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Ernest Hemingway’s fiction criticizes the American Dream and its myth of success in the early twentieth century. In *The Sun Also Rises*, “The Snows of Kilimanjaro,” and “The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber,” Hemingway exposes the corrupting influence of monetary wealth. During the economic collapse of the Great Depression, many Americans created for themselves a fantasy world to avoid the reality of the failure of the American Dream. In “Fathers and Sons,” *The Garden of Eden*, and *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, Hemingway’s characters escape into their own illusions. “Wine of Wyoming” and *To Have and Have Not* show the disillusionment of individuals who are denied access to the Dream. Hemingway uses the example of Santiago from *The Old Man and the Sea* to show a new and more realistic American Dream in which material wealth is not the goal. Hemingway is not bound by the geographical setting of his characters in his assessment of the Dream, illustrated by using Americans away from the United States, outsiders in America, and an expanded understanding of America to make his evaluation.
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INTRODUCTION

Delmore Schwartz writes, “Of all modern novelists it is Hemingway who has written the most complete moral history of the American Dream” (88). On the surface, this seems an odd statement. Such claims about the American Dream in literature are often applied to works by Hemingway’s contemporaries, such as F. Scott Fitzgerald’s *The Great Gatsby*, a novel considered by many critics to be, in Jim Cullen’s words, “the quintessential expression of the American Dream” (180). Schwartz’s claim also appears to have geography going against it. Hemingway’s four major novels and several of his short stories are set outside of the United States, and Hemingway himself spent a great deal of his life living away from America. It would be easy for a reader to see Hemingway as having little to say about the American Dream when so much of his work and life are focused on
Europe, Africa, or Cuba. This, however, would be a mistake. While this thesis does not assert that Hemingway has a superior claim over his literary peers to the examination of the American Dream, his work does concern the Dream, just the same. Hemingway’s fiction addresses the fundamental values that make up the American Dream as it was understood in the first half of the twentieth century, whether or not his characters are in America or even citizens of the United States.

Although a ubiquitous term in American discourse, the American Dream means different things to different people. In *The American Dream: A Short History of an Idea That Shaped a Nation*, Cullen notes, “[T]here is no one American Dream. Instead, there are many American Dreams” (7). Cullen lists some of these: the Puritans’ dream of the good life, the Founders’ dream expressed in the Declaration of Independence, the dream of upward mobility, the dream of equal rights, and the dream of home ownership (8-9). What all of these dreams have in common is that they are based on hope.

Hemingway’s life coincides with the rise of the American Dream as a popular phrase. Although the
values of the American Dream date back to the arrival of the Puritans in America, the term did not come into popular use until the early twentieth century. The first usage listed in the *Oxford English Dictionary* is from David Graham Phillips’ novel *Susan Lenox: Her Fall and Rise*. Phillips began working on the novel in 1904, and it was published in 1917, five years after his death (Bailey). Phillips writes of Susan Lenox,

> ...the reading she had done—the novels, the memoirs, the books of travel, the fashion and home magazines—had made deep and distinct impressions upon her, had prepared her—as they have prepared thousands of Americans in secluded towns and rural regions where luxury and even comfort are very crude indeed—for the possible rise of fortune that is the universal American dream and hope. (439)

Phillips’ use of the American Dream focuses on upward mobility through economic prosperity and calls attention to the influence of mass media in creating desire in Americans¹. His description of preparing for a “the possible rise of fortune” sums up the American Dream in the early twentieth century; material success was the goal.

The dream of economic wealth pervaded culture in the United States in the early twentieth century, as Phillips’ description suggests. Charles R. Hearn
describes the American Dream at the time as the “myth of success” illustrated in the “classic American success story—the story of the poor boy who raises himself to prominence through hard work, perseverance, and honesty (4). Popular magazines of the 1920s often published fiction using these rags-to-riches plots. For his study of culture in the 1920s and 1930s, Hearn took a random sampling of popular magazines in the United States to see how much the myth of success had entered popular culture of the time. Hearn found that almost all the stories were “somehow concerned with economic success” (29). The fiction used stories of easy money gained through accidental opportunity or unexpected inheritance in addition to plots in which hard work and dedication were rewarded with wealth (29-30).

A popular history book of the time spread the term American Dream further. James Truslow Adams wanted to call his 1931 history of the United States The American Dream; however, his publisher forced him to use The Epic of America instead. Adams keeps the theme of the American Dream in his book and uses the phrase more than thirty times (Cullen 4). C. James Taylor describes The Epic of America as a “highly
interpretative and selective work” with the theme “that a guiding dream to improve and grow had vitalized Americans from the earliest colonial settlements.” In his epilogue, Adams calls the American Dream a “unique gift to mankind” and a “dream of a land in which life should be better and richer and fuller for every man, with opportunity for each according to his ability or achievement” (404). His book sold more than 500,000 copies in a dozen languages (Taylor).

By living through the material excesses of the 1920s and then through the Great Depression of the 1930s, Hemingway saw the ways in which the American Dream and its myth of success functioned in the real world. This thesis will examine the American Dream in his fiction. First, it will consider Hemingway’s criticism of the value of monetary wealth as the goal of the American Dream of the early twentieth century, presenting the corrupting influence of economic prosperity. Next, it will show the ways in which Hemingway’s characters participate in illusions as they create their own myths in relation to the myth of success. The final chapter will show the ways newcomers to America in Hemingway’s fiction fail to
achieve the material success popularly associated with the American Dream, and it explores the disillusionment of workers whom the Dream implied could work their way to prosperity. In a reversal that projects the American Dream from a continental perspective, the characteristics of the Dream acquire a new relevance in the life of a transnational figure, the poor Cuban fisherman from *The Old Man and the Sea*. Through his work, Hemingway criticizes the American Dream of his time and proposes a more realistic expression of that dream.

1 For this thesis, the term “America” will refer to the area of the current U.S. and “Americans” to residents of that area. When those terms are used to mean the greater New World of the Americas and its people, this thesis will make that distinction.
CHAPTER I: APPEARANCE VERSUS REALITY:
HEMINGWAY AND MATERIAL WEALTH

The American Dream in the early twentieth century meant a chance to gain material wealth and economic success. This chapter contrasts the positive appearance of wealth to the reality of the American Dream as Hemingway presents it in his portraits of characters who seem to achieve that dream. Hemingway shows wealth as a corrupting force rather than a worthy goal of a national dream.

While Hemingway’s work often sets Americans outside of the United States, his fiction is always about America. In a 1926 letter to Sherwood Anderson, Hemingway wrote, “Americans are always in America—no matter whether they call it Paris or Paname” (Letters 218). Jake Barnes and his friends in *The Sun Also Rises* show that a working-class American and his
aspirations cannot be accepted in the world of the wealthy and upper class.

In Spain, Jake is an insider in the world of bullfighting, managing to become an aficionado in a culture that is not his own. In Paris, Jake is an outsider to the culture of his friends. There is one area in Paris, however, in which Jake is an insider: his work as a journalist. As Michael Reynolds notes, in Paris, Jake’s job “gives him a sense of identity, a reason to be alive” (Sun 26). It also gives him the means to stay alive.

Work for Jake Barnes provides a means to escape the grim reality of his life. Jake’s relationship with Brett Ashley is the strongest connection he has to his group of upper-class friends. He is infatuated by Brett, but will never be able to have a romantic relationship with her because of a wound to his genitalia in World War I. As Hemingway clarifies during an interview with George Plimpton in The Paris Review, Jake has the normal sexual desires of a man while being physically incapable of acting on what he feels (50). During the day, work gives him a diversion from the thoughts that haunt him at night: the effects of his war wound and his inability ever to consummate
his relationship with Brett. Jake uses work as an excuse not to go with Brett when she spends the evening with Count Mippipopolous, saying “I have to work in the morning” (41). His work provides a reason for Jake to avoid spending an emotionally painful night watching the woman he loves, but cannot have, with another man, one who has the financial resources to take care of her, if she would let him. Although he can use his work to avoid an agonizing situation with Brett and to keep his mind busy during the day, readers know that the nights provide no such distraction. After Brett leaves with the count, Jake comments,

This was Brett, that I had felt like crying about. Then I thought of her walking up the street and stepping into the car, as I had last seen her, and of course in a little while I felt like hell again. It is awfully easy to be hard-boiled about everything in the daytime, but at night it is another thing. (42)

When Jake is alone with his thoughts, the pain of his situation looms over him.

Jake’s relationship with Brett affords him an opportunity to join the upper-class expatriates of Paris. Because of his war wound, the two can never be sexually intimate, and Jake can never be fully part of
her circle of upper-class suitors because of his financial situation. After Jake invokes his work as a reason why he cannot go with Brett, she uses his work as a public excuse for why she and Jake cannot be together. When the count asks why the two are not married, Jake replies, “We want to lead our own lives” (68), and Brett comments, “We have our careers” (60). This remark subtly acknowledges Jake’s use of his job as a means to avoid intimacy. Work earns Jake enough money to entertain Brett and his other friends but not enough to quit his job and join their ranks. Jake’s wound precludes a sexual relationship with Brett, eliminating any opportunity to join her in the upper class through marriage.

In his essay “Ernest Hemingway,” John A. Pidgeon argues that the Puritan “wealth-goodness concept” is an essential part of the American Dream (90). Wealth, however, does not equate to goodness or moral superiority for Hemingway. The wealthy expatriates of The Sun Also Rises seem to have no values except for money. Michael Reynolds stresses that Hemingway brought with him to Paris a “deep belief in Theodore Roosevelt’s virtues of self-reliance and hard work” (Sun 60). He did not see these qualities in the
patrons of Paris’ cafés, and the absence of these qualities is reflected in Brett Ashley, Robert Cohn, and Mike Campbell. The characters with money ignore any power it might afford them to provide future security or to help others. Patrick D. Morrow notes, “There are no investments in the novel, and the monetary waste is continual, increasingly appalling as the novel progresses” (54).

The writings of one of the most famous self-made men in American history, Benjamin Franklin, provide part of the foundation for the American Dream. Hearn argues for the continuing influence of Franklin into the twentieth century, writing, “The virtues he associates with success—industry, frugality, diligence, honesty, prudence, initiative—have remained at the heart of our mythology of success” (7). Franklin views success as more than just the acquisition of wealth, however, valuing intellectual and moral improvement in addition to material achievement (7). Part Two of Franklin’s The Autobiography exhibits his dedication to self-improvement in what he calls the “bold and arduous Project of arriving at moral Perfection” (526). While Franklin admits he never achieves moral perfection
through his exercises in self-improvement, he writes, “I was by the Endeavor made a better and a happier Man than I otherwise should have been, if I had not attempted it” (532). While hard work and self-determination continue to be part of the myth of success, the need for personal improvement has been separated from the American Dream by the early twentieth century, leaving monetary wealth as the primary gauge of success.

Franklin’s “The Way to Wealth” gives the reader a guide to follow to lead a life of hard work and responsibility. The behavior of Hemingway’s expatriates in The Sun Also Rises runs completely counter to the normative model that Franklin provides in the voice of Father Abraham. One of his sayings speaks directly to the lives of Brett Ashley, Mike Campbell, Robert Cohn, and Jake Barnes:

Women and Wine, Game and Deceit, Make the Wealth small, and the Wants great. (718)

Of course, these are the pastimes of the expatriates of The Sun Also Rises, and what they all have in abundance is want: both the continued need for more money to support their lifestyle, as well as unfulfilled desires. Those who supply the money to
expatriates may have earned their wealth through hard work and diligence as recommended in “The Way to Wealth”; however, the access to wealth has been disastrous for the Lost Generation as it benefits from the past achievement of material success. Upward mobility does not lead to happiness in Hemingway’s philosophy. The financial prosperity associated with the American Dream actually harms the characters in his fiction because it is inherited. Hemingway’s expatriates in The Sun Also Rises neglect the need for self-improvement promoted by Franklin in favor of material gains.

Hemingway continues the exploration of the effect of material success in “The Snows of Kilimanjaro” by showing wealth as a corrupting influence on the artist. The protagonist, Harry, is dying of gangrene while on safari in Africa. While confined to a cot waiting for a plane to rescue him, he reflects on a life in which he has not achieved his dreams or fulfilled his own expectations. A failed writer, Harry has let the life of privilege that he achieved by marrying a rich woman leave him comfortable but numb to the experiences that fuel an artist’s creativity. Hemingway writes, “If a man is making a story up it
will be true in proportion to the amount of knowledge of life that he has and how conscientious he is” (By-Line 215). The active observation of experience is important to a writer for Hemingway. As Harry argues with his wife, Helen, she asks him:

...is it absolutely necessary to kill off everything you leave behind? I mean do you have to take away everything? Do you have to kill your horse, and your wife and burn your saddle and your armour? (57-8)

Harry responds, “Your damned money was my armour. My Swift and my Armour” (58). The response shows Harry admitting he has used Helen’s money to shield himself from the world. The money has protected him; however, it has also taken away his need to write. Harry’s life of comfort among the wealthy “dulled his ability and softened his will to work so that, finally, he did no work at all” Hemingway writes (“TSOK” 59). By achieving wealth, the goal of the American Dream, without working to attain it, Harry has lost the work ethic needed to write.

The second sentence of Harry’s response, “My Swift and my Armour” (58) refers to corporations which illegally pursued profits, presenting money as a corrupting influence. Swift and Armour were meatpacking corporations based in Chicago that were,
according to Paul Street, part of a group that “dominated the industry through the 1940s”. An article in the April 7, 1936 edition of The New York Times details how eleven packing concerns were issued a ban on price fixing after a two-year long investigation. Armour & Co. and Swift & Co. were among the corporations “ordered to cease and desist from price fixing, apportioning territories and other merchandising practices in contradiction to the Packers and Stockyards Act” (“Ban” 19). Armour and Swift denied they were ever involved in the violations. “The Snows of Kilimanjaro” was published in August 1936 in Esquire (Baker 289), and the always-informed and well-read Hemingway would have known about the corruption charges against the packers from his home state of Illinois.² Harry’s reference to Helen’s money as his Swift and his Armour takes the idea of the protection and safety of armour and changes it to suggest that monetary wealth has been Harry’s enemy.

For Hemingway and Harry, wealth is a disease. In her article “Contagion as Metaphor,” Cynthia J. Davis explores the relationship between Harry’s gangrene and the failure of his life. “Harry reads his gangrenous
leg as a symbol not only of his rotted soul but of his wasted potential as a writer” (833), Davis writes. When Harry says to Helen, “You rich bitch. That’s poetry. I’m full of poetry now. Rot and poetry. Rotten poetry” (58), Hemingway makes the connection between Harry’s unfulfilled artistic talent and the infection that will lead to his death (Davis 833). Harry acquires material success—the objective of the American Dream—without the work and wastes his artistic ability.

While on the surface “The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber” does not seem to comment as directly on the effect of wealth as “The Snows of Kilimanjaro,” this story of an African safari also illustrates the dangers of wealth. Any story about Americans on an African safari necessarily involves the rich. The poor or middle class could not afford to take such trips. Hemingway’s first safari was made possible by a gift of $25,000 from Gus Pfeiffer, the uncle of Hemingway’s second wife, Pauline Pfeiffer (Baker 226).³ Like Harry from “The Snows of Kilimanjaro,” Francis Macomber is wealthy. He differs from Harry, however, in that his wealth is his own, not his wife’s. The possession of wealth, with its source not revealed, allows Francis
opportunities to bypass any kind of apprenticeship in activities which typically require a great deal of experience.

Francis’ money has allowed him to participate in an activity, a hunt for big game in Africa, for which he is not qualified, physically or spiritually. After wounding a lion, Francis suggests several options to the white hunter, Robert Wilson, to avoid the dangerous task of finding the lion and killing it before it can charge. Wilson tells him he can take care of it without Francis. “That’s what I’m hired for, you know. That’s why I’m so expensive” (17), Wilson says. Francis’ wealth gives him the opportunity to shirk his responsibility for the lion. As Francis continues to ask why they cannot just leave the wounded lion, Wilson “felt as though he had opened the wrong door in a hotel and seen something shameful” (17). Without his money, Francis would not be in the situation to be challenged so far beyond his capacity for bravery, and he would not have someone there to walk him through the challenges.

Francis is not an evil man, but he is ignorant about the customs and expectations of his adventure in Africa. While Jake Barnes uses most of the money he
has saved to follow his passion for bullfighting, Francis’ African safari is not a trip to follow a longtime love of big game hunting. Francis is no aficionado. His trip to Africa is the custom of the rich. Hemingway shows that Francis has little knowledge about the etiquette of safari hunting. After Wilson and Francis drive a car to find the lion that Francis is to shoot, the white hunter directs his client to “Get out and take him” (14). Francis asks, “Why not shoot from where I am?” (14). Wilson tells him, “You don’t shoot them from cars” (14). Francis is not aware of one of the basic rules of big game hunting in Africa and ignorant about the culture of the white hunter. His wealth allows Frances to skip the preparation, training, and self-shaping of apprenticeship through which he would have learned the fundamental rules of safari hunting. While discussing his running from the wounded lion, Francis asks Robert Wilson whether the hunter will tell others about his client’s cowardice. Here Francis’ question shows his lack of knowledge about the world of the safari again:

“No,” said Wilson. “I’m a professional hunter. We never talk about our clients. You can be quite easy on that. It’s supposed to be bad form to ask us not to talk though.” (7)
Francis admits his ignorance to Wilson saying, “I’m sorry I didn’t realize that. There are lots of things I don’t know” (7). Through his money, Francis has entered into a world he knows little about.

After his failure with the lion, Francis tries the next day with the help of Wilson to kill buffalo. When he appears to succeed in shooting one, Francis undergoes a transformation. The narrator says of Francis, “For the first time in his life he really felt wholly without fear. Instead of fear he had a feeling of definite elation” (31). Shortly after this change, Francis is shot and killed by his wife. While many critics believe Margot seizes the opportunity of a charging buffalo to gun down her newly invigorated husband⁴, evidence shows the shooting is accidental. Kenneth S. Lynn argues that it does not make sense for Margot to shoot unless she is trying to save Francis from the buffalo: “if she had really wanted Macomber to die, her impulse surely would have been to do nothing.” Wilson’s accusations that Margot intended to kill Francis are leverage to keep her from reporting any illegal activity by the white hunter. The accidental shooting of Francis allows the story to
focus on Francis’ transformation instead of Margot’s role as a “soul-destroying bitch” (436).

If we are to take the change in Francis as a significant and life-changing moment when he stops being a coward and learns courage for himself, then the financial expense to take the safari has been worthwhile. Francis has successfully purchased the experience that gives him the courage he appears to be missing. The details of the shooting of the buffalo and the characterization of Wilson, however, make this interpretation problematic.

An analysis of Wilson aids the reader in trying to gauge the growth of Francis. Trudy Ring notes,

> Whatever one thinks of Wilson, the change in Francis Macomber comes when he becomes like Wilson. The question is whether this is, as Carlos Baker puts it in Hemingway: The Writer As Artist, rising toward a standard of manhood, or adopting a not very admirable set of values...

A close examination of “The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber” suggests the latter possibility. Jeffrey Meyers maintains that Hemingway “turned the hunter into a hero; for Wilson’s only vice is sleeping with the wife—a prerogative of his job” (272). This is not the case. Wilson violates the rules of hunting by chasing the buffalo in a car and beats his African
employees instead of docking their pay when they do not follow his orders (Ring). Both of these actions are illegal. By using a car to follow the buffalo, Wilson violates not only the rules of his hunting license, but also the code of hunters. Only Margot points out the lack of sport in Wilson’s actions: “‘It seemed very unfair to me,’ Margot said, ‘chasing those big helpless things in a motor car’” (30 “TSHLOFM”). Wilson lets Francis know when he has violated the code of the hunter and then ignores it himself when it is convenient for his business.

Beyond Wilson’s illegal actions, there are other signs that he is not the admirable hero of the story. George Cheatham notes that descriptions of Wilson’s eyes show a lack of humanity (343). Hemingway describes Wilson as having “flat, blue, machine-gunner’s eyes” (8). The machine gunner would be a negative image for any person who lived through World War I. For Cheatham, this reference “unquestionably undercuts Wilson’s bravery or code of manhood or standards of shooting or any other value one might attribute to him” (343). The idea of a machine gunner who shoots masses of soldiers at one time in an impersonal way does not match the image of a great
white hunter who fires with precision and accuracy, maintaining a code of sportsmanlike conduct. Wilson’s choice of rifle calls into question his code as well (344). Hemingway gives the reader a description of Wilson’s gun, writing that he “came up carrying his short, ugly, shockingly big-bored .505 Gibbs and grinning” (13). Hemingway’s own great white hunter, Philip Percival, sheds some light on this choice of weapon.

As Philip Percival would later emphasize in an unpublished autobiography, a Gibbs rifle is so powerful as to render its use on safaris unsportsmanlike, which is why he himself had never carried one. (Lynn 434)

Hemingway’s description of the gun and the description of Wilson’s “machine-gunner eyes” make the reader question whether Wilson honors the sportsman’s code that he professes. His use of such a large gun and his other illegal actions show that Wilson has turned his hunting into a form of “corrupt professionalism” (Cheatham 345). The honor of the hunt is sacrificed so that he may satisfy his paying clients.

Francis has paid Robert Wilson to provide an experience that he hopes will result in the big game trophies to show that he has courage. Unfortunately for Francis, trying to buy such an experience
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undermines the value of anything he gains on the adventure. Wilson’s main concern is not the honest and sportsmanlike hunting of animals on the African safari, but the satisfaction of his paying clients. Hemingway writes of Wilson and his clients:

He despised them when he was away from them although he liked some of them well enough at the time, but he made his living by them; and their standards were his standards as long as they were hiring him. (26)

For the sake of money, Wilson is willing to do whatever it takes to make his clients happy. Hemingway does tell the reader that Wilson has “his own standards about the killing” and that his clients “could live up to them or get some one else to hunt them” (26). Wilson’s choice of weapon and his willingness to chase animals in cars suggests that his own standards about killing have degenerated from years as a professional hunter. In an attempt to portray Wilson as a hero, critic Mark Spilka compares him to Pedro Romero, the bullfighter who is a model of true strength and courage in The Sun Also Rises. Spilka claims that like Romero, Wilson has “grace, control, and sincerity with manliness” (136; qtd. also in Cheatham 344). However, a more likely bullfighter with whom to compare Wilson would be Belmonte, who
picks out bulls for their safety and therefore avoids greatness. The choice of a more powerful rifle than necessary by Wilson is the equivalent of Belmonte’s choice to fight bulls without much horn (Cheatham 345). Both men are in their profession for the money now, making it easy to behave in a way that furthers their monetary interests but violates the code that gave them greatness in the past.

Many critics see Francis’ transition after shooting the buffalo as an authentic discovery of his masculine courage and power. A closer examination of what happens to Francis before he is shot and killed by his wife shows that he is not able to buy that bravery and that he mistakes fearlessness for courage. For Francis, it is not enough to use Wilson’s knowledge and experience for a successful hunt; he wants to be accepted by Wilson as well. The opinion of the white hunter is as important to him as anything else. John J. Seydow notes that when Francis has wounded the lion, he has the option not to pursue it into the grass and to let Wilson to take care of it (36). Hemingway writes that Francis wants “to find the courage to tell Wilson to go on and finish the lion without him” (18). At this moment it is worse for
Francis to have Wilson think poorly of him than it is to risk his life flushing out a wounded lion. According to Seydow,

> Francis is afraid of losing face and of being seen by the hunter as relying on his wealth to extricate him from the difficult situation. (36)

Francis knows that to Wilson he is only as good as his money, and he wants to be more. When he finds some success with shooting the buffalo, Francis feels a change as his fear is replaced by euphoria. "Macomber felt a wild unreasonable happiness that he had never known before" (32), Hemingway writes of the "new" Francis. This elation is not that of a hunter who has learned how to hunt by studying as an apprentice, but rather that of someone who has paid to skip over the important parts of the learning process.

Seydow observes that since he lacks the training and experience of a real hunter, Francis "should not consider himself a coward" (37) because he ran from the lion earlier. He is just inexperienced. Francis’ attempt to buy experience without putting in the appropriate time to learn the craft of big game hunting leads to his fearlessness and death. A properly trained hunter would be calm and in control
when confronting lions or buffalos; however, the hunter would know that in a situation with dangerous big game, fear is natural and probably healthy. Wilson does nothing to discourage Francis’ fearlessness and praises his shooting, ignoring the fact that the one bull for which Francis was responsible gets up, proving that Francis is not actually a very good shot (38). Francis falls for what Wilson thinks makes a man, fearlessness, and is killed because of it when he stands his ground as the bull charges. Francis tries to purchase an experience for which he is not prepared, puts his trust in a hunter who has let his standards slip because of money, and dies when his inexperience causes him to mistake fearlessness for courage, a mistake possible only because he used his wealth to skip the learning phase of big game hunting.

Hemingway’s portrayals of the perils of financial prosperity run counter to the popular depiction of wealth as the key to a good life. In popular fiction of the time, according to Hearn, the understanding that “material success is equivalent to happiness is rarely questioned” (34). While the hard work and dedication of rags-to-riches stories remain key components of the myth of success, “the fulfillment of
the American Dream means, above all else, the accumulation of money and indulgence in pleasure” to most popular writers of the 1920s and 1930s (29). Hemingway’s fiction shows that wealth does not lead to happiness and that the hard workers are not necessarily those who become rich. Material success damages the characters in The Sun Also Rises, “The Snows of Kilimanjaro,” and “The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber.” The wealthy expatriates living in Paris are without direction and have lost any sense of the value of self-improvement. When Harry achieves material success through his marriage, he gives up his work and squanders his talent as a writer. Hemingway does not specify the source of Francis’ wealth; however, money allows him to bypass apprenticeship and participate in the dangerous hunt for big game without the appropriate knowledge or emotional strength to be successful. Wilson, a man who has let business interests undermine the law and the hunter’s code, encourages Francis’ false courage, leading to his death. While wealth appears to be a worthy goal of the American Dream, Hemingway exposes the dangers of material success.
Abbreviations for Hemingway’s work will be used in parenthetical references when needed. For example, “TSOK” refers to “The Snows of Kilimanjaro” and “TSHLOFM” to “The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber.”

The investigation of corruption was not the first indication of Swift and Armour as companies that valued profits over ethics. During the Spanish-American War, fewer than 400 Americans were killed in battle, however, more than five thousand soldiers died from “disease and other causes” according to the Encyclopedia of American History (qtd. in Zinn 308). One probable cause for some of the five thousand deaths was food poisoning from rotten meat sold to the U.S. Army by companies including Swift and Armour. The army purchased 500,000 pounds of beef from Armour and Company in May of 1898. The meat sold to the army had been returned from Liverpool after being sent there the previous year. When tested by an army inspector, 751 cases of the beef were found to be rotten. “Thousands of soldiers got food poisoning” (309), reports Howard Zinn.

Uncle Gus was “a slender bespectacled man of great wealth who owned a controlling interest in Hudnut perfumes” (Baker 174). Although Hemingway was not rich himself when he went on his first trip to Africa, his marriage allowed him access to money.

Critic Edmund Wilson claims Margot deliberately kills Francis and believes Francis has risen to the occasion with the shooting of the buffalo. He writes, “[T]he male saves his soul at the last minute, and then is actually shot down by his woman, who does not want him to have a soul” (416; qtd. also in Lynn 433).
CHAPTER II: ALTERNATE REALITY:
ILLUSION AND ESCAPE

In the 1920s, the American Dream depicted in popular culture was the myth of success. The United States, according to Hearn, “was viewed as a prosperous utopia where opportunities for self-made success were virtually limitless” (24) and poverty was often explained as a personal deficiency that could be conquered by the individual (13). Before the crash of the stock market in 1929, “the businessman was the major icon of popular envy” (Dickstein 222). This period of economic growth obscured the discrepancy between the myth that anyone could become successful with enough determination and the reality that opportunity was not universally available (Hearn 56). The suffering of the Great Depression brought the American Dream into obvious conflict with the economic hardships of the 1930s. Many Americans, however, did
not give up their prior expectations and “responded to the Depression by escaping to a world of illusion,” Hearn writes (58). Popular magazines of the time perpetuated these illusions by continuing to publish rags-to-riches stories and wish-fulfillment fantasies (60-61). The American Dream remained “vitally alive in the popular mind” even though it “may have slipped so out of tune with reality as to become mere fairy-tale wish fulfillment” (59). For many Americans, the American Dream became an alternate reality: a place where they controlled their own destiny and had the chance to be successful.

In The Image: Or What Happened to the American Dream, Daniel J. Boorstin writes, “We risk being the first people in history to have been able to make their illusions so vivid, so persuasive, so ‘realistic’ that they can live in them” (240; qtd. also in Hearn 58). Boorstin warns that the American Dream has become one of these illusions because of the extravagant expectations of Americans (239-40). The American Dream helps to form our national identity and functions as an alternate reality where the myth of success is real even though we know the Dream will not necessarily come true. Individual Americans have their
own myths of identity, just as the nation does, and Hemingway’s characters participate in this mythmaking. This chapter explores the ways in which Hemingway’s characters in “Fathers and Sons,” The Garden of Eden, and For Whom the Bell Tolls use illusion and alternate realities to escape from their actual lives and to attempt to create their own history and identity.

“Fathers and Sons” reflects Nick Adam’s attempts to make sense of his past after the death of his father. At the end of the story, Nick’s son asks him, “What was my grandfather like?” (498). Nick admits his father was a complex person and then amends the negative memories, giving an incomplete description for his son. “He’s hard to describe. He was a great hunter and fisherman and he had wonderful eyes” (498), Nick responds. Although “Fathers and Sons” and Hemingway’s other Nick Adams stories provide a great deal of information about Nick’s father, as Susan F. Beegel notes, “Hunting seems the only element of Nick’s childhood that he is comfortable sharing with his son” (98). Then his son asks Nick for a value judgment of the grandfather the child can barely remember: “Was he greater than you?” (498). The use of the word “greater” implies that Nick’s son is not just
asking whether his grandfather was a better outdoorsman, but is instead looking for an overall assessment of him as a person. Nick evades the question and answers, “He was a much better shot and his father was a great wing shot too” (498). Nick creates for his son a mythology about the history of his family that emphasizes the skill of the men as hunters and fishermen, avoiding the family problems he has yet to reconcile in himself and those not suitable for his young son. Nick “finds he is no more capable of speaking truthfully to his son than was his own father a generation earlier” writes Michael Reynolds (“Brief” 32-3). He misrepresents the family history through the narrative he tells the boy.

After Nick acknowledges the virtues of his father as a marksman, the son replies, “I’ll bet he wasn’t better than you” (498). Nick continues creating the myth of his family by telling his son:

> Oh, yes he was. He shot very quickly and beautifully. I’d rather see him shoot than any man I ever knew. He was always very disappointed in the way I shot. (498)

Nick’s recollection of his father’s disappointment shows that the present does not live up to the past in the myth. This sense of the greatness of the past
creates an expectation in Nick and his son that they will have something to strive for. Nick modifies the image of his father to create this suitable history for the family.

Nick’s creation of an alternate reality to sustain his family’s myth mirrors the way the American narrative creates heroes from our founders and constructs a national identity. This practice begins with Cotton Mather, who fuses an Old Testament type with an actual person to create a new mythical prototype for the American. His hagiography, *Magnalia Christi Americana*, is filled with accounts of early New Englanders who assume greater importance through this process; for example, John Winthrop as “Nehemias Americanus” becomes an elevated American character and “distinctive concept of the representative American saint” (Bercovitch 2). These stories also take the form of fabricated tall tales such as George Washington never telling a lie, a story that can be instructive to children but is not likely to be believed by many people past adolescence.

Nick seeks to revise the individual narrative of his relationship with his deceased father by writing about him, but he is afraid of what writing the truth
will do to his family and friends. David Bourne in *The Garden of Eden* is in the middle of the process Nick avoids. David uses writing to address his past, but David’s writing also enables him to escape from the present into his own alternate reality to avoid the world created by Catherine, his wife. David’s Africa stories, including the final elephant story, create an alternative narrative of the past and reconcile the conflict between him and his father. Rose Marie Burwell writes,

> In the elephant story, David Bourne and Ernest Hemingway are removing layers of memory that shield them from what they have both heretofore avoided writing about. In the writing process each has sensed that something connected with childhood has made him able to be whole only when writing...(101)

By writing the story, David creates his past and comes to terms with it at the same time, fashioning an illusion in which he increasingly lives as the novel progresses.

When David begins his Africa stories he knows he will have difficulty facing what happened in the past with his father. David opens the memories about his father with his writing and at first still has positive feelings. Hemingway writes of David, “It
always made him happy to remember his father and he knew his father would have liked this story” (129). As David digs deeper into his memory through his Africa stories, his resentment for his father grows. By the time he reaches the elephant story, David sees the cruelty of his father, as he takes the humanity he once saw in him and other people and transfers it to the elephant. The elephant puts up a fight when he is finally found, wounding their African guide, Juma, before being killed. Hemingway writes,

The elephant was his hero now as his father had been for a long time and he had thought, I did not believe he could do it when he was so old and tired. (201)

David must use his creative process to conquer illusions about the past and his own guilt about the death of the elephant. David’s stories are his way of taking control of the past. According to Blythe Tellefsen, David, as an author, has the “power to shape his own identity, to re/present his father and his father’s story, and narrate/create history” (79). David uses the elephant story, an alternate reality into which he can escape, to see the real character of his father.
David’s elephant story centers on shame and, according to Nancy R. Comley and Robert Scholes, the “separation from the father” (102). As David gets closer to the shame of his past by writing of his betrayal of the elephant, he tries to avoid the conflict he feels from his present life with his new wife, Catherine. She attempts to take control of her life by creating her illusions through experimentation in race and gender. She associates power with the freedom of primitive culture and the preferential treatment of males. Her role-reversal in the bedroom and desire to make the couple look the same eventually causes David to retreat into his African stories. Hemingway describes the first instance of their experimentation:

He lay there and felt something and then her hand holding him and searching lower and he helped with his hands and he lay back in the dark and did not think at all and only felt the weight and the strangeness inside and she said, “Now you can’t tell who is who can you?” (17)

David’s love for Catherine leads him to follow her desires, although he has mixed feelings about their actions. He is a willing participant in Catherine’s sexual role-reversal, but begins to question his own behavior and feelings, telling himself, “You’re lucky
to have a wife like her and a sin is what you feel bad after and you don’t feel bad. Not with the wine you don’t feel bad” (21). ¹

As David’s life with Catherine and their lover, Marita, becomes more complex, he begins to spend as much time as he can outside of the real world and in his African stories. Hemingway writes,

He had been happy in the country of the story and knew that it was too good to last and now he was back from what he cared about into the overpopulated vacancy of madness that had taken, now, the new turn of exaggerated practicality. (193)

In his elephant story, David has control and can make sense of things. In the narrative of his marriage to Catherine, he has lost power and “she controls the evolving script of their marriage” (Silbergleid 97). David’s stories become a place where David can escape from Catherine (104).

Catherine creates an alternate reality for herself with David on their honeymoon. Catherine is a white woman from a family with money who tries to change her race and gender to create her own identity. “I’m the destructive type” (5), Catherine says early in the novel, foreshadowing the conflict between the couple. Although Catherine refers to a destructive
nature, she is really a creator. Her relationship with David becomes her form of expression.

Catherine’s conflict with her husband’s role as an artist propels her self-expression. Catherine as an artist is her attempted illusion, but it is an ineffective one. She is frustrated that she cannot create art in a traditional way, as David can with his writing.² She shares her feelings about her inability during a conversation with David, saying,

The whole way here I saw wonderful things to paint and I can’t paint and I never could. But I know wonderful things to write and I can’t even write a letter that isn’t stupid. Now it’s just like being hungry all the time and there’s nothing you can ever do about it. (53)

Catherine’s hunger arises from the fear of death and desire for immortality. Blythe Tellefsen observes,

Death obliterates transitory human experience, but Art—paintings, sculptures, novels—can commemorate, preserve, represent, and immortalize those experiences and, to some degree, the artist himself/herself. (68)

Through his art, David is able to attain a type of immortality that Catherine cannot. “There’s nothing here except through yourself,” Catherine tells David. “And I don’t want to die and it be gone” (53). Catherine feels as if she does not own her memories
and feelings, that they have no permanence because she cannot share and record them in traditional media as David can. Tellefsen writes, “Catherine’s creative body-fashioning will never be enough for her because the mortal body cannot immortalize experience” (68-9).

Catherine’s expression through her body and life with David still depend on David’s writing to become permanent. David’s writing of their honeymoon narrative is the only way through art to “preserve her experience for her” (69). David chooses to give up writing the honeymoon narrative and concentrate on the Africa stories, driving Catherine over the edge and causing her eventually to destroy David’s stories in an attempt to get him back to writing the narrative. By retreating into his Africa stories, David simultaneously ignores the world that Catherine is creating for him and threatens the permanence of that world.

As the Bournes live in Catherine’s fantasy world apart from the norms and standards of society, the question of their relationship to that society arises. The more they are unlike society, the more they become like each other. Toni Morrison notes, “Catherine well understands the association of blackness with
strangeness, with taboo” (87). The more they are unlike society, the more Catherine and David should be able to identify with one another. Morrison continues,

She comprehends how this acquisition of blackness “others” them and creates an ineffable bond between them—unifying them within the estrangement. (87)

In the end, Catherine’s experiments with being the Other do not bring the couple closer. They do not become estranged from society, because they are on their honeymoon in the Riviera where people are paid to serve and pretend to like them. They have no chance to test the new roles. Blythe Tellefsen sees the novel as

Hemingway’s attempt to construct a new garden—a new America, if you will—by reimagining the categories of race and gender, the structure of the family, and the meaning of artistry. (61)

The new roles that Catherine constructs for herself and David stay in this new garden, where their social status keeps them from being fully examined. For all of the changes Catherine goes through, she never loses the privileged position of being rich and white (63). After achieving the desired results from her tanning, Catherine still does not see herself as being fundamentally changed, saying to David, “Do you
remember when all I wanted was to be so dark and now I’m the darkest white girl in the world” (169). Catherine’s money and position allow her to continue to live inside her fantasy.

In *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, Robert Jordan’s and Maria’s love affair has as slim a chance to survive the operation to destroy the bridge as do the participants in the mission. During their time together, however, Robert and Maria construct a fantasy world for their own future. Maria offers Robert a goal beyond the bridge and allows him to envision a life after the war. “He would like to spend some time with Maria. That was the simplest expression of it. He would like to spend a long, long time with her,” Hemingway writes. He does not want to be a martyr, even though he knows death is a real possibility: “He did not believe there was ever going to be any such thing as a long time any more but if there was such a thing he’d like to spend it with her” (164). Robert knows there is little chance for himself or for his relationship with Maria, however he thinks of what it would be like to marry Maria and take her back to the United States.
Robert and Maria play out their fantasy of husband and wife at night together. When Maria joins Robert to sleep with him, she tells him she is “wearing only my wedding shirt” (261). He notes that it is the same shirt she wore the night before when they slept together. She agrees and again tells him, “It is my wedding shirt” (262). Maria has taken their brief relationship and turned it into the marriage that neither of them will ever have outside of the war, telling Robert, “I am thy wife” (262). At night they indulge in their illusions away from the conflict of the day.

Robert and Maria’s time together late at night is their escape from the probability that they will die in battle. The night before the attack on the bridge Maria is in pain and the couple cannot have sex. This forces the two to talk to each other more than they have before, as Robert Jordan admits to Maria: “I know thee very little from talking” (341). Maria would like to know more about his work and about how the operation will go; however, Robert Jordan seeks one last escape before what he knows could be his last day: “Then suddenly surrendering to something, to the luxury of going into unreality, he said, ‘Let us talk
of Madrid and of us in Madrid” (342). The couple now engages in building a fantasy life for themselves in Madrid after the war. Hemingway describes the power of feeling this escape in terms of

a voluptuousness of surrender into unreality that was like a sexual acceptance of something that could come in the night when there was no understanding, only the delight of acceptance. (342)

Maria breaks out of their illusion for a moment when she mentions that Pilar told her they would all die the next day in the operation and that Robert knows this. The American denies this fact and then cannot fall back fully into the world of illusion he and Maria have created. For Robert, Hemingway writes, “there was no slipping into make-believe again. Now he was just lying to his girl and to himself to pass the night before battle and he knew it” (345). When Robert declares to Maria how much he loves her, his fantasy extends for a moment past their relationship to his own values:

“Truly I have been very pure in my ambitions. I have worked much and now I love thee and,” he said it now in a complete embracing of all that would not be, “I love thee as I love all that we have fought for. I love thee as I love liberty and dignity and the rights of all men to work and not be hungry.” (348)
This “embracing of all that would not be” suggests that Robert Jordan knows the ideas he fights for and believes in may never be realized in the real world. These types of doubts, however, cannot be allowed to stay with him and affect his mission. He escapes briefly into an alternate reality, an illusion where he can exist.

The drastic economic change from the prosperous 1920s to the Great Depression of the 1930s casts doubt on the plausibility of the American Dream, and the myth of success became a fantasy for most Americans. When confronted with the hardship of poverty and unemployment, many Americans retreated into illusion. The unfulfilled promise of the American Dream induced many Americans to live inside a fantasy world where success could still be achieved through hard work. Like their real-world counterparts, Hemingway’s characters engage in this American habit of using illusion and fantasy to avoid difficult truths. Nick Adams creates for his family a portrait of his father based in illusion. David Bourne uses the illusions of his past to reconcile his feelings for his father and then escapes into an alternate reality formed from those illusions to avoid his conflicts in the present.
In an attempt to be an artist, Catherine Bourne constructs a fantasy world for herself and her husband. Although they are aware they will be killed soon, Robert Jordan and Maria spend their nights living in a fantasy of the way they wish their lives to be after the war. Their illusions become a world into which they can escape.

When Catherine suggests further changes such as getting matching haircuts, David feels anxiety again, but he goes along with Catherine’s desires. When she has Monsieur Jean give her a boy’s haircut, Catherine insists that David get the same cut. David asks for his hair to be cut shorter than his wife’s. She objects, telling the coiffeur, “No. Please just the same” (82). David relents and then agrees to have his hair lightened to match Catherine’s.

In “Hemingway’s The Garden of Eden: Writing with the Body,” Kathy Willingham shows that Catherine uses her body and David’s as “an alternative medium of expression” (47). Willingham’s assessment of the reasons behind Catherine’s lack of skill as a writer, painter, or any other type of traditional artist, however, weakens the argument that she is an artist. After sensing her “inadequacy regarding the employment of language” (47), Catherine, according to Willingham, has “no confidence in, nor because of her gender, full access to the traditionally male-controlled tool of literature” (47), forcing her to use her body as her creative outlet. While it would be ridiculous to argue that men have not unfairly dominated Western society and made many aspects of life difficult for women throughout history, being a woman is not what prevents Catherine from being a writer. Certainly, women artists faced unique hurdles, however; extraordinary female writers had existed for a long time before the novel’s setting in the 1920s.
CHAPTER III: EXPERIENCE AND REALITY:

DISILLUSIONMENT AND A NEW DREAM

Ernest Hemingway shows the American Dream as conventionally understood does not work, but he gives a new way to understand it. In his fiction, what the American Dream promises and what it delivers are rarely the same thing. This final chapter investigates disillusionment and its relationship to the myth of America in two of Hemingway’s less frequently studied works. The short story “Wine of Wyoming” shows that the bias of society prevents some groups from realizing the American Dream. In the novel To Have and Have Not, the individual is the focus for the disillusionment in the inability to achieve the Dream. Finally, an examination of one of Hemingway’s most popular works, The Old Man and the Sea, will show a more realistic expression of the American Dream which comes not from any of Hemingway’s U.S. citizens, but
from a Cuban fisherman, expanding the Dream to a larger idea of America.

Hemingway’s “Wine of Wyoming” has received relatively little critical attention compared to his other short stories. H.R. Stoneback believes this lack of attention may be due to the “excessive use of the French language in the tale” and the failure of critics to deal with Hemingway as “the troubled but disciplined Catholic convert who finds the practice of his religion difficult in Protestant America” (209). Hemingway believed in the story and wrote to Maxwell Perkins, “Don’t let anyone tell you it’s not a good story or has too much French in it... This is a 1st flight story I promise you” (Letters 323; qtd. also in Stoneback 221). Whatever the reason for its neglect, “Wine of Wyoming” is important because it displays the limits of the promise of opportunity in the New World.

With its description of immigrants in America during the era of Prohibition, “Wine of Wyoming” shows the American Dream to be unfulfilled for the country’s outsiders. An American expatriate writer narrates the story of his encounters with a bootlegging immigrant family from France while he is on vacation, hunting and fishing in Wyoming. During a series of
conversations, the mother and father speak with the writer and his wife about their impressions of America, and their experiences in the New World show a “distaste for boorish Americans and the corruptions of American life” (Grebstein 65). Madame Fontan tells the writer, “Only once in my life I ate at a restaurant in America. You know what they gave me? The gave me pork that was raw!” (451). The Fontans describe the vulgar behavior of the Americans who come to buy beer and wine from them. Madame Fontan says of a group who came for dinner and to drink:

So I made a big supper, and when they come already they drank a lot. Then they put whiskey in the wine... Then these girls were sick, nice girls too, all-right girls. They were sick right at the table. Fontan tried to take them by the arm and show them where they could be sick all right in the cabinet, but the fellows said no, they were all right right there at the table. (460)

The narrator, who has been living in France, is a Catholic like the immigrants and shares the values of the Fontans and of Europe (Grebstein 65). The apparent lack of values of the New World conflicts with the Fontans’ strong sense of values and shows Americans as hypocrites. The Fontans take pride in their work, provide a product that European culture values, and
are punished for supplying Americans willing to ignore Prohibition. Madame Fontan explains,

We don’t charge too much money. The wine one dollar a litre. The beer ten cents a bottle. We never sell the beer before it’s good. Lots of places they sell the beer right away when they make it, and then it gives everybody a headache. What’s the matter with that? They put Fontan in jail and they take seven hundred fifty-five dollars. (459)

Through the experience of the Fontans, Hemingway demonstrates the way Prohibition violates professed American ideals of freedom and responsibility, ideas that should be, according to Grebstein, the foundation of American values (65).

The narrator vows to join the Fontan family later in the evening for a celebration, but he skips the visit because he is too tired. Then on the way out of town, the writer visits the Fontans with his wife one last time. The writer learns that when he did not come to the house the previous night, the Fontans were disappointed and the father drank the three bottles of homemade wine he set aside for the party. This disappointment results not only from the narrator’s lack of courtesy, but also from the fact that the writer, one of the few likable Americans the family has met, may be “no better than the other customers
who use the Fontans merely as a source of food and alcoholic drink” (Grebstein 65). At the end of the story, the immigrant couple is distraught. As the Americans drive away, the writer’s wife says, “I hope they have a lot of luck.” Knowing the difficulty of being a foreigner, the writer replies, “They won’t” (466).

In “Hemingway’s ‘Wine of Wyoming’: Disappointment in America” Kenneth G. Johnston argues that the story shows “the discrepancy between the dream and the reality of American life” (160). In the discussion the narrator has with the Fontan family about the presidential candidacy of a Catholic named Schmidt, the reader sees this discrepancy clearly. As Johnston notes, St. John de Crévecoeur helped to create the American myth of religious tolerance. In 1782, he wrote in Letters from an American Farmer that indifference to religion is “one of the strongest characteristics of the Americans” (599; qtd. also in Johnston 162). This tolerance was not a reality in the early twentieth century despite the observations early America by Crévecoeur. Schmidt in the story is a reference to the real 1928 presidential candidate Al Smith and the attacks against him for his religion
(Johnston 162). Smith was a Roman Catholic and opposed Prohibition. His enemies claimed the father of the third-generation Irish American had changed his name from Schmidt, a false claim likely made in an attempt to alienate Smith’s Irish supporters (Burner). Smith’s critics spread Anti-Catholic literature across the country and claimed that if Smith won “the pope would have a suite in the White House” (Stoneback 217).

Smith lost the election to Herbert Hoover, earning 87 electoral votes to 444 by Hoover (Burner).¹

In the world of “Wine of Wyoming,” even a child knows that being Catholic at this time in America makes life difficult. Madame Fontan tells the narrator,

[T]here was a little French girl here with her mother, the cousin of Fontan, and she said to me, ‘En Amérique il ne faut pas être catholique. It’s not good to be catholique. The Americans don’t like you to be catholique. It’s like the dry law.’ (457)

Although she does not attend Mass regularly anymore, Madame Fontan believes she must stay true to herself and religion, remaining a Catholic because, as she tells the writer, “It’s no good to change the religion” (457). When the Fontan family discusses Schmidt, Madame Fontan has a hard time believing a
Catholic could be a candidate for president and expresses amazement when she accepts the facts. “My God, Schmidt est catholique” (458), she says. The narrator knows that no matter his background or qualifications, Schmidt is an outsider in America like the Fontan family. Hemingway writes, “‘You think he’ll be President?’ Fontan asked. ‘No,’ I said” (458).

According to Johnston, Hemingway is using Smith and his impending defeat at the polls to extend his theme of disappointment to cover the thwarted prospects of the “foreigner” in America (163).

Al Smith’s opportunity for success is limited by his religion. Despite the promise that the individual can control his or her own destiny in America and build a better life, fundamental parts of an individual’s identity such as religion, race, or gender limit the possibilities, as can be seen in the historical context of hate groups such as the Ku Klux Klan.

Hemingway’s views on the individual’s ability to succeed are shown in To Have And Have Not. Since its publication in 1937, critics have considered To Have And Have Not one of Hemingway’s minor works. Toni D. Knott sums up the “perceived faults” of the novel as “lack of social concern, anti-intellectualism, lack of
structure, and shifts in point-of-view” (“One” 78). While some of these complaints are valid, they do not mean the work should be ignored. As Hemingway’s only novel to take place in America, *To Have and Have Not* deserves to be examined for its interrogation of the American Dream.

Most of the novel concerns the ordeals of Harry Morgan as he smuggles liquor and people back and forth between Key West and Cuba. Although many critics have described Harry as a hero, his actions are a mixture of the admirable and the terrible. Knott writes of the reader’s conflicted feelings toward Harry, “We do not approve—nor should we—of the majority of Harry’s actions, whether or not we understand or accept his motives” (“Playing”). The encounter between Harry and Mr. Sing, a Chinese man who is arranging for other Chinese people to be smuggled to America from Cuba but is actually having them killed to make a larger profit, illustrates the moral gray area in which Harry constantly operates. Harry feels that the need to take care of his family and his lack of a legitimate way to make money with his boat justify his turn to smuggling. He accepts a charter from Mr. Sing after a client on a legitimate fishing trip skips town without
purchasing. Realizing his client ran out on him, Harry thinks,

All right, what was I going to do now? I couldn’t bring in a load because you have to have money to buy booze and besides there’s no money in it any more. The town is flooded with it and there’s nobody to buy it. But I was damned if I was going home broke and starve a summer in that town. Besides I’ve got a family. (28)

Harry’s need to make money is understandable and his dedication to his family is honorable; however, readers must question his decision to take a job that involves stealing from twelve people and then murdering them. Harry regains the respect of the reader when Hemingway reveals that the captain plans to kill Mr. Sing and let the Chinese immigrants go. Harry’s reputation suffers again when he abandons the twelve people along the shore in Cuba and keeps the money. Realizing what happened, one of the Chinese men calls him a “damn crook” (58), and the man is correct. At the same time, Harry has saved twelve lives and helped to “prevent even more Chinese from losing their savings and risking their lives” (Knott “One” 80). Morgan’s actions show he is a morally complex character who has to choose between options with no clear answer.
An emphasis on individuality is one of the core characteristics of the American identity. The individual is supposed to control his or her own fate. If one works hard enough, one will have an opportunity to live the American Dream. Most critics writing about To Have and Have Not have mentioned that the message of the book is summed up in the last words of Harry. He utters them to the captain and his mate of a boat that rescues him after he is shot when a plan to transport Cuban revolutionaries goes terribly wrong:

“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 fucking chance.” (225)

The narrator then tells us, “It had taken him a long time to get it out and it had taken him all of his life to learn it” (225). William Kenney points out that Harry’s attitude directly contradicts the optimistic assertion of the American dream that an individual, through self-reliance and hard work, can succeed at anything he undertakes. (28)

Philip Young sees Harry’s declaration as a shift on Hemingway’s part to the belief that “some kind of cooperative society” is the answer for America (99). The rest of the novel, however, does not support the
idea that working together or being a part of a group is always positive. Participation in a like-minded group reinforces the mistaken ideas of an individual and allows dangerous behavior to flourish (Knott “One” 81). The bank-robbing Cuban revolutionaries exemplify this in the novel. At least one of the revolutionaries knows that what they are doing is wrong, but the consensus of the group trumps this insight. He tells Harry they must raise money to fight and that they “have to use means that later we would never use. Also we have to use people we would not employ later. But the end is worth the means” (166). The group can negate the value of the individual’s judgment as easily as it can enhance it. Scott Donaldson asserts that To Have and Have Not “illustrates time and again how badly men behave when they form groups” and is anything but an “affirmation of human solidarity” (107), despite Harry’s final words. The forces that cause “one man alone” to fail will also cause the failure of individuals together in a group. The apparent futility of an individual’s efforts does not mean that Hemingway rejects self-reliance. Donaldson observes, “In a better world, one man alone would have a chance” (110). The problem is with America.
In one passage in the novel, Hemingway directly addresses the failure of the American Dream. This passage refers to those whose lives have been shattered in economic ruin brought on by speculators. The solution for some is to commit suicide. The narrator calls guns "those admirable American instruments so easily carried, so sure of effect, so well designed to end the American dream when it becomes a nightmare, their only drawback the mess they leave for relatives to clean up." (238)

The narrator of *To Have and Have Not* says that the sixty-year-old grain broker who lies awake in his yacht worrying about tax evasion “would not need to worry about what he had done to other people, nor what had happened to them due to him, nor how they’d ended” (237). *To Have And Have Not* exposes the truth about the American Dream. Success in the land of opportunity is tough and cannot be achieved solely through an individual’s hard work and determination.

Although much of Hemingway’s work presents characters who are destroyed despite their strength or self-reliance, there is one work in which the protagonist emerges from his ordeal ready to try again despite seemingly having lost all he had gained.
Although he is not a resident of the United States, Santiago in *The Old Man and the Sea* lives a version of the American Dream that is more realistic than the Dream as it has traditionally been conceived. The old man has hope, works hard when success is not guaranteed, and does not give up on life despite losing all he has won in the battle with the giant marlin. Santiago is Hemingway’s example of the way to live out the values of the American Dream, even if the reward it promises is not always realized.

Santiago shares a fundamental characteristic with all American Dreamers: hope. Hope has been a part of America since the colonial beginnings as evidenced in the jeremiad sermons of New England. After the initial litany of transgressions, every sermon ended on a note of hope. The quality, early on, became a hallmark of American character. Santiago has gone eighty-four days without taking a marlin but still believes he will catch a fish. “Eighty-five is a lucky number” (16), he tells the young boy who has fished with him for forty days. Santiago is poor, living in a shack where he uses his pants stuffed with newspapers for a pillow at night. He relies on himself for his survival and believes in his ability as a fisherman.
The old man does not hope unrealistically that he will become rich, famous, or powerful. Santiago seeks to provide for himself by doing, as he says, “the thing that I was born for” (50). After Santiago has caught a giant marlin and attached it to his boat, sharks attack the fish, eating the old man’s prize. During a break between shark attacks, the narrator tells the reader, “He watched only the forward part of the fish and some of his hope returned. It is silly not to hope, he thought. Besides I believe it is a sin” (104-5). Despite losing all he gained in the fight with the marlin, Santiago does not give up on himself.

In addition to showing the fisherman’s hope, Hemingway associates Santiago with the United States through the national pastime. The old fisherman loves baseball and often thinks about the New York Yankees and Joe DiMaggio. Santiago tells the boy he would like to take DiMaggio fishing, saying, “They say his father was a fisherman. Maybe he was as poor as we are and would understand” (22). Hemingway relates DiMaggio to Santiago by reminding the reader that the great hitter has a similar background to his poor fisherman. While at sea, Santiago continues to compare himself to the Yankee Clipper, thinking, “I must have confidence and
I must be worthy of the great DiMaggio who does all
things perfectly even with the pain of the bone spur
in his heel” (68). Hemingway uses baseball to expand
the domain of the American Dream from the area of the
United States to the nations of the Americas.
Santiago’s love of a quintessentially American sport,
known as the national pastime of the United States,
Cuba, and other countries in the Americas, contrasts
to the interests of previous Hemingway characters. For
example, Jake Barnes from The Sun Also Rises is an
American who admires bullfighting, a sport as closely
tied with Spain as baseball is with the United States
and Cuba. As Santiago sails home with his catch under
attack by sharks, he tells himself he must think:
“Because it is all I have left. That and baseball”
(103). Santiago’s embodiment of values of hope, hard
work, and persistence make him an American icon worthy
of the praise he gives to Joe DiMaggio.

Although the sharks devour the economically
valuable portion of Santiago’s catch, the fisherman is
not defeated at the end of the story. Here Hemingway
contrasts appearance and reality. To those who value
material wealth, Santiago would appear as a defeated
man at the end as at the beginning of the novel. The
narrator even describes the sail of Santiago’s boat as looking “like the flag of permanent defeat” (9). In describing Santiago himself, however, the narrator tells the reader, “Everything about him was old except his eyes and they were the same color as the sea and were cheerful and undefeated” (10). While he may not have possessions to show the world he has the status of success, his eyes show that his real power lies inside of him. Santiago questions himself and thinks he has been defeated because he has been able to bring home only the eighteen-foot-long skeleton of the giant marlin. When the old man tells the boy he has been beaten, the boy says, “He didn’t beat you. Not the fish.” Santiago replies, “No. Truly. It was afterwards” (124). The fisherman is incorrect in his assessment. Although he lost the marlin to the sharks, he keeps the spirit and determination to fish again, planning future fishing trips with the boy. He maintains hope and a belief in the future to the end. Philip Young writes of Santiago, “He is undefeated, he endures, and his loss therefore, in the manner of it, is itself a victory” (125). This endurance separates Santiago from other Hemingway heroes. Delmore Schwartz believes Nick Adams suffers from illusions about his
mortality while “Frederick Henry in A Farewell to Arms concludes in disillusion and despair.” Santiago, according to Schwartz, “surpasses both prior characters” as he lives “by hope” (85). This determination to try again with no guarantee of success is a realistic implementation of the values of the American Dream. A person will not necessarily be able to be anything he or she wants to be or have the opportunity to achieve wealth. Through hope, hard work, and persistence, however, a person can remain undefeated.

In “Wine of Wyoming” and To Have And Have Not, Hemingway shows disillusionment in the American Dream when the success promised by the myth proves to be inaccessible. Marginalized by the prejudices of society, the Fontans remain outsiders and have limited access to material success. Harry Morgan’s self-reliance and hard work are not enough to overcome the obstacles to his achievement of the Dream. His realization of the American Dream remains unlikely. In The Old Man and the Sea, Hemingway redefines success by removing the goal of material wealth. For Hemingway, success is to remain undefeated, a goal worthy of a new American Dream that encompasses the
entire New World and not just the United States. Santiago’s inner strength and hope make him the example of how to live Hemingway’s new expression of the American Dream.

1As the Democratic candidate for president in 1928, Al Smith’s religion “gave him major trouble” (Burner). The Atlantic Monthly published an open letter from Charles C. Marshall in April 1927 that claimed the teachings of Catholicism were incompatible with the demands of the U.S. Constitution and that, as a faithful Catholic, Smith would have to put the rulings of the Church above the laws of the United States. Marshal attacked Smith’s character, writing,

It is indeed true that a loyal and conscientious Roman Catholic could and would discharge his oath of office with absolute fidelity to his moral standards... But those moral standards differ essentially from the moral standards of all men not Roman Catholics. (541)

Smith responded to the attacks in the next issue of the Atlantic Monthly with the column “Catholic and Patriot.” Smith assured Marshall that the Church only has authority in the spiritual realm and that his religion, like Marshall’s Protestantism, follows the instructions “of our common Saviour to render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar’s, and unto God the things that are God’s” (726).
CONCLUSION

The popular understanding of the American Dream in the first half of the twentieth century valued material success and discounted the importance of self-improvement. This period saw the rise of literary treatments critical of the American Dream in the work of writers such as Theodore Dreiser, John Dos Passos, John Steinbeck, and F. Scott Fitzgerald. Ernest Hemingway investigates the American Dream as well and finds its promise to be unfulfilled. When characters achieve financial wealth, readers see the corrupting influence of money, as in the case of the expatriates of The Sun Also Rises. Money allows individuals to avoid accountability and responsibility. Both Harry in “The Snows of Kilimanjaro” and Francis Macomber in “The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber” are destroyed by wealth. Harry never fulfills his artistic promise because he uses his wife’s money to shield
himself from life. Money allows Francis Macomber to buy an experience for which he is not prepared. His personal fortune allows him to avoid paying his dues as a hunter and to gain a false sense of courage, and he dies as a result. In Hemingway’s work, defining success in life through wealth is a mistake.

When the economic collapse of the Great Depression rendered the myth of success unbelievable, many Americans escaped into illusion. Nick Adams, who creates the myth of his family in “Fathers and Sons,” and the newlywed Bournes, who try to escape the pain of their present situation in The Garden of Eden, create their own delusions in order to avoid reality. In For Whom the Bell Tolls, Robert Jordan and Maria live at night in the hope of a future that they know will likely never come to pass, creating illusions of escape.

The reality of the American Dream leads to disillusionment in most of Hemingway’s work. Disappointment overwhelms the immigrant couple in “Wine of Wyoming” as the Americans they encounter prove to be vulgar and hypocritical. By alluding to the presidential candidacy of Al Smith, the story shows that success is not equally possible for
everyone. In the case of Harry Morgan in To Have and Have Not, hard work does not provide enough to survive alone. The one character who escapes defeat and disillusionment is Santiago in The Old Man and the Sea. He has hope and his fair share of illusions, but he does not allow himself to give up. His life appears to readers to be fulfilling and full of meaning despite his poverty. With Santiago, Hemingway shows the way to live a new American Dream in which wealth is not the goal. Success is not guaranteed, but with hard work, determination, and hope an individual can remain undefeated and be prepared to try again to achieve success in this new Dream. Whether writing of its deceptive appearance, escapist illusion, or disillusionary experience, Ernest Hemingway contributes a cast of characters in his canon to provide perspective on the cultural reality of the American Dream.
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