to build a highway. In his article Hemingway blamed the government's inaction for their death. (Meyers, 1986, 288.) Hemingway had become familiar with the veterans earlier as he used to visit the bar where they frequently gathered on payday and he used this experience in *To Have and Have Not*. The reasons why Hemingway decided to write *To Have and Have Not* are probably various. The criticism he received and the demand for political commitment may have influenced him (Meyers, 1986, 288.) although others claim that his intention was not to please the critics. (Baker, 1973, 206.) The disaster on the Keys, that he witnessed and where he also did his best to help, had a profound influence on him and helped to waken his social consciousness. (Meyers, 1986, 287-9.) It seems that the criticism alone may not have been enough to make Hemingway attempt for a political novel; his motivation grew out of a realization of the suffering around him.

⁹⁰ Phillips, Kathy J. *Manipulating Masculinity : War and Gender in Modern British and American Literature* (New York : Palgrave Macmillan , 2006) 163.

The veteran is proud of his ability to endure horrible beating because it gives him a sense of self-control and power and thus lets him maintain his masculine self-image. He tells later to Richard Gordon that he even gets pleasure from the pain. It almost seems like he is addicted to pain. Seeing that endurance and the ability to withstand pain are seen as distinctive features of true men in hard-boiled fiction,⁹¹ it could be claimed that masculinity at least in the sense of obsessive seeking of pain can become an addiction. Duguid makes a stronger and more general claim when he states. “. . . masculinity is a habit and more precisely an addiction, debilitating and destructive but also alluring.”⁹² I would claim that obsession is a better word to describe masculinity than addiction.

The obsessiveness, the need to repeat, becomes clear in Savran’s analysis of the expression “taking it like a man”.

It implies that masculinity is not an achieved state but a process, a trial through which one passes. But at the same time, this phrase ironically suggests the precariousness and fragility – even perhaps the femininity – of gender identity that must be fought for again and again and again.⁹³

Savran also links masculinity to suffering “. . . masculinity is a function not of social or cultural mastery but of the act of being subjected, abused, even tortured.”⁹⁴ He suggests that there is an inherent masochism in American individualism. The American economic system of free market that began emerging in the 1800’s, demanded a new kind of self-controlling masculinized individual who saw himself as divided into two entities, the self and the body, where the body is the property of the self and disciplined by it. This divided subject who practices strict self-discipline is masochistic and ready

⁹¹ Nyman, 1997, 107.

⁹² Duguid, Scott “The Addiction of Masculinity: Norman Mailer’s Tough Guys Don’t Dance and the Cultural Politics of Reaganism” *Journal of Modern Literature* Volume 30, Number 1, (Indiana University Press, 2006,) 23.

⁹³ David Savran, *Taking it like a Man : White Masculinity, Masochism, and Contemporary American Culture* (Princeton (N.J.) : Princeton University Press, cop. 1998) 38.

⁹⁴ Savran, 1998, 38.

to submit itself to different ideals, such as nation or even freedom, turning the pain, that this submission causes, into pleasure.⁹⁵ The mind/body dualism dates obviously much farther back than to the USA of the 1800s, its most famous version being the one by René Descartes from the 17th century. Petersen notes:

The idea that men have an instrumental relationship with their bodies is a common theme in much recent writing by men about 'masculinity', and reflects the view that the mind/body dualism of Western thought has its correlate in the psyches of individual men. The Cartesian tradition, in which bodies are part of a separate 'nature' and hence separate from selves, is seen to provide the basis for a mind/body split within men whereby the body is seen to be a threat to masculine identity and therefore in need of control by the mind.⁹⁶

Seidler argues that the Cartesian view means that the body is not seen as part of the self but as part of material nature that lacks a life of its own.

The body does not have its own wisdom. If it does we are deaf to it, for we learn to live our lives as a matter of 'mind over matter'. We learn to pursue our ends and goals regardless of what our bodies might be saying to us.⁹⁷

Joey, the veteran takes this kind of contempt of one's own body to the extremes.

I will argue that the grotesque scene above, where a man takes pride in being ruthlessly beaten up by someone who claims to be his friend, criticizes the masculine ideal of endurance by taking it to the extreme and making it look ridiculous. Oddly enough, the veteran's attitude brings to mind the Christian ideal of turning the other cheek and the scene could be seen as a parody of it. Hemingway certainly had a skeptical attitude towards religion and although he once even converted to Catholicism, he soon lost his faith and regarded religion with cynicism.⁹⁸ I think that the purpose here is to show that endurance alone is not enough and something more is needed. A stranger

⁹⁵ Savran, 1998, 264-5.

⁹⁶ Petersen, Alan *Unmasking the Masculine : "Men" and "Identity" in a Sceptical Age* (London : SAGE , 1998) 90.

⁹⁷ Victor J. Seidler, *Unreasonable Men : Masculinity and Social Theory* (London : Routledge , 1994) 15.

⁹⁸ Meyers, 1986, 185.

in the bar makes a remark which points to a weakness in the veteran. "I can take it, see?" bloody-faced one said. 'That's where I got it on them.' 'But you can't hand it out,' someone said. 'Cut out the shoving.'" (Thahn p. 149) It is then not enough for a man just to be passive and to endure everything that the world can throw at him; he must also be able to fight and use force to mold the world. Another veteran, a communist⁹⁹ says:

But it's tough to try to do anything with because we have been beaten so far that the only solace is booze and the only pride is in being able to take it. But we're not all like that. There are some of us that are going to hand it out. ' (Thahn p. 152)

Hemingway seems to be saying, that endurance is a virtue only if one is able to be active and influence the circumstances. It makes no sense to voluntarily enter a situation where the only possibility is to passively "take it". But sometimes it is not possible to avoid such situations as Harry Morgan finds out when he is bleeding to death in his boat.

But that warmth was really only the haemorrhage produced by raising his knees up; and as the warmth faded he knew now that you could not pull yourself up over yourself and there was nothing to do about the cold but take it. (Thahn p. 134)

Either one has no choice or one makes a miscalculation like Morgan and the masculine ideal of self-reliance and autonomy proves to be an illusion.

⁹⁹ Like in many other countries the birth of a communist party in the USA resulted from a split from already existing socialist parties. In fact in 1919 there was two communist parties functioning in the United States. Under government repression and wasting their resources in mutual fighting they had lost much of their membership making them politically insignificant and powerless. In 1920 the Comintern in Moscow ordered them to merge into one called the Communist Party, USA (CPUSA)

In 1935 the Nazi threat made Comintern to soften its line as it sought alliance with the West and it was now ready to accept former enemies such as the Socialist Party of America. Although the Soviets soon hardened their line again, the Communist Party in the USA continued this so called Popular Front strategy by not attacking the Democratic Party and supporting President Roosevelt and his New Deal.

As a result of the new strategy CPUSA doubled its membership to about 55,000 by 1938 but although the Depression radicalised the workers, the majority of them did not see the Communist Party as a real alternative but continued to vote the Democrats. (Donald F. Busky, *Communism in History and Theory : Asia, Africa, and the Americas* (Westport (Conn.) : Praeger , 2002) 151-7) It also seems that there was not much support for the Communist party among the First World War veterans. (Klehr, 1984, 60-1)

Like Harry Morgan, an ex-police-officer, the war veterans are specialists in violence. R.W. Connell claims: “Violence on the largest possible scale is the purpose of the military; and no arena has been more important for the definition of hegemonic masculinity in European/American culture.”¹⁰⁰ In the propaganda, war has been described as a heroic enterprise and the military has been depicted as disciplined and rational. In the novel, however, the veterans are a group of drunken men who use violence against each other for no reasonable cause and who seem to be totally out of control. The Communist veteran describes them and war ironically and raises an interesting question: “‘Aren't they fine boys?’ said the tall man. ‘War is a purifying and ennobling force. The question is whether only people like ourselves here are fitted to be soldiers or whether the different services have formed us.’” (Thahn p. 151) His answer to the question seems to blunt some of the edge of his criticism. “‘I would like to bet you that not three men in this room were drafted,’ the tall man said. ‘These are the elite. The very top cream of the scum.’” (Thahn p. 151)

The men have joined the army voluntarily and in the Communist veteran’s opinion have already been somehow corrupted before entering the service. It seems that although the army and war are criticized by showing that corrupted and brutalized men are best suitable to be soldiers, the main reason for bringing up the veterans in the novel is to highlight the proper masculine code and show that it is always up to the individual to maintain his moral integrity. The best will always rise to the challenge and in the end it is not possible to blame the circumstances. When asked whether there are many Communists in the camp the Communist veteran tells Gordon: ” ‘Only about forty,’ the tall man said. ‘Out of two thousand. It takes discipline and abnegation to be a Communist; a rummy can't be a Communist.’” (Thahn p. 152)

¹⁰⁰ Connell, 1995, 213.

The Communists form the elite of the veterans. Communism is not for everyone; it requires an exceptional individual who has discipline and can control oneself. These are also qualities that the masculine code expects from a true man; consequently Communism is not promoting a totally new way to be a man. But Communism is a mass movement that stresses solidarity and co-operation. Although it is portrayed as a movement of the elite and in that sense emphasizes individual qualities, it does not require absolute self-reliance from the individual like the code that Harry Morgan follows.

I have already pointed out the relationship between Emerson's ideal of a self-reliance and Harry Morgan's individualism. However, in his essay Emerson does not totally deny the possibility of some kind of solidarity. It is clear that Emerson does not have any pity for humans in general but he is willing to make sacrifices for people that he feels are close to him.

I tell thee, thou foolish philanthropist, that I grudge the dollar, the dime, the cent I give to such men as do not belong to me and to whom I do not belong. There is a class of persons to whom by all spiritual affinity I am bought and sold; for them I will go to prison if need be. . .¹⁰¹

I take it that when Emerson talks about "spiritual affinity" he means that people share the same ideals. Just like the Communists, Emerson is loyal to a chosen elite who think alike and whom he claims he is ready to support even if it costs him his freedom. Harry Morgan too has his loyalties but they are restricted to his family; he does not feel any ideological solidarity.

The novel does not advocate Communism but uses it as a counterpoint to hard-boiled individualism. Jopi Nyman has noted that rather than offering any specific political ideology as the solution, the novel points to a need for change when

¹⁰¹ Emerson, 1982, 180.

individualism does not function anymore.¹⁰² The fate of Harry Morgan can be seen as an example showing the failure of self-relying individualism. The Communist represents another model, that believes in strong individuals, but one that relies on co-operation. However, the criticism is not aimed at the masculine hegemony in itself; the masculine code is evident also in the ideology of the Communist.

It could be said that Richard Gordon and Professor MacWalsey and the two groups of veterans respectively – the communist elite and the “ordinary” veterans – are pairs that serve as counterpoints to each other and Harry Morgan illustrating the different possibilities of masculinity. Richard Gordon is weak, vain, corrupted and not in control of himself and therefore does not fulfill the masculine code. Professor MacWalsey in contrast to Harry Morgan is educated, non-violent and capable of empathy, thus offering an alternative masculine model. The two groups of veterans are used to contrast co-operation and solidarity to individualism, which is depicted as anarchic everybody’s war against everybody, and to challenge the masculine ideal of self-reliance.

3.2. Black Men and the Chinese

In this subchapter I will discuss how race is used to construct and maintain white hegemonic masculinity in Hemingway’s novel. The novel has two racial groups that suit my purposes, namely the Blacks and the Chinese. I will not take up the Cubans because they form a multiracial group and the analysis of it would be too complicated.

R.W. Connell points out that “[w]hite men's masculinities, for instance, are constructed not only in relation to white women but also in relation to black men”.¹⁰³

There are two occasions when a black man appears as a notable character in

¹⁰² Nyman, 1997, 275-6.

¹⁰³ Connell, 1995, 75.

Hemingway's novel, the first one being a nameless hired helper in Harry Morgan's fishing boat. The second black man, named Wesley, is also a hired hand in Morgan's boat assisting him to smuggle liquor from Cuba. It is possible that the nameless black man and Wesley are in fact one and the same person, but I will handle them as two different characters.

The first black man whose name we never hear is usually referred to as a "nigger". His job is to take care of the baits that are needed in the deep-sea fishing. Sometimes he is given more responsibility and also steers the boat. Harry Morgan, who is the narrator in the first chapter of the novel, describes the black man as follows:

He's a real black nigger, smart and gloomy, with blue voo-doo beads around his neck under his shirt, and an old straw hat. What he liked to do on board was sleep and read the papers. But he put on a nice bait and he was fast. (Thahn p. 15)

There are some noteworthy features in the way that Morgan talks about him. The very fact that the man's skin color is mentioned indicates that whiteness is the norm. Whiteness is natural and taken for granted, which makes it invisible in a sense, but a deviation from the norm must be mentioned. Richard Dyer points out how whiteness becomes non-raced in the West by its invisibility in daily speech and writing. White people speak about the blackness or Chineseness of other people but not about whiteness of them.¹⁰⁴

Morgan calls the black man a "nigger", which strikes a contemporary reader as outrageous, and although it must have been acceptable when the novel was published, it certainly was not a neutral term even then. The racist contempt is very obvious. The description starts by emphasizing how dark the skin colour of the man is. He is not just black, he is "real black" and to drive the point even further, he is also "gloomy".

¹⁰⁴ Dyer, 1997, 2.

Blackness is associated with something dark and depressing, even dangerous. He wears “voo-doo beads”, which stresses the exotic and alien African culture that he comes from and also points to witchcraft and mystical powers that may be frightening. The beads could also be interpreted to suggest superstition and backwardness making thus a contrast to white male rationalism. On the whole, the description of the black man depicts him as different and strange; he is the Other, and as Nyman points out:

Otherness, the source of all evil, threatens the self of the hard-boiled characters. As a sign of this, hard-boiled fiction displays strong dichotomies which guide the thinking of hard-boiled characters: self/other, safe/threat, us/them, white/black, and masculine/non-masculine.¹⁰⁵

The mention that the black man likes to sleep and read newspapers can be seen as an effort to “tame” and make him feel less of a threat. But it is also a hint that he is lazy, which accusation is in turn moderated by praising his skills. The praise also serves to give the impression that Morgan is being fair because he appreciates professionalism regardless of race, but it still manages to convey his racism only too clearly. The reader feels that Morgan offers his praise as a kind of consolation to the black man. He is not truly a man because his is not white, but he can still have some masculine qualities and should be grateful for that. Toni Morrison also points out how calling the black man a “nigger” makes it possible to avoid identifying him as a “man”, the word being reserved for describing Morgan.¹⁰⁶

The nameless black man is not heard speaking at all during the first part of the novel where he appears. He is a nameless and voiceless creature whose purpose is to serve as a contrast to white masculinity that has name, voice and gender. The peculiar way that the black man is handled becomes obvious when we compare it to the way the other hired man in the boat is described. Eddy is an alcoholic who does not seem to be

¹⁰⁵ Nyman, 1997, 33.

¹⁰⁶ Morrison, 1993, 71.

much of help and cannot even be trusted to steer the boat unlike the black man. But he is white and therefore he has a name and he has a voice.

Toni Morrison claims that Hemingway resorts to clumsy writing in his effort to keep the black man silent at all costs.¹⁰⁷ She gives the following example. The black man is steering the boat when he sees something. “The nigger was still taking her out and I looked and saw he had seen a patch of flying fish burst out ahead and up the stream a little.” (Thahn p. 16) Morrison claims that the formulation “I looked and saw he had seen” is clumsy and irrational and she questions how it is possible to see that someone else has already seen something.¹⁰⁸ I must say that I do not agree with Morrison. It seems quite possible to me that Morgan notices how the black man gazes intently to a direction and looking that way Morgan too sees the patch of flying fish. He sees that the other man has seen. But I do agree with Morrison that it is Hemingway’s choice not to make the black man shout what he has seen.¹⁰⁹ It could be argued however, that the situation does not require for him to exclaim his observation. It would be enough for him just to steer the boat towards the flying fish, because they are a sign of the marlins that Morgan and his customer Mr. Johnson are trying to catch. On the whole though, considering that this anonymous black man is not heard to speak at all during his appearance in the novel, I think that Morrison’s interpretation, according to which Hemingway does not want to give the black man a voice, is justified.

One could argue that the silence of the black man is in keeping with the masculine code that interprets talkativeness as feminine and requires a man to control his language. The key word here is control. Does the black man control his use of language or does somebody else do it for him. Hemingway obviously controls it, but so does he for all the characters in the novel, and if that rendered them all feminine, this

¹⁰⁷ Morrison, 1993, 72-3.

¹⁰⁸ Morrison, 1993, 72-3.

¹⁰⁹ Morrison, 1993, 73.

analysis would be senseless. The total silence seems to suggest that the black man is not free to talk, maybe out of fear or because he feels rejected. Even if silence were partly his own choice, it is still forced upon him, meaning that he is not in control of his language. As Nyman points out, mastery of language and the correct way of speaking, not silence is important for hard-boiled heroes.¹¹⁰ Indeed, masculine control of language in hard-boiled fiction means using language, not abandoning it.

To sum up, the black man is not free and independent. His silent, serflike character functions as a contrast to Harry Morgan, emphasizing the freedom and masculine control of him.

The second more notable black character appears in the second part of the novel. Harry Morgan and his boatman Wesley are returning from Cuba with a load of smuggled liquor when they are shot and badly wounded. The narrator, who is not Harry Morgan unlike in the first part of the novel, calls Wesley a “nigger”. When Harry talks to Wesley, he does not call him “nigger” but uses his name with only one exception. Plausibly enough, Morrison claims that Harry cannot use “nigger” when he is addressing Wesley because that would offend the readers’s sensibilities and give the lie to his supposed benevolence. The exception becomes possible when Wesley has admitted his inferiority and Harry can use “nigger” in a patronizingly friendly way.¹¹¹ “‘Mr Harry,’ said the nigger, ‘I’m sorry I couldn’t help dump that stuff.’ ‘Hell,’ said Harry, ‘ain’t no nigger any good when he’s shot. You’re a all right nigger, Wesley.’” (Thahn p. 68)

In Harry Morgan’s opinion Wesley is “a all right nigger” but he is still not “any good” because he cannot endure pain like Harry, a white man can. The black man in

¹¹⁰ Nyman, 1997, 168.

¹¹¹ Morrison, 1993, 75-6.

the first part of the novel was silent but Wesley talks continuously. He keeps complaining and tells several times Harry how painful his wound is.

“I'm shot,' he said. 'I ain't never been shot before. Any way I'm shot is bad.' 'You're just scared.' 'No, sir. I'm shot. And I'm hurting bad. I've been throbbing all night'. . . 'I hurt,' the nigger said. 'I hurt worse all the time.’” (Thahn p. 56)

Nyman claims that Wesley is trying to cover his pain by talking too much.¹¹² This seems to imply that Wesley tries to hide his pain to comply with one aspect of the masculine code that demands one to endure pain stoically. But there is a contradiction here, because it is obvious that Wesley is not hiding his pain; on the contrary, he is plainly telling that he is hurting. Unlike the veteran who was proud of his ability to “take it”, Wesley shamelessly reveals that the pain is too much for him. Harry is trying to make Wesley shame his behavior but cannot silence him.

He was getting on the man's nerves now and the man was becoming tired of hearing him talk. 'Who the hell's shot worse?' he asked him. 'You or me?' 'You're shot worse,' the nigger said. 'But I ain't never been shot. I didn't figure to get shot. I ain't paid to get shot, I don't want to be shot.' (Thahn p. 57)

Wesley fails to meet the demands of masculine code both because he is not in control of his language and talks too much and because he is not able to endure pain. But it seems that he actually does not even try to fulfill the code. Being black he could never belong to the white male hegemony and is therefore free to express criticism against it. Nyman points out that “. . . whereas hegemonic masculinity is normative and normalizing, non-hegemonic masculinities are in a critical relation to it.”¹¹³

Wesley clearly represents non-hegemonic masculinity and while his character in the novel serves as a contrast to Harry Morgan its function is ambiguous. It can be interpreted either to strengthen Morgan’s masculinity or to show its weakness. Wesley

¹¹² Nyman, 1997, 144.

¹¹³ Nyman, 1997, 52.

can be seen as a non-masculine loser who is unable to fulfill the code or a man who is free from its restrictions and can therefore express his feelings without shame. The ambiguity of Wesley's character seems to rise almost inadvertently as if Hemingway could not help it. On the surface the intention is clearly only to emphasize Harry Morgan's masculinity by showing his exceptional ability to endure pain. Wesley's complaining and refusing to help Harry in any way is useless defeatism and without Harry's capability to act they would be in danger to perish. Although the narrator tries to destroy Wesley's credibility by making him appear like a querulous child, Wesley's complaints about Harry's inhumanity and his rejection of tough heroism do not lose their legitimacy. Harry believes that being strong justifies contempt and merciless treatment of those who are weaker but Wesley reveals the true nature of that belief. "You ain't human,' the nigger said. 'You ain't got human feelings.' (Thahn p. 68)" Wesley's ambiguous role as a character who emphasizes Harry's masculinity but also criticizes it mirrors Harry's own inner conflicts. For it is not true that Harry has not got human feelings: He cares for his wife and his children.

Toni Morrison remarks how Wesley makes comments that reveal the other side of Harry Morgan and the code he represents.¹¹⁴ It is the code that demands independence and self-reliance at any cost that makes Harry try to make his living by illegal means when the Depression put an end to his deep-sea fishing business. He is too proud to work on the relief for seven and a half dollars a week. Wesley gives voice to questions that must have been troubling Harry also.

'Why they run liquor now?' he said. 'Prohibition's over. Why they keep up a traffic like that? Whyn't they bring the liquor in on the ferry?'
The man steering was watching the channel closely.
'Why don't people be honest and decent and make a decent honest living?' (Thahn p. 57)

¹¹⁴ Morrison, 1993, 76.

Wesley's questions are bothering Harry and he dismisses them by claiming them irrational. "The nigger was going out of his head, or becoming religious because he was hurt. . . ." (Thahn p. 57) At this point Harry is not ready to change his values especially when the criticism comes from a "nigger". He sees his way of life as natural and thinks that pondering over alternatives or morality of his actions is "religious", something bordering on insanity and not suitable for a practical man. Later however, when it is too late and he lies dying in his boat, Harry has to reconsider his choices. "I guess I should have got a job in a filling station or something. I should have quit trying to go in boats. There's no honest money going in boats any more" (Thahn p.129)

The Chinese are the other ethnic group that forms a contrast with Harry Morgan's masculinity. Harry makes a deal with Mr. Sing, a Chinese businessman, to illegally transport twelve Chinese men from Cuba. The way Harry describes him reveals already his dislike.

Mr Sing was about the smoothest-looking thing I'd ever seen. He was a Chink all right, but he talked like an English-man and he was dressed in a white suit with a silk shirt and black tie and one of those hundred-and-twenty-five-dollar Panama hats. (Thahn p. 28)

There is an air of disapproval and contempt in Harry's description of Mr. Sing. Harry calls him a "thing", robbing him his humanity and making him appear as a lifeless object or an animal. It is notable that in the scene where Harry kills Mr. Sing, he is compared to an animal fighting for its life. "He was flopping and bouncing worse than any dolphin on a gaff." (Thahn p. 45)

Harry obviously does not like Mr. Sing's "smoothness" or his expensive clothes and Mr. Sing's British accent seems to irritate him. It is as if he thinks it improper for "a Chink" to try to pass as a white gentleman. But despite his efforts he is still only "a Chink all right". Maureen T. Reddy makes a similar kind of interpretation when she

analyses the attitude of the hero in Dashiell Hammet's story "The House in Turk Street"¹¹⁵ towards a Chinese character that resembles Mr. Sing. "Whereas the disembodied British voice implied rule by right of birth, coupled with the Chinese face . . . it signifies something entirely different: confusion, chaos, things out of their rightful places."¹¹⁶

Robert G. Lee points out how throughout American history Orientals have been portrayed as aliens and a threat, giving rise to several stereotypical images such as "the yellow peril" and "the pollutant".¹¹⁷ Mr. Sing is dangerous because he does not stay in his proper place, threatening to blur the distinction between white and non-white and to pollute the "pure white race".

Calling Mr. Sing a "smooth-looking thing" also brings mind the chauvinistic way women may be called "pretty things", suggesting that his appearance is effeminate. It seems also credible that Harry sees Mr. Sing's interest in clothes as a feminine feature that is not suitable for a true man. R. W. Connell points out that:

Gayness, in patriarchal ideology, is the repository of whatever is symbolically expelled from hegemonic masculinity . . . Hence, from the point of view of hegemonic masculinity, gayness is easily assimilated to femininity.¹¹⁸

It may be suggested that Harry Morgan thinks Mr. Sing is homosexual or at least that his gender is ambiguous. Comley and Scholes point out that often in Hemingway's writing "male homosexuality is coded as a form of femininity that deforms the male

¹¹⁵ The story was published in 1924 in a pulp magazine *Black Mask*. The magazine was important in the development of hard-boiled writing and it introduced authors like Dashiell Hammett, Raymond Chandler and Erle Stanley Gardner.

¹¹⁶ Maureen T. Reddy, *Traces, Codes, and Clues : Reading Race in Crime Fiction* (New Brunswick (N.J.) : Rutgers University Press, cop. 2003) 21.

¹¹⁷ Robert G. Lee, *Orientalism : Asian Americans in Popular Culture* (Philadelphia : Temple University Press , 1999) 8.

¹¹⁸ Connell, 1995, 78.

body and makes it repulsive to an essence of manliness that excludes everything female”.¹¹⁹

In the same way as Mr. Sing blurs the distinction between races he blurs the traditional gender roles and is therefore a threat to masculinity that must be destroyed. Nyman makes a similar kind of interpretation although his focus is on masculine control of language. When Harry describes how he killed Mr. Sing he uses the pronoun “she” of his throat. “But I got him forward on to his knees and had both thumbs well in behind his talk-box, and I bent the whole thing back until she cracked.” (Thahn p. 45) Nyman essentially claims that Harry sees Mr. Sing’s talkativeness as a feminine feature and therefore genders his throat feminine. Mr. Sing must be killed because “[b]y destroying the feminine with its Otherness the masculine can feel safe, and to be able to govern the world.”¹²⁰

There are also more straightforward explanations for the antagonism between Harry Morgan and Mr. Sing. Mr. Sing is an unscrupulous person who is willing to betray his compatriots for the money and leave them for a certain death. Harry feels that he cannot trust him and he detests Mr. Sing’s ruthlessness towards his fellow countrymen. Harry kills Mr. Sing to prevent him from betraying him and to revenge for the Chinamen. He then saves the doomed Chinese by letting them ashore. His obvious empathy for the Chinamen is in odd contradiction with his capacity for cruelty and violence. Yet it is not totally against what we have already seen about him. He has shown that he cares for his family and he takes care of Wesley by bandaging his wounds. It is not totally true then, what Harry’s friend Albert said that Harry has no pity for himself or others. There is a divide inside him, on the one hand, between the code that requires self-reliance and detachment from other people and, on the other hand, the

¹¹⁹ Nancy R Comley and Robert Scholes, *Hemingway’s Genders : Rereading the Hemingway Text* (New Haven : Yale University Press , cop. 1994) 110.

¹²⁰ Nyman, 1997, 158.

understanding that other people need him and he needs them. 'I would like to argue that Harry's inner conflict shows that there is a possibility for Harry to change and adopt a different kind of masculinity that admits its dependence on others. But instead of changing himself Harry chooses to strive for power and to fight the evil he sees outside and of which Mr. Sing is only one representative. According to Jopi Nyman

Like the protagonist of the quest romance, the hard-boiled protagonist seeks peace and love, but in addition to those ideals he seeks order in a world of chaos. Thus, by exploiting the conventions of the romance hard-boiled fiction constructs a vision of a man who is shown to suffer from romantic dilemmas, but who in the end finds the attraction of the dream of sole power and the possibility of autonomous and unrestricted action more rewarding than he does human relationships.¹²¹

Harry's fight is useless because killing Mr. Sing does not destroy evil; there will always be another one to take his place.

'Where did you know Mr Sing?'
 'He ships Chinamen,' Frankie said. 'Big business,'
 'How long you know him?'
 'He's here about two years,' Frankie said. 'Another one ship them before him. Somebody kill him.'
 'Somebody will kill Mr Sing, too.'
 'Sure,' said Frankie. 'Why not? Plenty big business.'

So Harry is on a romantic quest to fight the evil and restore the order. His actions stem partly from his genuine concern about other's suffering and partly from his code, but the code he feels he has to follow, also blurs his ethics. Although the code itself demands that one must act fairly towards others, its notion of fairness is distorted and ruthless. Being strong gives one a right to demand strength from all others regardless of their abilities and situations. Being ruthless towards oneself justifies ruthlessness towards others.

¹²¹ Nyman, 1997, 85.

Harry kills Mr. Sing partly because he is a threat to himself and his ideals. But Mr. Sing's Otherness, his race and ambiguous gender, is also a cause for Harry's hate for him. But not only does it form a threat, it also serves as a way to distance the evil from the idealized masculinity. As Ferrebe points out, "Attempts to establish masculinity as a coherent concept, doomed as these may be, depend upon a constant process of othering all Others, discrediting them on as many scales of judgement as possible".¹²² The evil is projected on the feminine and racial Other which is then destroyed leaving the ideal masculinity pure. This projection enables Harry to remain blind to his own cruelty.

Harry's attitude towards the Chinese, whom he transports and saves from the grim fate that Mr. Sing had planned for them, shows that he is capable of feeling compassion for others and also for those who belong to the Other. He does contemptuously call them "Chinks" and is obviously ready to kill them if they threaten them. He tells Eddy: "If any Chink starts bursting out of the cabin or coming through the hatch, once we're out and under way, you take that pump-gun and blow them back as fast as they come out." (Thahn p. 41) It may seem rather farfetched to claim that a man who is ready to kill somebody can also feel compassion for him, but the situation in which Harry acts is extraordinary. Transporting the Chinese is illegal and dangerous, making it necessary for him to be ready to defend himself. His passengers themselves may be dangerous and therefore he must deal sternly with them. It does not mean that he has any intention or wish to kill them. He actually does not seem to believe he would be able to do it. "Now I tell you it would take a hell of a mean man to butcher a bunch of Chinks like that and I'll bet there would be plenty of trouble, too, let alone mess." (Thahn p. 47) It is typical that he has to list also other reasons than humane ones; a

¹²² Ferrebe, 2005, 12.

tough man obviously does not shy away from considering coolly and practically the ugly reality of all the blood and mutilated corpses that would have to be get rid of after a massacre. But Harry does also see the Chinamen as humans. When Eddy talks to the Chinese cruelly, Harry clearly shows that he does not want them to be unnecessarily humiliated. “‘You yellow rat-eating aliens’ Eddy said, ‘get overboard.’ ‘Shut your drunken mouth,’ I told him.” (Thahn p. 48)

As I have pointed out already in the case of the silent black man, Harry can show his appreciation of masculine qualities even in non-white men. This is apparent also when he praises the courage of a Chinaman who dares to show his resentment at how Harry treats him even at gunpoint.

You damn crook,’ he said and went over the side, hanging on and then letting go. His head went under but he came up and his chin was out of water. ‘Damn crook,’ he said. ‘Goddamn crook.’
He was mad and plenty brave. (Thahn p. 48)

Harry is capable of feeling for other people but what he really appreciates more than anything are masculine virtues. Mr Sing’s undoing was not his ruthlessness or his race in itself but his attempt to cross the borders of race and gender. When an otherwise despised Chinaman fulfils the masculine code, Harry can even admire him although maybe somewhat reluctantly.

4. Conclusion

The aim of my thesis was to analyse how masculinity is constructed in Hemingway's novel *To Have and Have Not*. My focus was on the main character Harry Morgan and his relationship with his family and the men he encounters, but I also analysed at people whom he does not actually meet, but who provide a point of comparison to him and his masculinity. I argue that they form a background against which Harry's masculinity is projected in order to make it appear more sharply delineated and more powerful.

Although it can be claimed that the novel represents Harry Morgan's masculinity as an ideal, I argued that it is possible to see symptoms in the text that point to a possibility for another kind of reading. There are other men in the novel that can be seen as alternatives to the masculinity that Harry represents. I also pointed out the ambiguities in Harry's own character that seem to imply that he himself doubts the rationality of his masculine code.

Harry Morgan's family life seems rather conventional and conveys the patriarchal values that are apparent throughout the novel. He is the breadwinner of the family, a role that is of great importance to him as he feels that is a man's responsibility to face the world and to bring security to his wife and children. Harry's close relationship with his wife is depicted with great warmth, and it is only to his wife that Harry can to some degree reveal his self-doubts and vulnerability.

Sex seems to be a very important factor in their marriage and a satisfactory sex life is what the novel advocates as one of the key components that distinguishes a good marriage from a failed one. Because the focus in the novel is on men and they are seen as the real source of power, the happiness of a marriage is seen as dependent on their actions and abilities. Therefore the happiness of a marriage becomes also a criterion of masculinity. Richard Gordon, who can be seen as a kind of counterpoint to Harry

Morgan, loses his wife to another man and one of the reasons for this is that he is not capable of satisfying her sexual needs. Harry's sexual capability is, on the other hand, shown to be not lacking as their lovemaking scene reveals. What still emphasizes Harry's manliness in this respect is the fact that his wife, Marie, is a former prostitute and therefore more experienced, which with her knowledge and lack of inhibitions make her more demanding to her lover.

Harry's attitude towards his children, three girls, is ambiguous. He obviously loves them and wants to give them all the good things in life that he possibly can, but he does not appreciate them because they are girls. Here we can see revealed a crack in Harry's masculinity that forces him to rethink his values. The patriarchal value system that he has adopted and sees as natural and universal states that one of the essential features of a true man is his capability to produce male descendants. As Harry has fathered only girls he cannot feel himself a whole man and tries therefore to fend off the shame by suggesting that his wife is to blame because in his opinion women are the ones who decide the sex of the child. In order to escape the shame of not being a true man, he is bending the rules of the code and gives up the power that patriarchal masculinity has traditionally bestowed on a man, but he is not willing to let go of the masculine hegemony by questioning the value system that takes it for granted that girls are not as valuable as boys.

Marie is seen to play the role of a devoted wife whose duty is always to support a man's wavering self-confidence and she tries to convince Harry that they have only girls just because he is so manly. Of course there is nothing wrong with loyalty between spouses in itself; on the contrary, it is certainly essential to a functional marriage. But Marie's decision to back up Harry's masculine pretensions amounts here to self-contempt. In order to support Harry's crumbling masculine self-confidence she is ready

to admit that women are inferior to men. It want to claim that the novel presents Harry's and Marie's marriage as a model against which the other marriages in the novel are compared and found lacking. There seems to be a deal where a man's responsibility is to support his wife and children economically and satisfy his wife sexually. The wife's part of the deal is to take care of the home, to support her husband emotionally and also give him sexual satisfaction. Questioning of a man's authority at home destroys the harmony of marriage as the example of Albert's inability to hold his own against his wife shows. The atmosphere at their home is tense and dispiriting.

“. . . she says to keep my rummy breath away from her and sit down to the table. So I sit down. The kids are all gone to see the baseball game and I sit there at the table and she brings the supper and won't speak to me.” (Thahn p. 82)

The novel advocates a view that male hegemony is the key for harmonious marriage and that weakness in men like Albert or Richard Gordon eventually ruins the relationship between man and wife.

In the third subchapter of my analysis I argue that Professor MacWalsey, who is depicted as an educated and humane man who does not like violence, can be seen as representing an alternative to the tough masculinity that Harry Morgan represents. Obviously his kind of man comes dangerously close to what could be considered a wimp, and Hemingway makes sure that MacWalsey proves his masculine credentials by showing that he is not afraid of getting beaten.

Tough masculinity comes under criticism in the novel also in the scene where the endurance of pain is parodied as a drunken veteran boasts of his ability to take beating. Solidarity is contrasted to individualism by the difference between the organized “elite” of the Communists and the unruly mass of the corrupted veterans.

The dominant or hegemonic masculinity in the novel is very obviously white heterosexual masculinity. As I have pointed out in the fourth subchapter of my analysis, skin colour is only mentioned in the novel when people are non-white. The whiteness of Harry Morgan, who clearly is the hero of the novel and the only one who fulfils the requirements of tough masculinity, is so self-evident and “natural” that it becomes invisible. Harry’s heterosexuality seems to be equally firmly established, as Hemingway clearly wants to convince his readers by showing Harry’s lovemaking with Marie, although his disgust for Mr. Sing could be interpreted as homophobia stemming from his own potential but repressed homosexual bent. Be that as it may, Harry’s hostile, in fact murderous, attitude towards the feminine and racially ambiguous Mr. Sing reveals the tenor of the novel with regard to transgressors of “natural” borders, be they sexual or racial. Mr. Sing’s behaviour and appearance threatens the masculine notion of rational and controllable world by blurring the borders of gender and race. Mr. Sing represents chaos that horrifies the masculine that yearns for control and certainty and therefore he must be destroyed.

As I have shown in the last subchapter of my analysis, the two black men that work in Harry’s boat represent subordinate masculinity that is seen as racially inappropriate and they are used as a background against which his superior masculinity is displayed. But whereas the first anonymous black man serves this purpose without casting any doubts on the reasonableness of Harry’s masculine code, the other man, Wesley, protests and can be interpreted as a voice that speaks out against the inhumanness of the code and points out to a possibility of change.

The masculine ideal that Harry Morgan strives to fulfil sees a great value in self-reliance. He is a man who believes in self-reliance to such a degree that it approaches paranoia: he feels he cannot trust anybody who does not fulfil the criteria of a true man

and there are no such men around him. It seems that he does not have any real friends – Albert being the one that comes closest to being a friend. Albert falls short of the ideal and is not to be trusted because he cannot hold his own and lets his wife criticize him. Wesley is out of the question as a friend or a trusted companion because of his race and the fact that he openly questions the rationality and morality of Harry's code. Eddy, with whom Harry also sails, may once have been a man that Harry could have trusted. Harry repeatedly remarks how Eddy was a good man on a boat but when he became an alcoholic he lost his self-control, which is essential for a true man.

It is noteworthy that professionalism is highly valued in the novel. It is obvious that Harry respected Eddy once because of his professionalism, because “[he] was a good man on a boat” (Thahn p. 20). Professionalism can also somewhat bridge the racial divide; Harry can appreciate how skilfully the black man puts on a bait and even admit that the black man can do it faster than he. Harry's careful preparations for his final trip also emphasize the importance of rational professionalism as a means of coping with the hostile world that threatens him. Professionalism is a way to maintain control in the uncertain world and control is an essential part of masculinity.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Hemingway, Ernest. *To Have and Have Not* 1937. London : Granada, 1982

------. *For Whom the Bell Tolls* 1940. New York : Scribner , 1968

Secondary Sources

Badinter, Elisabeth. *Mikä on mies?* Tampere : Vastapaino, 1993

Baker, Carlos. *Hemingway The Writer as Artist*

Princeton : Princeton University Press, 1973

Busky, Donald F. *Communism in History and Theory : Asia, Africa, and the Americas*

Westport (Conn.) : Praeger , 2002

Connell, R. W. *Gender and power : Society, the Person and Sexual Politics* Stanford,

Calif. : Stanford University Press, 1987

------. *Masculinities* Berkeley : University of California Press, 1995

Duguid, Scott “The Addiction of Masculinity: Norman Mailer's Tough Guys Don't

Dance and the Cultural Politics of Reaganism” *Journal of Modern Literature*

Volume 30, Number 1, Indiana University Press, 2006, 23-30

Dyer, Richard. *White* London : Routledge , 1997

Emerson, Ralph Waldo. *Selected Essays* Harmondsworth, Middlesex : Penguin Books

New York, N.Y , 1982

Ferrebe, Alice. *Masculinity in Male-Authored Fiction 1950-2000 : Keeping it Up*

Basingstoke : Palgrave Macmillan , 2005

Greven, David, *Men Beyond Desire : Manhood, Sex and Violation in American*

Literature New York : Palgrave Macmillan , 2005

Haralson, Eric L *Henry James and Queer Modernity*

- Cambridge : Cambridge University Press , 2003
- Jokinen, Arto, ed. *Yhdestä puusta : maskuliinisuuksien rakentuminen populaarikulttuureissa* Tampere University Press, 2003
- Klehr, Harvey. *Heyday of American Communism : The Depression Decade*
New York : Basic Books , 1984
- Lee, Robert G. *Orientalism : Asian Americans in Popular Culture*
Philadelphia : Temple University Press , 1999
- Meyers, Jeffrey. *Hemingway: a Biography* London : Macmillan, 1986
- Morrison, Toni. *Soittoa pimeässä* Helsinki : Tammi, 1996
- Nyman, Jopi. *Men alone : Masculinity, Individualism, and Hard-Boiled Fiction*
Amsterdam : Rodopi, 1997
- Petersen, Alan. *Unmasking the Masculine : "Men" and "Identity" in a Sceptical Age*
London : SAGE , 1998
- Phillips, Kathy J. *Manipulating Masculinity : War and Gender in Modern British and American Literature* New York : Palgrave Macmillan , 2006
- Reddy, Maureen T. *Traces, Codes, and Clues : Reading Race in Crime Fiction*
New Brunswick (N.J.) : Rutgers University Press, cop. 2003
- Reynolds, Michael. *The Young Hemingway* Oxford : Blackwell , 1986
- Savran, David *Taking it like a Man : White Masculinity, Masochism, and Contemporary American Culture* Princeton (N.J.) : Princeton University Press,
cop. 1998
- Seidler , Victor J. *Recreating Sexual Politics : Men, Feminism and Politics*
London : Routledge , 1991
- . *Rediscovering Masculinity : Reason, Language and Sexuality*
London : Routledge , 1989

----- . *Unreasonable Men : Masculinity and Social Theory*

London : Routledge , 1994

Sipilä, Jorma and Arto Tiihonen, eds. *Miestä rakennetaan - maskuliinisuuksia puretaan*

Tampere : Vastapaino, 1994

Skeggs, Beverley. "Theorizing Masculinity." *Mieheyden tiellä : maskuliinisuus ja*

kulttuuri. Ed. Pirjo Ahokas, Martti Lahti & Jukka Sihvonen. Jyväskylä :

Jyväskylän yliopisto , 1993, 13-35.

Traister, Bryce. "Academic Viagra: The Rise of American Masculinity Studies"

American Quarterly Volume 52, Number 2, The Johns Hopkins University Press

June 2000, 274-304

Young, Philip. *Ernest Hemingway : A Reconsideration*

University Park : Pennsylvania State University Press , 1966 (1976)