

**TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY**

**Political Irony in *To Have and Have Not***

**A Thesis Submitted to the faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences,  
Tribhuvan University for the Fulfillment of the Requirement for the  
Degree of Master of Arts in English**

**By**

**Urmila Rijal**

**Reg.No: 6-1-54-764-98**

**Central Department of English**

**Kirtipur, Kathmandu**

**June 2011**

Tribhuvan University  
Central Department of English

LETTER OF RECOMMENDADION

Mrs. Urmila Rijal has completed her thesis entitled “Political Irony in *To Have and Have Not*”.She carried out her research in 2011 A.D. I hereby recommend her thesis be submitted for viva voce.

.....  
Pradip Raj Giri  
Supervisor  
Date.....

## Acknowledgement

I would like to thank and heartily gratitude to my research supervisor Mr.Pradip Raj Giri for his valuable guidance and encouragement at all the stages to my research.

Similarly my special thanks goes to Dr.Ammar Raj Joshi, the head of department of English,Kirtipur for his ingenious encouragement and academic support.

Likewise thanks goes to respected teachers Mr.Prem Bahadur, Gurung Ghanshyam Bhandari and Birendra Pandey who have provided me the basic ideas and support from initials for preparation.

At last I would like to express my thanks to my friends who have directly and indirectly help me in course of this research writing and I am also thankful to my family for their kind cooperation, encouragement and financial support

June, 2011

Urmila Rijal

## **Abstract**

This research is a critical study of Ernest Hemingway's *To Have and Have Not* that explores the socio-political issue based on the ironic gaps between expectation and fulfillment, pretense and facts, intention and action, the message sent and the message received, the way things are thought or ought to be and the way the things are. An art shows the contradiction between appearance and reality, particular and general, and immediate and conceptual. The struggle of Harry Morgan's authority embodies these qualities. Where there is always nostalgia for the harmony and beauty in Harry Morgan's characterization but that harmony of life was lost forever.

## Table of Contents

	Page No.
Acknowledgement	
Abstract	
I: Struggle for survival	1-10
II: Political irony	11-30
III: Political irony in <i>To Have and Have Not</i>	31-49
IV: Have vs Have Have not	50-51
Work Cited	

## **I: Struggle for survival**

The situation presented in *To Have and Have not* by Ernest Hemingway is much more marvelous and extraordinary than very rarely takes place in common cases. In fact Hemingway dramatizes the miserable plight of the marginalized that often get ignored in the decent and so-called civilized society. And at the same time he shows the bitter irony on the parts of the power holder people upon those who do not have power. In the very beginning of the novel power holder people kill the Negro women. Harry Morgan, the main character of the novel is very sad and mentally injured after seeing the Negro women murder. But later he himself lost his boat and he was insulted by upper class people because he did not have enough economic standards and from the middle part of the novel Morgan involves in the revolution and opposes all rules and regulation. Actually it is incorrect to boycott any groups of human beings whatever their condition gender, class, ethnicity is. The conservative often favors the very mentality that in the society.

Hemingway's prose style was probably the most widely imitated of any in the 20th century. He wished to strip his own use of language of inessentials, ridding it of all traces of verbosity, embellishment, and sentimentality. In striving to be as objective and honest as possible, Hemingway hits upon the device of describing a series of actions using short, simple sentences from which all comment or emotional rhetoric have been eliminated. These sentences are composed largely of nouns and verbs, have few adjectives and adverbs, and rely on repetition and rhythm for much of their effect. The resulting terse, concentrated prose is concrete and unemotional yet is often resonant and capable of conveying great irony through understatement. Hemingway's use of dialogue was similarly fresh, simple, and natural-sounding. The

influence of this style was felt worldwide wherever novels were written, particularly from the 1930s through the '50s.

From almost the beginning of his writing career, Hemingway employed a distinctive style which drew comment from many critics. Hemingway does not give way to lengthy geographical and psychological description. His style has been said to lack substance because he avoids direct statements and descriptions of emotion. Basically his style is simple, direct and somewhat plain. He developed a forceful prose style characterized by simple sentences and few adverbs or adjectives. He wrote concise, vivid dialogue and exact description of places and things. Henry Louis Gates says:

Hemingway's style was fundamentally shaped in reaction to his experience of world war. After World War I, he and other modernists lost faith in the central institutions of Western civilization, by reacting against the "elaborate style" of 19th century writers; and by creating a style in which meaning is established through dialogue, through action, and silences - a fiction in which nothing crucial—or at least very little—is stated explicitly. Because he began as a writer of short stories  
(169)

Hemingway is known for his simple, easy-to-read writing style, but everything he writes goes much deeper than the oceans he writes about. He writes *To Have and Have Not*, which is common with his other books, tells about the struggles of trying to make it through life, and how one has to play with the hand he's given. Everyone has to put up with hardships in life, some more than others, but everyone has to learn how to deal with them because there's not much they can do to change their lives. It is a very realistic account of life

Hemingway referred to his style as the [iceberg theory](#), the supporting structure and symbolism operate out-of-sight. Writing in *The Art of the Short Story*, he explains: "A few things I have found to be true. If you leave out important things or events that you know about, the story is strengthened. If you leave or skip something because you do not know it, the story will be worthless. The test of any story is how very good the stuff that you, not your editors, omit". (169)

Hemingway used autobiographical details as framing devices about life in general—not only about his life But Hemingway used his experiences and drew them out with what if scenarios: what if I were wounded in such a way that I could not sleep at night? What if I were wounded and made crazy, what would happen if I were sent back to the front? (170) the concept of the iceberg theory is sometimes referred to as the 'theory of omission.' Hemingway believed the writer could describe one thing though an entirely different thing occurs below the surface .The simplicity of the prose is deceptive. His iceberg theory of omission is the foundation on which he builds.

Hemingway uses the syntax, which lacks [subordinating conjunctions](#), creates static sentences. The photographic [snapshot](#) style creates a [collage](#) of images. Many types of internal punctuation are omitted in favor of short declarative sentences. The sentences build on each other, as events build to create a sense of the whole. Multiple strands exist in one story; an embedded text bridges to a different angle. He also uses other cinematic techniques of cutting quickly from one scene to the next; or of splicing a scene into another. Intentional omissions allow the reader to fill the gap, as though responding to instructions from the author, and create three-dimensional prose. In his literature, and in his personal writing, Hemingway habitually used the word 'and' in place of commas. This use of [polysyndeton](#) may serve to convey immediacy.

Hemingway's polysyndetonic sentence—or in later works his use of subordinate clauses—uses conjunctions to juxtapose startling visions and images. (170-171)

Many of Hemingway's followers misinterpreted his lead and frowned upon all expression of emotion; [Saul Bellow](#) satirized this style as "Do you have emotions? Strangle them"(172). However, Hemingway's intent was not to eliminate emotion, but to portray it more scientifically. Hemingway thought it would be easy, and pointless, to describe emotions; collages of images in order to grasp "the real thing, the sequence of motion and fact which made the emotion and which would be as valid in a year or in ten years or, with luck and if you stated it purely enough, always".(173) This use of an image as an [objective correlative](#) is characteristic of Ezra Pound, T. S. Eliot, James Joyce, and [Proust](#).(174) Hemingway's letters refer to Proust's [\*Remembrance of Things Past\*](#) several times over the years, and indicate he read the book at least twice (175) His writing was likely also influenced by the [Japanese poetic canon](#).(176)

To explain Hemingway's style in a few paragraphs in such a manner as to satisfy those who have read his articles and books is almost impossible. It is a simple style, straight forward and modest. Hemingway's prose is unadorned as a result of his abstaining from using adjectives as much as possible. He relates a story in the form of straight journalism, but because he is a master of transmitting emotion without embellishing it, the product is even more enjoyable.

In *To Have and Have Not* Hemingway shows women with titanic inner strength, Marie is possibly the strongest character in the novel her role in life is stereotypical, but that is due to the realism of the story, Rene Sander views:

More than any other Hemingway's novel, *To Have and Have Not* shows the author's awareness that perspective is everything, Whatever

the blind sports in Hemingway's perception of women, he was not utterly unaware of them. In an ironically, after a glimpse of Marie, Morgan, assumes that he has seen, in a flash of perception, the whole inner life of that type of women. *To Have and Have Not* is a story about surviving love and loss; about being a man and about fishing. It is a great and moments of satire and grisly noir to go along with the adventurous plight of Harry Morgan. (189)

The novel consists of two loosely interwoven plots that align the contrast between socio-economic classes with a contrast between marital situations. The first plot depicts the hard boiled, violent world of Harry Morgan and his wife Marie; the second shows the unhappy lives and marital infidelities of the writer Richard Gordon, his wife Helen and their wealthy friends. Harry Morgan enjoys a satisfactory if carnal relationship with his wife. Harry who has only his 'conjoints to Peddle'; sinks hopelessly into a life of crime, but he knows that he is doing it to support a wife who without question adores him.

Though various viewers analyze this novel from various perspectives. None of them has highlighted about the socio- economic impacts. The novel depicts Harry as an essentially good man who is forced into black-market activity by economic forces beyond his control. Hemingway presents the main character Harry Morgan in such a way who always talks about human right and social justice in society. Due to the lover of humanity Harry Morgan dislikes the killing of negro woman and still feeling bad, Harry heads out in his boat on a charter fishing expedition for which later he forced to agree to smuggle some illegal Chinese for the mysterious Mr. sing, From there it's just a small step to carrying liquor-a disastrous run that ends when Harry loses an arm and his boat. Once Harry gets mixed up in the brewing Cuban revolution, however,

even those losses seem small compared to what's at stake now: his very life. Kenneth Kinnamen says "Basically board with politics" according to the biography by Jeffery Meyers, Hemingway responded to the call of the left in 1930s in a half hearted way with *To Have and Have Not*, which represent only a token commitment to class struggle". (149) In *To Have and Have Not* we see contrast between haves and have notes. This comparison makes it easier to understand by contrast just how inevitably Morgan was driven to the life he now leads. Though Hemingway could have treated this issue by simply depicting the rich people as bad and Harry as good, he instead develops the story with tremendous emotional complexity- in a chapter dedicated to the former; Hemingway gets inside the heads of many well-off Americans and shows their thoughts and fears. They are shown to be just as many victims of circumstances as Harry Morgan- while this does not forgive them of their foibles, just like it doesn't forgive him of his crimes; it makes all of them easier to understand. Nor does Hemingway paint the Marxist rebels that Morgan agrees to transport to Cuba in black and white-some are ruthless mercenaries, but some genuinely seek to make the world better, and others are just there by chance.

The tragedy of the book is that all these people, who with a few exceptions really weren't bad sorts, were driven by much more powerful forces against one another, and all ended badly. Here we have Harry Morgan, a strong and intelligent man who really didn't want anything other than to have enough to subsist for him and his family, and he ends up hopelessly alone up against both the law and the lawless. His last monologue, where he ruefully summarizes his life, is one of Hemingway's finest moments.

Like that Hemingway raised the social and economic issue in this novel *To Have and Have Not*, distinctly modernistic point of view, in his connection in an

essay entitled “Revaluing Nature: towards an ecological criticism”- Glen A Loves says:

Race, class, and gender are the words that we see and hear everywhere at our profession meetings and in our current publications. But curiously enough. The English Profession has failed to respond in any signification way to the issue of the environment, the acknowledgement of our place with in the nature word and our need to live heedfully within it, at peril of our survival. (284)

In each case of economic hardship, Morgan has avoided taking other actions that would have solved his problem, at least temporarily. He owns his boat, so he could have sold it or borrowed against it. He owns his home, and could have sold it and rented. He could have rented other peoples' boats when he could get a charter. The government has subsistence work available for the unemployed, but he prefers to maintain his life style and appearances as though he has no problems. He also has tried to keep from getting caught in breaking the law, but that hasn't worked either.

The style is distinctly modernistic with the narrative being told from multiple viewpoints at different times by different characters. It begins in first person (Harry's viewpoint), moves to third person omniscient, then back to first person (Al's viewpoint), then back to first person (Harry's again) then back to third person omniscient where it stays for the rest of the novel. As a result, names of characters are frequently written under the chapter headings to indicate who is narrating that section of the novel. Evaluating Hemingway's Works, F.Beegel in the critical Reputation of Earnest Hemingway. Says:

Hemingway's Nonfiction of the 1930s *Death in the Afternoon* (1932) and *Green Hills of Africa* (1935) had been disappointing by

comparison, and a “novel” like *To Have and Have Not* (1937). Two previously published stories hastily cobbled together, seemed shocking performance from craftsman once so exacting.(271)

**Chares Poore** writes comment upon *To Have and Have not* in this way: Harry Morgan tried to make a living lawfully and lost, tried to make a living unlawfully and lost, learned by dying that he could not win as a buccaneer. He had a wife, Marie, and three daughters to take care of, and a boat to run when he could find any profitable use for it. Times were terrible. Most men around him were on relief. But Harry Morgan, not content to let things happen to him and take them on the chin, was always planning ways out, refusing to give in. You see, this is going to be a very moral tale. Harry Morgan was trying to earn a living honestly, in the book's beginning, by carrying a sportsman called Johnson out to the fishing waters. He had just refused a chance to smuggle three Cubans over to the United States at a thousand dollars a throw. The Cubans die in gun battle with another faction. Some of the variety in Hemingway's new book is pretty well illustrated, by the way, in the description of that fight ("He hit one tire, because I saw dust blowing in a spurt on the street as the air came out"), and the totally different account of the fishing trip that follows it, and Harry's soliloquy a good deal later, when he thinks how easy it would be to let things slide and do nothing instead of going out and facing the final music.

*To Have and Have Not* tells about the story of a fisherman named Harry Morgan who has to do smuggling business to feed his family. The book does a good job of depicting many kinds of characters. All portraying the negative aspects of a human being. Greed, violence, jealousy, and competition from the naive ‘chink’ Mr. Sing to the tragic Albert. The book brings out a lot in terms of people's lives during the Great Depression. Hence Hemingway ironizes the quest of the materially-

obsessed characters like Morgan and Mr. Sing who became hollow while pursuing the quest of material prosperity by hook and crook

Irony happens in the realm between and including both said and unsaid. The ironic meaning is not then simply the unsaid meaning, and the unsaid is not always a simple inversion or opposite of the said. It is always different- other than and more than said. For political ironists, irony is not a detached aesthetic rhetorical device which has nothing to do with life, politics and verticality of axis of power, Hutchison believes that irony “always has an edge; it sometimes has a sting”. (15)

**For political ironists**, irony is not a detached aesthetic rhetorical device which has nothing to do with life, politics and verticality of axis of power, Hutchison believes that irony “always has an edge; it sometimes has a sting”. (15) “Political irony arises from the said and the unsaid. The unsaid is related to the repressed, marginalized and colonized; it is not just the unsaid, but the unswayable within the hegemonic, homogenous discourse, it is just as the uncanny is never surmounted, the repressed is similarly related to the said in a dialectic, uncanny fashion; it can be seen at once constitutive and discursive structure or controlling intention including ironical ones, but the ironist may approach and play with the uncontrollable”. (50) Political irony which function to rehearse and yet to revise the white stereotyping by the whites leads the blacks to mediate between the opposite poles; if the stereotyping by the whites leads the blacks to the sad reality of always looking at one’s self through the eyes of others, the ability to see is a quality that many people in majority cultures lack. They can’t get enough distant from themselves to turn the irony inward that is to laugh at their own whiteness .(50) Irony, in this point maps the micro politics of the power relation by linking itself inextricably to the issues of race, class, gender of sexuality. (50)

I have studied this novel *To Have and Have Not* with the social political implication from political ironical perspective. In course of the research, I have included suggestion from internal examiner and other lecturers as the treasure. I will develop my own critical tools for making textual analysis by relevant critical theories and literatures in the text, writer and the problem. I have divided this thesis into four chapters. Chapter one is about introduction in I have introduced my text writer's writing technique, likewise in chapter two I have discussed the theoretical tool, the political irony and then in chapter three I have analyzed text applying politics of irony and finally the chapter four is conclusion of the text.

## II: Political Irony

Irony is subtly humorous perception of inconsistency, in which an apparently straightforward statement or event is undermined by its context so as to give it a very different significance.

Wayne Booth a great figure in the field of irony and its political significance stands different in the matter of application of irony. He says “Irony has been located and explicated in literature, the visual arts, music, dance, theatre museum displays. Conversation, and philosophical argumentation” (Booth I). Hence he makes clear that the use of irony pervades all sorts of discourse. He further says irony that appears to have become a problematic mode of expression at the end of the twentieth century. Wayne says that some commentators have written about irony in a deliberately and controversially unsystematic and ironized way. In his book further explains the concepts of irony concerning its political nature and its use in the social-cultural domains. LaCarpa says as quoted in Wayne’s book: “There is nothing intrinsically subversive about ironic skepticism or about any such self – questioning internally dilogized” (LaCarpa 119). “There is no relationship between irony and radical politics or even radical formal innovation” (Nichols 65). “Irony has often been used to reinforce rather than to question established attitudes” (Muser 414), as the history of satire illustrate so well.

Booth Wayne further tells us that the major players in the ironic game are indeed the interpreter and the ironist. The interpreter may or may not be intended address of the ironist’s utterance, but s\he is the one who attributes irony and then interpretes it. In the other words, the one who decides whether the utterance is ironic or not, and then what particular ironic meaning it might have. This process occurs regardless of the intensions of the ironist. This is why irony is “risky business” (Fish

176) there is no guarantee that the interpreter will get the irony in the same way as it was intended. In fact 'get' may be an inaccurate and even inappropriate word 'make' would be much more precise. In the same way the person usually called the ironist though is the one who intends to set up an ironic relation between the said and the unsaid, but many not always succeed in communicating that intention Wayne Booth says:

From the point of view of the interpreter and intentional move, it is the making of inferring of meaning in addition to and different from what is stated, together with an **attitude toward both the said and the said and unsaid**. The move is usually triggered by contextual textual or contextual evidence or by markers which are socially agreed upon.

(11)

As Wayne makes the sense of irony clear: he says that irony is the intentional transmission of both information and evaluative attitude other than what is explicitly presented. Furthermore he highlights the positions of the interpreter. The interpreter is an agent performs act-attributes both meaning and motives and does so in a particular purpose, and with particular means. Attributing irony involves then both semantic and evaluate inferences irony's appraising edge is never absent and indeed is what makes irony work it might structurally seem to resemble to method, allegory and puns.

Irony happens in common speech as well as highly crafted aesthetic form in so-called high art as well as in popular culture, it has been used to reinforce rather than to question established attitudes. According to transideological nature of irony. Irony can and does tactically in the service of a wide range of political positions, legitimating or undercutting a wide range of interest Hutcheon views:

Irony's indirection complicates considerably the various existing

models of inter subjective communication between a speaker and a hearer. With irony there are instead, dynamic and plural relations among the text or utterance, the so-called ironist, the interpreter and the circumstances surrounding the discursive situation. **It is these that means up neat theories of irony that see the** task of the interpreter simply as one of decoding or reconstructing some “real meaning this is hidden, but deemed accessible, behind the stated one. If this were actually the case, irony’s politics would be much less contentions .(10-11)

Politics grows out of tragedy is a response to tragedy, is an attempt to become tragedy. Political community must be used as a precarious triumph over the radical separateness of human existence, political order, must be understood as a rare achievement given the chaos and flux of life. Community and order to be sure are principal aims of politics but it must be quickly added that of politics emerges out of an awareness of tragedy as a responses to tragedy then politics is an endeavor that can never fulfill itself can never finally attain its highest goal for politics can never fully defy the tragedy of human existence; political community can never completely repair human separateness; and what semblance of order politics imposes can thus be only temporary. Politics then is inactivity that is always at odds with itself always ambivalent about itself, never satisfied evil incomplete.

Tragedy provokes irony. Politics of course, is the art or the rough and tumble of diverse persons trying to live together. Certainly the imperative of brute several provide some of the mundane pressures of context for politics, but the fullest sense of political context, the parameters of such activity is provided by the fact that all human life ends in death. Which by definition constitutes the termination of political activity

peruse. Those who hold that the imperatives of survival provide all of the pressures of context for politics elide its fundamental strangers politics literally does not make sense in the face of death and by parity of reason an anxious attachment to survival does not make sufficient sense in view of death and thus cannot fully define the meaning of politics.

Hutcheon says instead that politics acquires its meaning and form and direction only by recognizing its essential if underlying irony. That all is part pretenses play, fiction temporality, construct indirection. She points out Politics is ironic, because it requires an acceptance of the pretense, the possible fiction, that living together matters in the face of death, it requires a fundamental reversal of sensibilities an outlook that can somehow affirm wordless notwithstanding the ultimate of consequences (*Irony's Edge* 10). She claims in politics the ironist would have an advantage of being able to affirm the value of diverse persons living together even though one might not be able to say that sure activity leads anywhere, represents, anything or that various constitutions involved have anything literally, naturally or practically in common with one another.

From a theoretical perspective, irony seems appropriate for addressing nuclear matters and the likely disparity between intentions and consequences for irony begins with the premise that theory is preciously limited, but unlike literalist Theorists, ironic theorists make a method, construct a creative conceit, out of that very awareness of that own limitations and preciousness of their enterprise similarly, irony holds the general potential for investing choice.

Further she elaborates, in ironic discourse, the political meaning in the whole communicative process is not only altered and distorted but also made possible by those different micro political power relations and from the basis of the expectations

assumptions and preconception that we bring to the compound processing of language in practice. To the ironist, whose outlook on things is already detached, life is fundamentally tragic, finally devoid of inherent meaning; human activity is framed by the inescapable facts of morality and separation. These facts of nature simply cannot be reversed any farther, no matter how playful, how talented the ironist. At some point irony can go no farther; finally irony must affirm human existence. The last twist of irony, as Thomas Mann contended; is to turn its own skepticism “backward” upon itself, in order to affirm existence, “political irony; as Mann called it, becomes “eroticism” in the sense that it entails an unconditional affirmation of human life .(344)

Irony has been placed and explicated in literature the visual arts, music, dance, theater, museum displays, conversation, philosophic argumentation. Irony appears to have become a problematic mode of expression at the end of twentieth century. Unlike metaphor or allegory, which demands similar supplementing of meaning, irony has an evaluative edge and manages to provoke emotional responses in those who get it and those don't as well as in its targets and it what some people call its” victims “.This is where the politics of irony get heated. The scene of irony involves relations of power based in relations of communication. It unavoidably involves touchy issued such as exclusion and inclusion, intervention and evasion. There is also a curious gendering in the discourses about irony and its politics. Kiergaard says when irony is seen as something debilitating, it is figured as a Vampire- a feminine vampire; likewise Palate says when it is considered the mark if the intellect, women is denied access and understanding (Palate); Conrad says; when its negativity is deemed counter to instinct. Faith, devotion and action, women join children and revolutionaries in hating it .(Conrad 8)

Irony is the mode of the unsaid, the unheard the unseen; in western cultures it has always fascinated theorists, critics and artists alike. States views; irony has certainly been called the “child of Janus, god of beginnings, and without doubt the most ill-behaved of all literary tropes” (states 3). Moser defines irony has often been used to reinforce rather than to question established attitudes as the history of satire illustrates so well. (Moser 414) Irony can and does function tactically in the service of a wide range of political positions, legitimating or undercutting a wide variety of interest.

Irony happens all kind of discourses in common speech as well as in highly crafted aesthetic form, in so-called high art as well as in popular culture. It has often been used to reinforce rather than to question established attitudes. According to the Transideological nature of irony, irony can and does function tactically in the service of a wide range of political positions, legitimating or undercutting a wide range of interest. (*Irony's Edge* 10)

Irony's indirection complicates considerably the various existing models of intersubjective communication between a speaker and a hearer. With irony there are, instead, dynamic and plural relations among the text or utterance, the so-called ironist, the interpreter and the circumstances surrounding the discursive situation. It is these that means up neat theories of irony that see the task of the interpreter simply as one of decoding or reconstructing some "real meaning a meaning that is hidden, but deemed accessible, behind the stated one. If this were actually the case, irony's politics would be much less contentious. (10-11)

Irony happens in the space between said and unsaid i.e. as part of communicative process. it is not a rhetorical tool to be deployed, but it comes into being in the relations between meanings, but also between people utterances and

sometimes between intensions and interpretation Hutcheon is of the view that there is an affective "Charge" to irony that cannot be ignored and that cannot be separated from its politics of use if it is to account for the range of emotional response and the various degrees of motivation and proximity. (Hutcheon15)

Irony may bring us into hierarchical participation, but the hierarchy of meaning inherited from the German articulation of romantic irony seems to have too easily become a hierarchy of participants. There has been a move from sense of shared knowledge to a sense of superiority, often based on a sense of superiority, often based on a sense of superior intellect. (94)

When its politics are conservative or authoritarian as easily as when its politics are oppositional and subversive irony can be provocative. It depends upon who is using it and at whose expense it is seen to be, that is the trans-ideological nature of irony which forces a distinction between irony that might function constructively to articulate a new oppositional position and irony that would work in a more negative and negative way. The ironist would stand outside in a position of Power. (16)

Even if an ironist intends an irony to be interpreted in an oppositional framework, there is no guarantee that this subversive intent will be realized. In a totalitarian regime to use or dangerous: that rules or norms are known and adhered to in the letter, thought not in the spirit, of the ironizing utterance. The dangers only materialize if the authorities also attribute irony in order to undermine – from within is relatively straightforward, if attribute irony and the protective cover of indirection is blown, in a more democratic situation. Where different positions or "truths" theoretically coexist and are valued, irony is actually even riskier-thought less materially dangerous.

*(Irony's Edge 15)*

Irony is a risk business because there is no guarantee that the interpreter will get the irony in the same way as it was intended. The interpreter may or may not be the intended addressee of the ironist utterance but he or she is the one who attributes irony and then interprets it. Irony varies between interpreter and ironist. According to the interpreter, irony is an interpretive and intentional move it is the making or inferring of meaning in addition to and different from what is stated together with an attitude toward both the said and the unsaid. The move is usually directed by conflictual textual or contextual evidence or by markers which are socially agreed upon. And from the point of view of the ironist is the internal transmission of both information and evaluative attitude other than what is explicitly presented. However the political issues that arise around irony's uses and interpretation always focus on the issue of intention, and it is because of its very foregrounding of the politics of human agency in this way that irony has become an important strategy of oppositional rhetoric. From the point of view of its discursive politics, the one thing irony would not seem to be is what it is usually claimed to be. A simple antiphrastic substitution of the unsaid for its opposite, the said (12) Further ironic meaning is unsaid exists for the interpreter and each meaning in relation to the other because they literally interact to create the real ironic meaning.

The politics of irony are never simple and single; it exists within a relationship between ironist and audiences. It invokes notions of hierarchy and subordination, judgment and perhaps even moral superiority while provoking laughter. It deals a lot with power that may be in the case with other discursive strategies. Burke says that, "since irony happens in discourse, its semantic and syntactic dimensions cannot be considered separately from the social, historical and the cultural aspects of its context of deployment and attribution. Issues of authority and power are encoded in

that notion of discourse" (qtd in Hutcheon 17). Similarly Fish views: the multiple discursive communities to which each belongs cannot be reduced to any single component, such as class or gender. They certainly involve openly held belief but also ideologies unspoken, understanding, "assumptions-about what is possible, necessary, telling essential and so on-so deeply held that they are not thought of as assumptions at all. Of course things like class, race ethnicity, gender and sexual preference are involved, but so too are nationality, neighborhood, profession, religion and all the other micro political complexities of our living to which we may not even be able to give labels (qtd in Hutcheon 18). In this way irony is the superimposition or rubbing of meaning with a critical edge created by a difference of context that makes irony happen. The discursive community makes the irony possible in the first place, but does not create any community.

The relationship between irony and human is a vexed one but can not be ignored in dealing the politics of irony. Both involve complex power relation and both depend upon social and situational context for their very coming into beings. The theories of humor do exist as incongruity, disarmament and release that find their echoes in those elements of irony that its politics foregrounds (Gagner 135-6). The affective dimension of irony and its formal dimensions find their way into theories of humor as well (Paulos 8). And in the same way, irony as a form of humor also seem as what "disharm" and therefore offers access to material that is not, in fact very funny at all : like the racial stereotypes in Weems's photo texts or Colescott's paintings. But Hutcheon says that:

It is irony's edge that appears to be what gives certain forms of humor, such as that in recent North America Native writing. Fishers says: its status as a "Survival skill", a tool for acknowledging, complexity, a

means of exposing or subverting oppressive hegemonic ideologies, and an art for affirming life in the face of objective troubles. That may sound like it's claiming a lot, but the history of both humor and irony bears witness to many similar statements about their perceived function and significance throughout the centuries. (qtd in Hutcheon 25)

Of course, even humorous ironies can be deadly serious. But not all serious or humorous ironies work to demystify or subvert authority. Some use power as a weapon to different ends. As the Trans ideological nature of its politics, irony can be used either to undercut or to reinforce both conservative and radical politics. Irony might be seen as Transideological in two senses as well. The position that irony works in a positive and constructively affirmative way is usually held by those who also see irony as a powerful tool or even weapon in the fight against a dominant authority- which irony is said to work to destroy. (26) Whether it is feminist, postcolonial, gay and lesbian terrorists who have argued this position in different but related ways.

The contrasting view of irony as negating, as largely destructive, appears to be held at different times, by almost anyone who has been on the receiving end of an ironic attack or by those for whom the serious or the solemn, and the univocal are the ideal. Obviously this last group would include not only the humorless, but those whose political commitments lead them to desire, perhaps for didactic purposes and an unambiguous discourse of engagement. The totalitarian regime uses or attributes irony in order to materialize dangers in the protective cover of repressive irony. The conservative function of irony, therefore is controlled by Bakhtin, says, "one-sidedly serious dogmatic and authoritarian cultures (qtd in Hutcheon 27). But again it is the repressive cultures, affirmative and the destructive political functions of irony to

force the marginal be complicit with the system. In the the “affirming and negating” use, irony function, in Culler’s words, as the “ultimate form of recuperation and naturalization.” “We reduce the strange or incongruous, or calling them and making them confirms rather than abuse our expectations” (qtd in Hutcheon28).

Thus the possible function of irony is both "affirming and negating" (Culler 25), as in the view that irony is what allows one to "see where God is to be found in a world abandoned by God", Yet is itself "Demonic" (Lukacs:92). The academic interpretation of text that show how "the forces of oppression are subverted by the boundless powers of irony and allegory that no prison can contain" risk rendering their perpetrators complacent and smug, irony becomes a kind of surrogate for actual resistance and opposition. (27)

The oppositional functioning of irony is often connected to the view that it is a self critical self knowing, self-reflective mode. It has the potential to offer a challenge to the hierarchy of the very sites of discourse, a hierarchy based in social relations of dominance. For stall brass and white, that challenges the capacity to undermine and turn upside down the "politically transformative power".(qtd in Hutcheon 30)

Terdiman sees this political dimension of irony as "counter – discourse" (30). The concept of irony as a counter – discourse is the mainstay of oppositional theories that resist such hierarchies. When their, they are based on race ethnicity, gender, class, sexuality. As it is a "mode of combat", irony becomes "a negative passion, to dispatch and annihilate a dominant depiction of the world" (Terdiman 12). It is a passion that is seen to be carried when the dominant, established discourses show greater "absorptive capacity" (13). Hutcheon shows the irony's negative intimacy with the dominant discourses. She further makes it clear that "irony's intimacy with the dominant discourses it contests. It uses their very language as its said- is its strength, for it

allows ironic discourses both to buy time and also to relativise the authority and stability," in part by "appropriating its power" (Hutcheon 30). Irony's ability to relativise the oppressive ideology shatters its claim to absoluteness, to truth.

Because of this subversive power of irony, it has become a most appropriate mode not only for politically suppressed groups but, more generally for those with the "divided allegiance" that comes from their differences from the dominant norms of race, ethnicity, gender or sexual choice (qtd in Hutcheon 31). Irony functions to repeat and yet to revise the white discourses and this allows negative along two axes of power, the social and the mental, and the public and the covert. Irony enables, Hutcheon puts;

The marginalized, (To) be heard by the centre, and yet keep its critical distance and thus unbalance and undermine. The complexity and multivocality of signifying are seen as a means of critique of the metaphysical presuppositions both of western white culture, and also and any, notion of the transcendent and (marginalized) subject, integral and whole. (Hutcheon 31)

The large majority of women writers believe that the suspicion of irony's instability is countered by the realization of the power that lies in its potential to destabilize.

Sometimes, this power is directly harnessed to oppositional and critical ends.

Sometimes it is an indirect attempt to "work" ideological contradictions and not let them resolve into coherent and thus, potentially oppressive dogma (31). In both cases, irony has been seen as a serious play, a rhetorical strategy and a political method designed to trust and decentring patriarchal discourses. Hutcheon calls it a form of "guerrilla warfare" (191) Hutcheon, here notes that "irony's trans-ideological nature has meant that it has often been used as a weapon of dominant cultures to keep the

supervise in their place, [on the other hand] irony, Spring from the recognition of as specially constructed self as arbitrary and that demands revision of values and convention's" (Hutcheon 32). In this later case irony works to deprive hegemonic culture and its critics of the claim to naturalize or essentialist gender identities.

Women use irony as a particularly potent means of critique or resistance to patriarchal social restrictions or even essential mate claims to truth. Irony both empowers and on pleasures.

Irony is a political issue that involves relation of power based in relations of communication with issues such as exclusions and inclusions, intervention and evasion, thereby making the functioning of irony inevitably political. Our nationality, male or female, working class or not, all these factors condition the interpretation of the specific function of ironic meaning.

The function of ironic meaning gets its political edge out of the ironist's intentional and the interpreter's interpretative move with a certain attitude towards both the said and unsaid meaning of irony in certain discursive situation. In the other words, irony is a complex intentional act on the part of both the interpreter and the ironist-one that has both semantic and evaluative dimensions between intentions and interpretations, which are directed by conflictual textual and contextual evidences. Irony turns to be political in "the intentional transmission of both informative and evaluative attitude other than what is explicitly expressed" (11). The interpretation of irony as Christine Kerbrat Orecchioni says, "Bring into play, besides their linguistic competence, the cultural and ideological competence of ironist and audience" (qtd in Muecke 40-41). Reading or interpreting irony is at once reading or interpreting life itself where we read character and value, thereby referring to our deepest convictions. It is because of its very of foregrounding the politics of human agency in this that

irony has become an important discursive strategy. Its discursiveness comes from the interpreter and the ironist as the agents who perform the act of attributing both semantic and evaluative inferences. Similarly, “the semantic dimension of irony happens because of such a discursive communicative process in which irony “itself into being in a relation between meanings, between intensions and interpretations” (13). Irony explicitly sets up a relation between ironist and audience that is political in nature as irony invokes notions of hierarchy and subordination, judgment and perhaps even moral superiority. Its “semantic and syntactic dimensions cannot be considered separately from the social, historical and cultural aspects of its context of deployment and attributions” (16-17). In such a context, the interpreters’ interpretation is not simply a matter of the “subjective attitude of either interpreter or ironist, but[is] a function of the culture, language, and social context [where] both participants interest with each other and with the text itself” (91). In this light, the political meaning of irony is not only substitution of the identity and position of both the ironist and the audience but is a matter of interpretations as much as of its use that as Hutcheon argues:

In the space between the said and unsaid, it needs both to happen ironic meaning is inclusive and relational: the said and the unsaid coexist in the interpreter, and each has meaning in a relation to the other because they literally interact to create the real ironic meaning, and the unsaid is not always a simple inversion or opposite of the said. [It] is the complex inclusive, relational and differential nature of ironic meaning making. [So] it is [impossible] to treat the semantics of irony separately from its conditions of use and reception. (13)

Thus, the context for the construction of irony is always crucial to interpreting its meaning and politics. This point further clarifies that the politics of “irony is a relational strategy in the sense that it operates not only between said and unsaid meanings, but also between people, ironist, interpreters and targets” .(58)

Irony, being a relational discursive strategy, has its transideological functions. The transideological nature of its “politics means that the irony can be used either or undercut or to reinforce both conservative and radical positions” .(27) To put it more explicitly, irony can be provocative when its politics is conservative or authoritarian as easily as when its politics is oppositional or subversive. It depends on who is using and attributing it and at whose expense it is seen to be. The politics of irony, in this sense, at once forces a distinction between irony that “might function constructively to articulate new oppositional position[s]”, and irony that would work in amore negative and negativizing way” where the ironist would stand outside of system in a position of power .(16-17)

The use of irony from the positions of power, especially by the dominant authority, generates irony’s conservative political function. Such an elitist use makes the irony as a weapon for “negating”, thereby becoming “largely destructive”. (27) In this context, the notion of irony as a negation appears to be held by almost everyone who has been on the receiving end of an ironic attack or by those for whom the serious or the solemn and the univocal are the ideal. Obviously, the last group includes not only the humorless but those elites whose political commitments lead them to desire for didactic purpose and an unambiguous discourse of engagement. The totalitarian regimes uses or attributes irony in order to materialize dangers in the protective cover of repressive irony. The conservative function of irony, therefore is controlled by the Bakhtin says, “One-sidedly serious dogmatic and authoritarian

cultures”. (qtd in Hutcheon 27) It is the repressive cultures, affirmative and the destructive political functions of irony to in force the marginal be complicit with the system. In the “affirming and negating” use, irony functions, in Cullers words, as the ultimate form of recuperation and naturalization”: “We reduce the strange or incongruous, or even attitudes with which we differ, by calling them ironic and making them confirms rather than abuse our expectations” .(qtd. in Hutcheon 28)

Another radical transideological political function of irony is to use it in a positive and constructively progressive way wherein it is used as a powerful tool or even as a weapon in the fight against a dominant authority by demystifying or subverting the repression. Oppositional theorist like feminist, post-colonialists and other marginal use this function of irony where, as Culler reminds, “the forces of oppression are subverted by the boundless powers of irony that no prison can contain”. (qtd. in hutcheon 28) In such a use, irony is not taken, as Belsey reminds, as “authoritative because its meanings are inherent than unambiguous” (qtd. in Hutcheon 29). The recourse to irony’s multivocal instability is exploited by the oppositional theories at the expense of necessarily univocal social commitments in which irony not only works to point to the complexities of historical and social reality but also has the power to change that reality. So, the subversive function is the “mode of the unheard, the unseen relishing them power in its verbal and structural forms” (4). Irony, in this light, is a discursive strategy operating at the level of language, which has intrinsically subversive, self-questioning and internally and internally dialogized mode that can and does function tactically in the service of a wide range of political positions, legitimating or undercutting a wide variety of interests as Hutcheon reminds us:

Irony is often connected to the view that It is a self –critical, self knowing, self-reflexive mode that has the power to challenge to the

hierarchy of the every 'sites' of discourse, a hierarchy based in social relation of dominance and overturn, is said to have 'politically transformative power' (30).

Such a subversive political function of irony has established ironic discourse as in Terdiman's words' a "counter discourse" (qtd. in Hutcheon, 184). In this view, irony's intimacy with the dominant it contests is its strength to relativize the authority and stability in part by appropriating its power. This intimacy is what makes irony potentially an effective strategy of oppositionality since the ironized discourse can point to difference to avoid both imperial and simply oppositional single voicing. The ironized language can allow "alternities of being" through the "aternities of saying" (31). In such aternities, the marginalized can be heard by the center 'and yet to keep their critical distance and thus undercut the authority. This function of irony, therefore, is radical and democratizing" as it gives a room for alternative reaction (38). Irony involves social interaction as an inquiring mode to avoid the single and dogmatic. It becomes as Bakhtin says, "a special kind of substitute for silence" wherein the irony can be interpreted as a kind of defense mechanism (qtd in Hutcheon 35). Thus the irony's politics is not only relational but also counter discursive.

This is a function of irony that does not reject or refute or turn upside -down: no evasiveness or lack of courage on conviction, but an admission that there are times when we can not be sure not so much because we don't know enough as because uncertainty is intrinsic of the essence. When such a provisional position is seen as valuable, it is often called demystifying. For some, this provisionaity actually becomes the essence of true art, over which irony rules as a kind of divine protector.

Such a function of irony has especially been called “counter discursive” in its ability to contest dominant habits of mind and expression. (51-52)

The counter discursive function of irony, which rests on irony’s denial over certainties by unmasking the world as an ambiguous and instable is frequently exploited in oppositional theories. Such a function of irony that lies in the realization of the power that lies in its potential to destabilize with critical ends and ideological contradiction so that not to let the marginal resolve into the coherent and potentially oppressive dogma. It is the irony’s politics that gives in Fisher’s words, “survival skill, a tool a tool for knowledge acknowledging complexity, a means of exposing or subverting oppressive hegemonic ideologies and art for affirming life in the face of objective troubles”. (qtd in Hutcheon 26) Irony becomes a political method when it deconstructs and de-centers the dominant discourse on the premise that the single vision produces more illusions than the double vision. While irony has often used as a weapon of dominant cultures to keep the subservient in their place, it has been reversed as something that springs from recognition of the socially constructed self as arbitrary, and that demands revision of values and convection. This the irony, for instance, that that feminist theorists and other marginal see as working to deprive, in the words of J. Butler, “hegemonic culture and its critics of the claim to naturalized or essentialist gender identities”(qtd in Hutcheon 32).

They are said to be able to use irony as a particularly potent means of critique or resistance to patriarchal social reactions or even essentialist claims to truth. Irony therefore is seen as both empowering and displeasing. And it is often the transideological nature of irony itself that is exploited in order to recode into positive terms what the patriarchal discourse reads as a negative, in which silencing of

women's voice is transformed into the willed silence of the ironic and traditional feminine manner. In this sense, irony becomes:

One thing of a loosening of a bond that blinds us to the single and the singular track, to a paranoid obsession with certitude and fixed single destination. Irony can be this kind of general reflexive mode, one has the potential to reflect and make the recognition that all conceptualizations are limited, that what is socially maintained as truth is often politically motivated. (Hutcheon 33)

The transideological identity of "protean polymorphism," (qtd in Hutcheon 33) in Tittler's words, is exploited as the rhetorical figure of the dialogue whose function is to project an alternative through which any element of the here and now may be shown as contingent, thereby subjecting the whole configuration of power relationship to the erosive dialectical power of alterity.

To put the whole exploration of political irony in laconic terms, it is political. Both the dominant and the marginalized can appropriate its consolidating as well as subversive potentiality in their own different interests. Hutcheon says that it has an "edge", "can put people on edge" and "is decidedly edge". (37) Both rebels and conformers use irony at each other, and both suffer from it.

In this way, irony occurs because of the presence of discursive communication and its discursive presence about in interpretation whether arising from the ironist's intention or from the space between the said and unsaid. It comes into being in "social spaces where different ideologies and cultures meet, dash, grapple with each other often in contexts of highly asymmetrical relation of power" .(Hutcheon 93)

Hutcheon defines political irony explores the recesses of tragedy, and only by indirection does it "transcend" or reverse a tragic outlook. The reversal of expectation

is the reason irony informed the ancients explored a symbolic realm of death and destruction in order to gain moral insight into the activity of this world, but at the same time they realized that this netherworld investigation was indeed a roundabout approach to ethics .(Hutcheon 344)

At some point irony can go no farther; finally irony must affirm human existence.

Thomas Mann gives his idea that, the last twist of irony, is to turn its own skepticism "backwards" upon itself in order to affirm existence. (Hutcheon 344)

The grandest of issues and debates circulating in contemporary political theory and that preoccupied these are with concerns drawn exclusively from life and are lacking in any implied acknowledgement of the ultimate fact of human morality and thus how unwittingly self traveling most accounts become when all is said and done the good life, power ,right, Justices, prosperity, interests, performance ,desire, liberty, obligation, authority, representation, negative versus Positive, freedom, individuation versus community, public versus Private, separations versus attachment, different versus identity, equity is about the only concept that retains its grammatical integrity when viewed from the perspective of death" .(25 )"Political irony", as Mann caused it, becomes, "eroticism" in the sense that it entails an unconditional affirmation of human life.(344)

### III: Political Irony in Hemingway's *To Have and Have Not*

Earnest Hemingway in his novel *To Have and Have Not* raises the social and political issue that is of a wider significance with broader message to spread among the communities where people always looks toward material prosperity, but most of the time human being faces ironic situation in the life that they live. After all, the ultimate consequences the ultimate consequences they encounter with sometimes go beyond their capacity of tolerance and handling. When something happens opposite than it has been expected and thought of before is in literature known as irony. And moreover because of this ironic situation, even the happier life of the human being turns into the more complicated and miserable one.

The irony of life is when something happens beyond the expectation and in contrary to that indeed of life moves ahead and people hardly pay attention to that. Similar to that in 'To Have And Have Not' Hemingway presents the character like Morgan and Mr. Singh who made the headlong journey toward material prosperity but the very journey leads toward the immature death further shattering the lives of other dependent. Here Hemingway symbolically ironizes the quest of material prosperity sought after by material-minded characters. Here the protagonist Harry Morgan has strong commitment for economic upliftments. However material prosperity is interested in studying how the human mind through the sense, perceives the external reality and particularly with the idea of how we know things objectively. Material prosperity often wants to ask hoe we know something is real. In the very beginning of the novel narrator says: "But when we got inside the café and sat down, there were three of them waiting for us. We sat down and one of them waiting for us".

(3)

From these above lines it is clear that the 'us' versus 'them'. Through the use of irony, the indicative of the need to connect and cooperate with one another, the distinguish individual and to love or hate individuals rather than the categories of people based on hasty and often misconstrued perceptions. And this beginning scene of the novel is in a restaurant of Havana. Harry Morgan was coming there from San Francisco. Harry Morgan started to talk with other colleagues in restaurant, at the same time chauffeur killed a Negro woman. Harry Morgan disliked the killing of Negro woman because he was a lover of humanity. The following lines his social position is presented:

The three of them started for the door and I watched them go. They were good looking young fellows, were good clothes, none of them wore hats and they looked like they had plenty of money. They talked plenty of money anyway and they spoke the kind English Cubans with money speak. As they turned out of the door to the right, I saw a closed car coe across the square towards them. The first thing is pane of glass went and the bullet smashed into the row of bottles on the show-case wall to the right. I heard the gun going and bop, bop, bop there were bottle smashing all along the wall. I jumped behind the bar on the left and could see looking over the edge. The car was stopped and there were two fellows crunched down by it. One had a Thompson gun and the other had a sawed-off automatic shotgun. The one with the Thompson gun was a nigger. The other has a chauffeur's white duster on (5).

Here Hemingway uses ironic categorization to show that hero's are people with inner strength self awareness and a sense of humility who cannot be picked from crowd by

physical appearance or defined by a particular code of behavior. And many of Hemingway's contemporary critics believed that his use of categories within *To Have and Have Not* resulted in shallow caricatures would argue instead that he created character drawn from categories in order to show that the only way past stereotyping is getting to know the individual. Some individuals do not fare well, such as Richard Gordon, whom we continue to dislike after we get to know more about him. Others' such as Harry Morgan and Helen Gordon we come to know more and perhaps respect, although we may not be aware of their actions.

Like that Harry Morgan puts all politicians and rich tourists into one category, labeling them as threats to his existence and the well being of his family, instead of directing his anger and frustration toward the individuals responsible, such as Mr. Johnson and the 'big alphabet man' yet Harry bases his opinions and actions for instance, he kills Mr. Singh not because he is a 'chink' but to avoid killing twelve more people, who are also 'chinks' to Harry helps prevent even more Chinese from losing their savings and rising their lives to escape the slavery inflicted upon them by the Cuban government.

Similarly Harry is a mere man, just as the captain, the crutch the veterans and some of the tourists are men. There are women too, in this novel, in all shapes, sizes, personalities and varying degrees of goodness. Sub categories of men and women include the shallow rich, but also the rich, 'happy family' on one of the yachts', finding contentment within themselves and with each other, able to sleep peacefully without the gnawing hunger experienced by the Conch children. There is at least one bad writer and tourist who cares for little outside of their own-contained world.

The only terms in the novel that carry the objectives better are man, husband and writer. And how does one become a better man, husband and writer, Hemingway

shows that the path begins with self-examination know thyself. A person cannot connect successfully with others until he/she self and found love and acceptance.

Robert E. Gajdusek says that the title *To Have and Have Not*, “pivots on the balance provided by the fulcrum that is the joining connective and” .(2) His statements indicates that only through cooperation with one another, at least some Degree of trust, can the novel’s characters succeed. Regarding the novel’s first violent scene, where the Cubans Harry has just refused to carry across gunned down in the street outside the café Gajdusek comments:

The reader of course doesn’t see and is not meant to see the intricate relationship Hemingway builds into his drama, but under the surface we are led to understand that black who can associate and perform effectively down or up together with the white are adaptable to the situation as their opponents are not, opponents who... are destroyed .(530)

Harry to will be destroyed. Yet he was willing to die for that he believed, for what was important to him, for what he was unafraid to confront within himself. What is the alternative? The novel indicates more than one route. The safety in numbers, approach allows and individuals to be very wrong indeed and even to commit atrocious acts, so long as a group of people agree or even assist. This person is wrong because, after all, everybody does it within the novel. American and Cuban politicians, as well as Cuban revolutionaries provided good examples of this type of behavior.

As to Harry’s relationship with Marie and what we have got, we must remember although she is good and loving, Marie is a coarse woman, Richard Gordon’s description of is cruel but telling:

Riding his bicycle he passed a heavy set, big, blue eyed woman, with bleached-blond hair showing under her old man's felt hat, hurrying across the road, her eyes red from crying. Look at that big ox, he thought. How does her husband feel about her when she gets that size. Wasn't she an appalling looking woman? Like a battleship...Her husband .when he came home at night hated her, hated that way she had coarsened and grown heavy was repelled by heavy breasts. (125)

It is not a true picture for we know how Harry really feels about Marie and we now what is good as well what is cheap and ugly but it is certainly the portrait of a common woman. She is Harry's kind of woman. It is the typical of what Harry wants Marie to be that in the tenderest scene in the novel she remembers that when she first bleached her hair he was struck with love, lust and admiration.

However, if we can look to Harry's family life for evidence of his commonness we can also find it in a crude sensitivity which most critics ignore. His relationship with Marie, though rough and expressed in the crude language that is they know, is powerful and deep, by far the most convincing and enduring human relationship in the novel. We cannot forget either that Harry's main concern throughout the book is only feeding and caring for his family not himself. Certainly Harry's strongest loyalties and affections are basically and almost primitively on the family level. This is not to say however that he is without morals beyond his relationship with Marie. He holds a friendly contempt for Eddy, the rummy, except when the man's depravity and incompetence becomes truly intolerable or dangerous and pure humanity keeps Harry from killing Eddy, although a witness to Harry's killing of Mar sing the Chinaman. As for Albert, Harry looks out for him and when he is killed needlessly by the Cubans, Harry feels sick inside."The poor hungry

bastard, he thought'' . (79). This is hardly the comments of a totally brutalized and callous man, and it is not a typical. Neither is Harry's desire to save the life of young revolutionary, nor the reaction to the killing that opens the books. Even when Harry is most brutal, as he is with the cod blooded killing of the collie runner Sing or with his massive butchery of the revolutionaries, he is so because the alternatives are worse than his toughness. But aside from his fundamental morality, there is depth in Harry which we might not at first notice. Leo Gurko's judgment is questionable when he says that Harry is '' utterly mindless'' (Gurko149) and he is simply wrong in calling Harry ''a pure pragmatic instrument, with absolutely no life of the spirit who lives entirely in sensory flow'' (Gurko150) may be basic and inarticulate but they are very real and profound and hardly lacking in the ''the life of the spirit'' unless we define life or the spirit in particularly cerebral terms.

In *To Have and Have Not*, we can notice irony upon the Cuban people. Here the very appearances verses reality. Actually the Cuban people never like to go revolution and destruction but there was no alternative way for them. Government itself pushed the people to go against the prevalent system. There was too much domination upon middle class people which results the great revolution. From those following lines it is clear that how much people were aggressive against the authority:

I love my poor country and I would do anything, to free it from this tyranny we have now. I do things I hate. But I would do thing I hate a thousand times more. I want a drinking, Harry was thinking. What the hell do I care about his revolution's-his revolution .To help the working man he robs a banks and kills a fellow works with him and then kills that poor damned .Albert that never did any harm. That is workingman he kills .He never thinks of that with a family. Its Cuban

ran Cuba. They all double cross each other. They sell each other out. They get what they deserve. The hell with their revolutions. All I got to do is make a living for my family and I can't do that. Then he tells me about his revolution. (71)

In above lines, it is clear that people are not what they actually appear. To prove this we have to analyze that how the honest man turns into aggressive violent. Harry Morgan himself used to hate the alcoholic things but later on he himself started to drink alcoholic things because government become failure to give way out for him. The government tries to minimize the revolution rather than to find out the solution of the social problems.

According to Edmund Wilson, Hemingway offers a more sophisticated attitude to the slogans about proletarian dictatorship, the brotherhood of working men or the people's revolution in Cuba. He has given the blistering irony which undermines the young Cubans' defense of Stalinist terrorism and Harry's court comments:

Further, Harry's life has been as one of the ordinary people of the world. He is perfectly capable of living a successful and virtuous life, but only on the personal, not the ideological level and only in a world which allows ordinary men to live in dignity and peace. Unfortunately for Harry, the economic deterrents' of the world make it impossible for him to do so and therefore his story must be a tragedy, a demonstration of the necessary destruction of a good man by a corrupt system.(80)

Hemingway however didn't realize that he could, and should simply have left it at that. He felt that he had to make the reader, and Harry aware of the instruments of Harry Morgan destruction just as terrible, had he never spoken that final line or if

Hemingway hadn't hammered home his point with the yacht caricatures or with the Richard Gordon material.

What Hemingway didn't recognize was that he had wrought better than he new, that he had already written a novel with all the social conscience necessary. In the very creation of Harry and the delineation of his destruction. Hemingway had created the novel that he wanted. In the elements of the plot integral to Harry's strong, the basic book is all the domination of the system necessary, the duplicity of Mr. Johnson, the officious lack of humanity in the meddling government official who reports Harry for smuggling, the government's impounding of Harry's boat and its failure to make it possible for the make to feed his family.

Dorothy Hollis's masturbation scene in *To Have and Have Not* is directly followed by the wrenching grief of Mrs. Tracy and Marie Morgan as they learn of their husband's deaths. Juxtaposed against this grief, Hemingway's allusion to a book which shows women how to be happy without husbands and which gives single woman "a more cheerful slant on [there] situation, and dozens of practical, if banteringly delivered, suggestions for relay enjoying [their] single blessedness" (Haworth), becomes bitterly ironic. Marie Morgan's moving interior monologue in the novel's final pages underscores what is at stake:

It ain't what happens to the one gets killed. I wouldn't mind it was me got killed....I wish to Christ it was me was dead. And if I live now twenty years what am I going to do? Nobody's going to tell me that and there ain't nothing now but take it everyday the way it comes and just get started doing something right away. That's what I got to do. But Jesus Christ, what do you do at nights is what I want to know. How do you get through nights if you can't sleep? I guess you find out

lie you find out how it feels to loose your husband. I guess u find out all right. I guess you find out everything in this goddamned life. I guess I'm probably finding out right now. You just go dead inside and everything is easy. You just get dead like most people are most of the time. I guess that's how it is all right. I guess that's just about what happens to you. Well, I've got a good start. I've got a good start if that's what you have to do. I guess that's what it comes to. All right. I got a good start then. I'm way ahead of everybody now .(260-61)

From this above lines, we come to know that emotionally and erotically alienated by the impotence, infidelity, or deaths of their husbands, Dorothy Hollis, Helene Bradely, Helen Gordon, Mrs. Tracy, and Marie Morgan must a in their various ways struggle with the loneliness and pain of living alone and they don't like it. Lisa Tyler is surely right that Dorothy Hollis's masturbation is not a measure of her sexual dysfunction so much as it is a measure of the inadequacy of her husband and lover. "She would obviously prefer intercourse," but what options are left to her?. (Tyler 58)

The serial infidelities of a Helene Bardely, though perhaps similarly inspired, hold little charm for Dorothy, and she lacks Helen Gordon's faith that another marriage might solve her problems. Men, in Dorothy's estimation, are simply incapable of genuine monogamy:

I suppose they can't help the way they're built any more than we can... They want some one new, or some one younger, or some one they shouldn't have, or someone that looks like someone else. A Jewish girl I guess\, and if they've had really enough they want Chinese or lesbians or goodness knows what. I don't know .(244)

Not that blissful monogamy would offer long time protection from the pain of solitude. Rather, this pain is greatest for Marie Morgan-not simply because she had lost a lover of overstated, even mythical endowments and now feels herself so big and ugly that she'd "have to hire a man to do it"(260) but precisely because this ex-prostitute shared an intensely monogamous bond with her husband, now dead. It is as if Hemingway were remembering and regendering the lines he wrote in *Death in the Afternoon*:

Madame, all stories, if continued far enough, ends in death, and he is no true-story teller who would keep that from you. Especially do stories of monogamy end in death, and your man who is monogamous while he often lives most happily, dies in the loneliest fashion. There is no lonelier man in death, except the suicide, than the man who has lived many years with a good wife then outlived her. If two people love each other there can be no happy end to it. (122)

Many critics- among them have noted the special intensity of Hemingway's sympathy with many of the female characters in this novel, and most have rightly pointed to Hemingway's guilt over his deteriorating relationship with Pauline as a key source of this sympathy.

In the bitterness of ironic allusion and Dorothy's humiliating circumstances there may well be a degree of anger is self directed. It is a contrast between what Hemingway saw as the glibness of Hollis's advice about pleasures of living alone and numbering grief of Marie Morgan that gives us our best measure of how deeply Ernest was hurting Pauline Lynn suggest that the marriage was already "close to collapse" in the fall of 1936, well before December when Martha Gellhorn walked to Sloppy joke's bar and Hemingway's life (462).

In the similar way, Harry Morgan's final word is also much more significant. Dying of wounds suffered during a gunfight on his boat, Harry seemingly incoherent tries to answer the Coast Guard captain's question:

Tell us who did it? How did it happen, boy? Harry replies to the uncomprehending captain and his mate: A man [.]. One man aone aint got. No man alone now [.].No matter how a man alone get it out and it had taken him all his life to earn it. [...] He had told them, but they had no heard (225)

His dying words then seem to sum up Harry's final understanding of the human condition and it is the politics of irony that an individual man is helpless in the face of an implacably hostile universe. In a typical interpretation of Harry's speech that represents Hemingway's first step toward collective as contrasted with purely individual actions, From this view point, Then Hemingway's speech in *To Have and Have Not* represents Hemingway's filtration with a quasi- socialist economic analysis of traditional American individualism.

Here if we reexamine Harry's dying words from a religious perspectives .There is the hidden meaning which is unsayable but strike in such a way that we are able to find out easily. Hence as it happens, the boo of Ecclesiastes, already used as a source by Hemingway for the title of *The Sun* also rises, seems to provide a striking intertext for Harry's observation in 3 that 'A man [.].One man alone ain't got.No man alone now [...].No matter how a man alone ain't got no boldly fucking chance" (225).Here, especially Harry's speech recalls Ecclesiastes:

Two are better than one; because they have a good reward for their labour. For if they fall, the one will lift up his fellow; but woe to him that is alone when he falleth; he hath not another to help him up. (9-11)

Comparing these two passages, we notice immediately a striking similarity of content, a similarity emphasized by the repetition in both texts of the word alone. And of course, we also notice that when there are two people involved, they have a good reward for their labour and they have heat, But a person alone “hath not another to help him up “(10).

Moreover, Hemingway appears to use this passage from Ecclesiastes several other times near to the end of *To Have and Have Not*. For example the question how one can be alone seems to anticipate Marie Morgan’s monologue at the end of the novel, when she expresses her fears at now having to sleep alone (261). But an even more specific echo of rhetorical question about warmth, as well as the phrases lift up and help up , at the end of the chapter 20, when Harry alone on his boat and shot in the gun, tries vainly to keep himself warm. Hemingway writes:

The water of the lake that was his belly was very cold; so cold that when he stepped into its edge it numbed him, and he was extremely cold now and everything tasted of gasoline as though he had been sucking on a hose to syphon a tank. He new there was no tank although he could feel a cold rubber hose that seemed to have entered his mouth and now was coiled, big, cold.[...] Each time he took a breath the hose coiled colder[...] like a big smooth-moving snake[...] what he minded ,now, was the cold. The cold was a through him, an aching cold.[...] For a time he had thought that if he could pull himself up over himself it would warm him like a blanket ,and he thought for a while that he had gotten himself pulled up and he had started to warm. But warmth was really only the hemorrhaged produced by raising his knees uplands, as the warmth faded he new now that you could not pull

yourself up... and there was nothing to do about the cold but take it  
[...] and it was colder all the time(180-181).

Earlier at the end of chapter, the wounded Harry thinks of Marie; now, however, he thinks only about staying warm. Actually realizing with Ecclesiastes that because "you could not pull yourself up" there is no way: one [can] be warmth alone".

Still another instance of Hemingway's use of this passage from chapter 4 of Ecclesiastes comes from the phrases "lift up" and "fellow" in verse 10, "if they fall, the one will lift up his fellow, For example, Harry is especially referred to by the coast guard captain as "poor fello" "poor Fellow", said the captain "think he'll live?" "No", said the captain. "But you can't ever tell." (226)

And later, at the beginning of chapter 5, as the men are unloading Harry's body in a stretcher, we are told that Two other picked him up from the captain's bunk.[..] He had been unconscious since early evening and his big body sagged the canvas of the stretcher deeply as the four men lifted it up toward the pier. "Up with it now" "Hold his legs. Don't let him slip" "Up with it". (247)

These words and phrases from Ecclesiastes, then refers throughout last part of To Have and Have Not; moreover the fact that Hemingway tends only to use an individual word or phrases like "fellow" and "Lift up" once but also to repeat words and phrases like 'alone' and 'warm' strongly suggest that Hemingway's use of Ecclesiastes is deliberate. Therefore Hemingway wants Hemingway's life and death to be seen within the context at least partially religious, that Hemingway is interested in a dimension of existence, a mode of being that certain of characters achieve the mystical religious dimension of life perceived only when there is nothing left to perceive and in turn suggests that Harry's final words about dying alone should be seen not so much as an argument for economic collectivism or as a critique of

traditional American individualism but rather as an affirmation of the value of the warmth of his relationship with Marie and his daughters. Without Marie in the boat with him at the end, Harry dies alone and without warmth. And had she been there with him at least he might have had a 'bloody fucking chance.

With the possible exception of Harry Morgan's dying remark about a man alone, not standing a chance, there are three segments of superfluous material in *To Have and Have Not*; the scene of the degenerate veterans drinking and fighting in the bars of the Florida keys; the Richard Gordon subplot; the satiric 'roll call of the hatch' which closes the boo counterpart to Harry's suffering and death. Everything else in the novel functions tightly and necessarily as part of the story of Harry's life and personality. These segments do not.

Of the three extra sections, most critics feel that most effective is the one dealing with the battered veterans basically drinking away their meaningless lives auspices of the callous government. At least the material of this section, if unrelated to Harry's life, is very much of a piece with that action. The clipped unintellectual dialogue and the atmosphere of elemental masculine life, all gives ironic scene on the Harry's world.

The Richard Gordon subplot is harder to defend. Certainly, it expands the theme of the depravity of the rich, and in the original draft of the novel. Finally the function of the 'roll call of the hatch' is easy to understand, but its inclusion is as unfortunate as that of the Gordon section. Hemingway catalogues the empty lives of the idle rich, describing the occupants of various luxury boats past which the dying Harry's crude crafts float. The rich present a scathing picture of sexual depravity, greed, spineless, parasitism but the sketches are flat caricatures of vice and writing typical didactic.

Principally, Harry Morgan is an activist. More than any other Hemingway character, except perhaps the bullfighter, whom we see at a distance, Harry is a doer. His entire concern is with putting himself back into action, throwing him into the physical world of fishing and boating that he knows, and within which he can operate. The central action of the “basic” novel, like that of *The Old man and the Sea*, concerns the details of Harry’s physical activity in running his boat or supervising the fishing. When the dramatic action heightens, it is largely in purely physical terms and in the gripping writing that describes that physicality - the killing of Mr. Singh, the painful dumping of the bootleg liquor, the final blood bath with the Cubans. In these sections lie the best and most immediate prose of *To Have and Have Not*, and they are completely uncerebral descriptions. Like the writing in ‘Big Two-Hearted River’, they simply present the picture of man functioning. But unlike that story there is nothing vital submerged in Harry’s psychology against which the physical action is a defense. Harry does what he does because it is his nature to do it, because he feels most at ease with physical activity.

Because of this intense and one-sided activism, Harry is an almost completely non-verbal person. Although some of the novel uses Harry as a first person narrative persona, Hemingway gives him the limited vocabulary and direct syntax of a simple man. When pressed, about the most Harry can say is, ‘take it easy’, and when angry and upset his most damning and descriptive adjective is ‘Some’, as in ‘Some Mr. Johnson’, ‘some Nigger’, ‘Some Albert.’ Like many of Hemingway’s earlier protagonists, when anything is really the matter. Harry doesn’t want to talk about it. He doesn’t want to talk about his killings that open the book, about the loss of his tackle, about the dangerous trip with the Cubans. Too much talk in the other people bothers him, too. The lawyer, Bee-lips, scares Harry when he talks about his own

chances of dying, and Harry thinks, "It's funny how a man can mouth something. When I heard him it scared me." When the murdering Cuban Roberto threatens to kill Harry, it is almost as if the articulation of the threat is worse than the threat itself: Cut out talking that way", Harry says, "What do you want to talk that way for." Even Harry wants to communicate with somebody, when he wants to tell Freddy and barman about the business with the Cubans, he can't: "In at Freddy's he wanted to tell him about but he couldn't... It wasn't until he thought of telling it to Freddy that he realized how bad it was." It is indicative that Harry expresses his distaste for smuggling human cargo by saying, "I don't carry anything to the States that can talk."

Harry's lack of verbalization is only part, however, of a life pattern that defines him as the most basic and unsophisticated claims, but his personality is certainly without polish and skill. There is no art, nor music. In his life, and not once are we even led to believe that Harry can read. A revealing look into Harry's psychology is the picture that Hemingway gives us of his home and family life:

He sat at the table and looked at the piano, the sideboard, and the radio, the picture of September Morn, and the pictures of the cupids holding bows behind their heads, the shiny, real-oak table and the shiny real-oak chairs and the curtains on the windows and he thought , what chance have I to enjoy my home? Why am I back to worse than where I started? It'll be gone too if I don't play this right. The hell it will. I haven't sixty bucks left outside of the house, but I'll get a stake out of this. 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? (127)

These are the thoughts and house and family of a very common man. The cheap picture and the cupids, and the accent on the 'real-oak' mark a man who lives in a lower class world, cheap and somewhat tasteless. The slovenly daughters and Harry's primitive speculations on genetics are part of the proletarian pattern.

Hemingway's *To Have and Have Not* depicts the Senseless tragedy suggests a juxtaposition of opposing economic classes. Provides a glimpse of both poor and rich. The late 1930s were a time of great dissatisfaction in America, even industrious people struggled to survive. The development and growth of big businesses forced independent individuals to become dependent on others to make their living. Although he seems at first to have avoided poverty, he does not escape violence. And the wealthy allow themselves to be corrupted by money, with the result that they divorce themselves from humanity. Besides I've got a family. Even after getting to know the man, Morgan is unable to see beyond the exterior, commenting, and "He was a smooth looking Chink "(35) because the work is more a presentation of reality than a moral recitation, the highest priority on Hemingway's agenda is engaging the reader. Because he is not a victim of the same social injustice as the veterans, Morgan does not need to involve himself in illegal activity. And Dorothy, "the wife of that highly paid Hollywood director"(241), has taken to masturbation because she has never been sexually satisfied. Hemingway, an enraged citizen, chose to vent his feelings in this social commentary by suggesting that--poor or rich--all people are victims. Bee Lips, is assassinated after he agrees to help facilitate a robbery. The greedy lawyer Mr. But Hemingway adds that the man wears "thick leased spectacles,"(129) implying that the man cannot see clearly what lies beneath the appearances in his world. The protagonist of the story, Harry Morgan, is not as poor as the homeless veterans, but he finds tragedy. Not only Hemingway's characters but

also the third person narrator use racist language. Violence, anger, and despair touch every one of them, but not one person's tragedy can be considered heroic. Homeless veterans, the poorest of the poor, are living tragic lives. Even when Morgan is familiar with someone as an individual, he prefers to use an ethnic or otherwise unflattering phrase to address him. Some critics have argued that Hemingway intended to suggest the poor are vicious because they are poor. And the prospects for the future were not great. And, while Morgan is struggling with Mr. Sing, he notices "the Cuban standing in the stern" (53) indicating he sees not men but races and colors. But he does not arouse enough sympathy for the poor to make them heroic.

Although Captain Willie makes meager attempt to protect Morgan from the government officials who have identified him as a bootlegging criminal, "taking this big alphabet man fishing until dark" (83), he does not succeed. Veterans--betrayed by the government--struggle to feed their families, while the wealthy are starved for love and affection. Foreigners hire unscrupulous smugglers to steal their way into America. Cuban revolutionaries rob banks to help fund their cause. When the reader first meets the three tourists at Freddy's bar Hemingway describes the "very tall, thin, wide-shouldered man" and the reader might conclude he is the pinnacle of perfection. In spite of the sympathy which led Morgan to save the lives of 12 immigrants, he cannot see beyond their appearance. He refuses to carry Cuban revolutionaries, saying, "I don't care who is president here. He says he's got to see you" .(64)In the reader's first view of Harry, he is working as a fishing boat captain and making "thirty-five dollars a day right through the season taking people out fishing".(96)

Hemingway illustrates society's tragic condition. Although all the characters are in the same metaphorical boat, they fail to connect with one another. Albert Tracy, the impoverished shot by Cuban bank robbers, was desperate for money. They too are

living with tragedy. Morgan repeatedly reveals himself to be a racist. And, in this violent, angry society, not one of those tragedies can be considered noble. He includes portraits of individuals from all walks of life--from the very poor to the very rich. From Morgan's response to this violent episode, the reader concludes he is calm, cool, and ready to do whatever is necessary to survive. Eddy, "You're rummy" (62).

The wealthy character's excessive consumption of alcohol and sexually behavior suggest they are not happy in their lives. Even the characters that make only a appearance have their faults. In the harbor, Hemingway introduces a wide variety of the 'pretty people' but discover underneath the exterior they are not pretty at all. There is no justifiable reason for, nor is there any nobility in, the tragedies, and violence contribute to tragedy, so too does anger. Anger is most clearly illustrated through the racism which is in the novel. The tourists are engaged in extramarital affairs and continually threaten to harm one another. Tragedy affects everyone in the novel, poor and rich alike. The portrayal of Morgan and his upstanding values soon changes when Morgan is not particularly offended when he witnesses the violent death of the men he refused to carry: "I heard the gun going and, bop, bop, bop, there were bottles smashing along the wall. (5) The author describes the era by writing of characters in true-to-life situations. Running up to the dock, his wife is so ridiculous character that still screaming, she fell into the green water. In this society, tragedy is a way of life. Although they served their country--and achieved victory in the war that was supposed to end all wars--their country refuses to return the favor. Violence, anger, and depravity have led diverse characters to the same end. The reader cannot see him sympathetically because the activity surrounding his deaths almost comical.

#### **IV: Have vs Have not**

In the novel *To Have and Have not* Hemingway Presents socio-political issue such as gender, class, age profession margin, center and so on. Hence Hemingway ironizes; how Harry, who had the honesty and fear of law to turn down and offer of three thousand dollars to smuggle four men from Cuba to the U.S.A becomes a man – runner and a crooked murder which he is cheated by a wealthy man who has chartered his boat and lost his fishing tackle. The social theme of how an honest have-not is corrupted and changed into a criminal by the haves is presented in the first part which is the politics of irony.

Similarly *To Have and Have Not* consists of two loosely interwoven plots that align the contrast between socioeconomic classes with a contrast between marital situations. The first plot depicts the hardboiled, violent world of Harry Morgan and his wife Marie; the second shows the unhappy lives and marital infidelities of the writer Richard Gordon, his wife Helen and their wealthy friends. This novel focuses on Harry Morgan's efforts to support himself and his family. His tools for accomplishing this are his fishing boats, his wits and his strength. He must depend on the rich, whom he often despises, to charter his boat, and then he must deal with their erratic, often destructive natures. He is not an immoral man, but he is willing to make compromises to achieve his principal goal: clothing and feeding his wife and three daughters. This leads him to progress from fishing trips for rich "sportsmen" to smuggling liquor, ferrying illegal immigrants, and, finally providing a gateway for gangsters. He is one of the 'have nots' and sympathizes with the other 'have nots' but he lives off the 'haves.' This means that he must be willing, when necessary, to sacrifice other 'have nots' such as the Chinese immigrants, whom he is paid to double-cross

The novel clearly differentiates between Harry Morgan, who fights and kills to survive, and the others who kill either for profit, politics, or out of blood lust. Yet he has an amazing capacity to withstand physical punishments and pain. Hemingway may have meant for Morgan's courage, independence, and masculinity to contrast with the decadence of the two segments of the upper class depicted late in the novel: the idle rich and the intellectuals who use social conflict to show how clever they are. In fact, Morgan's toughness becomes part of the expression of his existential attitude toward life.

Thematically, the political irony arises from the last words of Harry Morgan; that's a man alone ain't got no bloody chance; but there is a subtle difference in the level of thinking between Harry's words which emphasize collective action or the futility of individual action and the Donnean theme of the oneness.

### Works Cited

- Baker, Carlos. Ed. Ernest Hemingway: *Critique of four Major Novel*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1962.
- Donaldson, Scott. ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Eastern Hemingway*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1973.
- . Ed. *The Companion to Hemingway*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996.
- Forgaces, David. *Marxist Literary Theory. Modern Literary theory*. Ed. Ann Jefferson and David Robey, London: bastford, 1989.
- Hemingway, Ernest: *To Have and Have Not*. London: Longman, 1937.
- Ellmann, Richard, and Charles Feeidelson, eds. *The Modern tradition: Background of Modern Literature*. New York: oxford 1965.
- Daiches, David. *A Critical History of English Literature*. VOL. VI. Delhi: allied Publishers, 1991.
- Eagleton, Terry. *Literary theory: An Introduction*. London: Longman, 1983.
- High, Peter B. *An online of American literature*. New York: Longman, 1997.
- Lukacs, George. *The Historical Novel*. Trans. Hannah and Stanley Mitchell. 2nd ed. London: Merlin, 1965.
- Lukacs, George. *History and Class Consciousness*. London: Macmillan, 1980.
- Michery, Pierie, and E.Ballbar. *Literature as an ideological Form: Modern Literary Theory*. Ed. Philip. Rice and Particle Wough, London: bastford, 1989.
- Barry, peter. *An introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory*. New York: Macmillan, 1987.
- Armstrong,Paul B. "The Politics of irony in reading Conrad".*Conradiana* 26.2.3 1994,85-99.