In this chapter, an attempt is made to study the ecofeminist aspects of Hemingway’s stories. The stories considered in this chapter exhibit feminist, ecological as well as ecofeminist features. Violence, physical, emotional or psychological, inflicted on women and nature, is discussed here, and ecofeminist insights are applied to the analysis of the stories. All these stories portray man-woman relationship against the backdrop of nature either in its pristine condition or denuded and despoiled by the greedy human.

There are nine stories of Hemingway which come under this category. They can be further classified into three groups. The first group shows the husband suppressing and exploiting the vulnerability and susceptibility of the wife. They are

1. *The Doctor and the Doctor’s wife*
2. *Cat in the Rain*
3. *Mr. Elliot and Mrs. Elliot*

The second group shows the lover overriding and crushing the sensibilities and wishes of the lady love. The stories are

4. *Up in Michigan*
5. *The End of Something*
6. *Hills Like White Elephant*
7. *A Very Short Story*

The third group of stories are

8. *Indian Camp*
9. *Mother of a Queen*

These stories portray the negligent or unsentimental, selfish attitude of man towards mother or woman in general. The male protagonists of these stories share one common quality which is their oppression of women in one form or another. Since
these stories are enacted against the backdrop of nature, the reader can note the parallel between man’s domination and exploitation of woman and nature. Another feature that distinguishes these protagonists from their female counterparts is the way they tend to be isolated and self-centered, and fail to interconnect, while the women tend to interconnect and display an emotional depth.

The stories in the first group show the dominance of the husband over the wife. This is worked against ecological domination. In The Doctor and the Doctor’s wife, the protagonist is a physician by profession, but his hobby turns to be denudation of landscape. He uses native Indians to cut logs to make cordwood and to provide logs for the fire place. The phrase, “to cut up logs”, of the opening sentence clearly shows the ecological concerns of the story as much as of the writer.

Dick Boulton came from the Indian camp to cut up logs for Nick’s father. He brought his son Eddy and another Indian named Billy Tabesaw with him. They came in through the back gate out of the woods, Eddy carrying the long cross-cut saw. …He turned and shut the gate. The others went on ahead of him down to the lake shore where the logs were buried in the sand (91).

The Doctor plays the role of the dominant male in the lakefront encounter with Dick Boulton. Dick, his son Eddy and the Indian Billy Tabeshaw cut the logs for the Doctor. But the logs are apparently not his own: they are stolen as Boulton points out: “that’s a nice lot of lumber you’re stolen”. But the doctor is offended by the implication, and asks Dick Boulton and his mates to leave.
In contrast to the Doctor, the Doctor’s wife sits in her dark room with her Christian books. She tries to inculcate Christian virtues of charity and self-restraint in her husband: she quotes from her scriptures in her attempt to convert him. “Remember that he who ruleth his spirit is greater than he that taketh a city” (93).

The Doctor though a physician, shows little or no interest in updating his knowledge, as the heap of unopened medical journals in the room indicate. He is even irritated by the very sight of these books. He would rather sit down and clean his gun. This act of cleaning shows his preferences for shooting and he dreams of indulging in violence. In other words, he who is taught to save lives would rather take lives through his hunting. The gun in his hands is a dearer object to him than his wife who harangues and exhorts him to mild and peaceful activities. The gun is a closer companion to him than the woman he married because the gun speaks his language, and at his command it kills the animals. And it would not talk back.

As the father so the son: when the Doctor’s wife asks for Nick their son, he tags along with his father on his hunting trip into the woods, and does not care to go to his mother. “I know where there’s a black squirrel, Daddy” (95), he tells his father. The father and the son feel choked by the value system the doctor’s wife represents. Both the males, father and son, prefer the freer and more open world of the woods.

The Doctor’s destructive propensity and negative attitude to life are brought out clearly through the story, in the way he rejects his wife’s world of positive values and indulges in logging, log cutting and hunting with the gun. At the same time, the writer symbolically suggests the oppression and male domination experienced by the doctor’s wife, by putting her in the darkened room, “cribbed and cabined”, and surrounded by fine sounding books of virtue. In short, it is gun versus dark room! Is the wife less sensitive towards nature than the husband, as one might infer from the
way she immures herself in a darkened room, away from open nature, and is the Doctor more friendly towards nature because he is described as an outdoor man? Not necessarily so. The way the writer describes the Doctor’s handling and fondling of his gun is enough to nullify any such reading of the characters.

On the other hand, the next story for consideration, *Cat in the Rain*, presents a clearer link between apathy to nature and human character. This story already discussed under the head deep ecology also exhibits ecofeminist perspectives. The story presents an American couple on vacation, staying in an Italian hotel. Through the window one could see a war memorial beyond which could be seen a public garden with big palm trees and green colored benches. And beyond that is the sea. The man, George, is dying on the bed, propped up, with a couple of pillows at the fort of the bed; he is reading a book. Throughout the story, he is presented as being in the same posture, dying in bed, and reading. He does not know or care about the atmosphere outside or the rain that is falling.

The wife, in contrast, is seen to be more closely connected to nature. She is standing at the window, looking out and watching the scenery. That is how she comes to see a cat that is huddled under a table, keeping itself from getting wet. Her wish to save the cat is both instinctual and psychological; her heart goes out to the poor cat instinctively. The wife is able to empathize with the helpless creature easily, because she is no better. In psychological terms, she is frustrated; her situation as a childless wife of an insensitive man like George is no fun. She asks him to go out and rescue the poor cat. He merely grunts and says, “I’ll do it”, but does not bestir himself; he continues with his reading. When for a moment she loses sight of the cat, the wife laments, “I wanted it so much, I don’t know why. I wanted it so much. I wanted that poor kitty. It wasn’t any fun to be a poor kitty out in the rain” (138).
Feeling sorry for the cat, and for herself, she goes and sits in front of the mirror. She is disgusted with her short hair “I get tired of looking like a boy”. But George had insisted that she have her hair short, because he liked it “the way it is” (138). Cutting the hair short may be a cultural practice, but it is contrary to nature. So, in contrast to what is found in the earlier story, the situation is reversed here the man who is apathetic to nature is insensitive while the wife who shows a concern for nature and other creatures is seen to be more sensitive.

For all the company the reading husband gives her she is lonely. Her desire to save the cat and to tend it is evidently born out of her sense of loneliness. She is found saying, “Anyway, I want a cat. I want a cat now. If I can’t have long hair or any fun, I can have a cat” (138). She is seeking to fill the gap caused by the inattentive husband. His insistence on her having short hair is none other than an attempt to dominate his wife, the same attitude he seems to have against nature or non human beings. Insensitivity and domineering go together in him. The woman is eager to find solace in her relation with nature and with a non human creature like the cat. When the emotional needs of a person remain unfulfilled, the person seeks fulfillment through linking with other people, creatures or other things. And, in the cat, the wife sees a being as abandoned as her. Hence she shows her sympathy for the cat. She is emotionally unfulfilled as her statement shows.

I want to eat at a table with my own silver and I want candles.
And I want it to be spring and I want to brush my hair out in front of a mirror and I want a kitty and I want some new clothes (138).
But George in his insensitive condition fails to notice his wife’s needs. He silences her with, “Oh, shut up and get something to read” as if all problems would be solved thereby. The wife wishes to connect with the cat and with the environment outside. The window is the channel and the medium that links the human and the non-human world. Ana Romia, a critic, has something interesting to say in this context in her article “The Symbolism of the Cat under the Rain”:

This story relates how a defenceless cat is struggling to keep dry during the pouring rain, and how the American woman wants to go outside. The cat is gone. After this event, the woman realizes that she is missing so much more than just the cat (web 15 May 2008).

Towards the end of the story, the hotel maid retrieves the cat for the woman. Her wish is fulfilled by a maid, and not by her husband.

“The sense of self as separate is more common in men, while an interconnected sense of self is more common in women” (Ecofeminism 1993: 9) says Greta Gaard, the ecofeminist critic. This idea is clearly illustrated in this story in which the woman shows ecological concern and associates herself with nature, while her husband is engrossed in the self-centered activity of reading a book.

The above idea of Greta Gaard finds further illustration in the third story of this group, Mr. and Mrs. Elliot. Hubert Elliot, a Harvard scholar and a poet, falls in love with Cornelia. Being an idealist, he had kept himself pure, and had not even kissed a girl, before meeting Cornelia. They marry in Boston. He feels that he had failed. So he moves to Paris. There he hopes to have a baby. They move from place to place in the hope of having a child. Since Paris is too crowded, they rent a castle in Touraine for the summer.
Cornelia’s friend, several years older than her, and a few other friends join the Elliot’s at Touraine. The friends find the place too hot for them, and they drift back to Paris. On the contrary, Mr. Elliot could compose many poems during the journey thither and the early days of their stay, and hopes to bring out a collection of poems soon after returning to Boston. On the other hand, their wish for a child remains unfulfilled: “He and Mrs. Elliot tried very hard to have a baby in the big hot bed room on the big, hard bed” (135). Unsuccessful in his attempts, Mr. Elliot spends more and more of his time writing poetry, and drinking white wine. He ends up with neither friends, intimate relations, nor any masculinity.

Cornelia is able to connect with her friend: she feels very pleased with her presence. And they sleep together, implying that Cornelia finds a surrogate in her friend, while Mr. Elliot is seeking a surrogate mate in his poetry-writing.

The story about the Elliots is not merely a story about failed love and failed relationships and failure of conjugal efforts; it is a story about man’s inability to come out of the shell of his self, and connect with the outside world, be it nature or men. ‘Reading’ as in the other story, or ‘writing poetry’ as in this story does not make much difference – both of them are forms of self-indulgence, and lead the person towards his center, and away from the enveloping atmosphere. And, the woman can connect easily be it a friend or a cat.

The next group of stories focuses on the same theme of male domination and man’s insensititivity to the ambient atmosphere. Only here, the protagonist is the lover, and not the husband. Wed or unwed, still the woman is the target of man’s domination, and is vulnerable.
**Up in Michigan** is the first story Hemingway has written when he was a twenty-two year old young man. Since he had spent a very pleasant and memorable time of his childhood in Michigan, it is not surprising that he should locate his story here. An interest in the story is the way in which male domination, on woman and nature alike, is illustrated therein.

On the outside, the story presents the love between Jim and Liz. But a deeper reading shows what harm Jim induces on nature and on his lover. The story opens with a description of Hortons Bay.

Hortons Bay, the town, was only five houses on the main road between Boyne City and Charlevoix. There was the general store and post-office with a high false front and may be a wagon hitched out in front, Smith’s house, Stroud’s house, Dillworth’s house, Horton’s house and Van Hoosen’s house. The houses were in big grove of elm trees and the road was very sandy (79).

Jim, from Canada, is an intruder into this scene. He purchases a blacksmith’s shop and makes Hortons Bay his home. He lives above the shop of a blacksmith and makes Horton’s Bay his home. He lives above the shops, and has his meals at D. J. Smith’s. Liz Coates, a young girl working there, admires Jim. His physique fascinates her: “Short and dark, with big moustache and big hands. He was a good horse-shoer and did not look much like a blacksmith even with his leather apron” (79).

During summer, Jim joins Smith, the owner of the eating house, on a hunting trip. Mrs. Smith and Liz get busy for four days in cooking for the hunting party. The hunters return after a few days with unshaven chins, but with three carcasses of deer in the back of the wagon. Neither Jim nor Smith displays any concern for the
ecological/moral question of killing the deer. It is, for them, a masculine act. Liz, already fascinated by Jim’s masculinity is further excited by his prowess. She asks him breathlessly, “Did you shoot it, Jim” (81)?

They celebrate their exploit and feast and drink that night. After the wonderful feeling of a good dinner and the feel of whiskey, Jim feels the need for a woman. He holds Liz in his muscular embrace and kisses her hard. And he asks her to come out for a walk. Docilely, she follows him. They walk through the trees and beyond the dock to the bay, feeling warm in each other’s company. He puts his arms around her and pulls her to him. He takes her for granted. He doesn’t ask her if she likes it, and wants to take her for granted. He wants to take her there on the sands. But she puts off his overtures: “you mustn’t do it, Jim. You mustn’t” (82). And she walks back to the house.

Hemingway uses words like “clean” and “neat” repeatedly in connection with Liz, conveying a sense of physical and moral cleanliness, and the non-carnal nature of her feelings towards Jim. Her background is limited, however civilized, and is domestic and conventional. Jim’s world is obviously different: it is larger, wilder, not given to domesticity, but seeking pleasure in activities like hunting. He is not “clean” or “neat” like her. His wish to have sex outdoors perhaps suggests an unwillingness to be confined and domesticated, and also suggests an element of bestiality in his character. His brutal approach to his lover: soon after his hunting exploits, indicate a close link between violence and masculinity. Therefore, in spite of her protests: which he perhaps takes as insincere, and anyway, too drunk to care, he takes her. Her weak resistance and passivity through the scene could have encouraged the drunken Jim. In love with Jim, Liz might surely have allowed him to take her, but in this instance and at this moment, Jim is clearly forcing her to it, and then showing his domination over her.
His domineering tendency comes out both in his hunting prowess and in his overcoming Liz’s real resistance. He is insensitive and exploitative in regard to both woman and nature.

The next story in the group, *The End of Something* demonstrates the extinction of the town, Hortons Bay. Returning to Hortons Bay after a period of ten years, he is struck by the amount of destruction that had overtaken the town. Simultaneously, he feels that his feelings for his lover Marjorie are no longer as strong as earlier.

In the old days Hortons Bay was a lumbering town. No one who lived in it was out of sound of the big saws in the mill by the lake. Then one year there were no more logs to make lumber. The lumber schooners came into the bay and were loaded with the cut of the mill that stood stacked in the yard.

All the piles of lumber were carried away (96).

This passage summarizes the tragic tale of a dying town, a town that had flourished while there were enough trees to be despoiled and pulled down to feed the logging industry, and which is abandoned by the rapacious men for the simple reason that there are no more trees left to be pulled down. So the greedy populace shifted to a greener place which they could destroy. They took away all their machinery, leaving behind everything that had no value for them, and causing an irreparable damage to nature. Hortons Bay is now left with “one-story bunk houses, the company store, the mill offices, and the big mill itself stood deserted in the acres of sawdust that covered the swampy meadow by the shore of the bay” (96).
Nick and Marjorie, the lovers, see the sad sight of the disappearing town, all caused by man in the name of civilization. Apparently, Marjorie too, like the town, is experiencing the destructive effects of the rapacity of man: her lover had taken her virginity and now does not find any interest in her. The long passage describing the demise of the logging town serves as a parallel to the breakup of the romantic relationship between the protagonist and his lover. Val Plumwood, the ecofeminist critic, makes a pertinent comment on this parallel: “each woman has her own relationship with nature and that there are reasons why one cannot brush aside the whole issue of a woman-nature connection and that it has to remain central to feminism. Both have been mutually inferiorised” (21).

Probably, the ruined landscape had affected Nick psychologically, and perhaps he is sensitive to the damage of the landscape. But clearly, his sensitivity does not extend to the point where he would relent over the deteriorating relationship with Marjorie, and might endeavor to repair it. It is anti-climactic as well as ironical that his feelings for her should be in terms of vagueness of his emotions. After their supper

They sat on the blanket without touching each other
and watched the moon rise.

You don’t have to talk silly, Marjorie said. What’s really the matter?

I don’t know.

Of course you know.

No, I don’t.

Go on and say it.

Nick looked on at the moon, coming up over the hills.

It isn’t fun anymore.

He was afraid to look at Marjorie. Then he looked at her. She sat there with her back toward him. He looked at her back. It isn’t fun anymore. Not any of it (99).
It is possible that the term “something” in the title is meant to indicate the non-specificity and therefore vagueness in the feelings of the protagonist. Even as the logging community had no use for a treeless town, Nick too finds no fun in having an emotional relationship with the woman who is no longer fresh. Insensitive to her feelings, he simply puts her aside. Moonlight, a satisfying dinner and the presence of his beloved by his side do not stir him up: on the contrary he feels as if “everything was gone to hell” inside of him. Marjorie takes this rejection passively and rows away from him on the waters, leaving him to his own thoughts and feelings. Bill, Nick’s friend, out of touch with the feelings of others, is shocked at what had happened between Nick and Marjorie, but cannot understand how Marjorie could walk away without any protest.

According to biographer Carlos Baker, Hemingway was particularly disheartened by the change he witnessed in Spain’s Irati River region from one year to the next:

All winter and spring the loggers had been working in the beach and pine forests and it was locally rumored that the fishing had been ruined. Ernest could not believe it ………But they soon found that the land lady was right. The dark stream bed of the Irati was filled with loggers’ trash…………In four days of trying they did not take a single fish. “Fish killed, pools destroyed, dams broken down,” said Ernest. “made me feel sick” (1969: 149).

Thus the story reflects the ecological concerns of Hemingway. Throughout the story Hemingway uses the imagery of an irreparably damaged environment. He appears more ecofeminist in his sympathies than his readers. Thus the reader notices that the oppression of Marjorie by Nick runs parallel to the ruined Hortons Bay.
This story yet again illustrates the insensitivity of man to a woman’s ability to connect with the world outside her. Marjorie had believed in their love and had hoped to marry Nick and go to Italy. But the sight of the destroyed forest scope around Hortons Bay had perhaps given her a forewarning of how her own life would be no better than the “acres of dust” she saw all around. The damage done to the ecology, sad enough for conventional critics, rouses the anger of the ecofeminists. Such environmental damage is considered as no less than violence. In Karren Warren’s words,

Feminist can begin to develop analyses of violence and non-violence which show the connections among kinds of violence: violence against the self (eg. Suicide); violence against others (eg. Spousal and child abuse, rape); violence against the earth (eg. “rape of the land”); perhaps even global, systemic, economic violence (eg. Poverty). This would involve showing ways in which patriarchalism underlies all such kinds of violence and itself breeds violence (1996: 194).

The ecological and geographical destruction is seen in terms of economic and moral destruction, affecting not only nature but human nature, as much as the character of the humans.

The parallel between woman and nature is fairly open in this story. But in the next story of the group, it is more veiled. *Hills Like White Elephant* presents the disparity between man and woman with regard to having children. If motherhood for a woman is sweet and fulfilling, for the man it is a burden: he is unwilling to take on the responsibility, particularly when he is not yet ready to take on the burden of a wife. So he wants his lover to abort her pregnancy. And if she wants to retain his love, she must agree to his demands and sacrifice her motherhood. As it often happens, the vulnerable woman becomes the victim of male domination. It is a case of a woman being oppressed by the male.
This story too opens with a vivid description of the fertile hills on one side and the dry and drab railway station on the other side, where there is no shade:

The hills across the valley of the Ebro were long and white. On this side there was no shade and no trees and the station was between two lines of rails in the sun. Close against the side of the station there was the warm shadow of the building and a curtain, made of strings of bamboo beads, hung across the open door into the bar, to take out flies (219).

On the one side is nature in its plentitude, and on the other side is what man has made in the name of civilization, the drab shelterless station. The phrases, “no shade”, “no trees” etc. only emphasize and focus on man’s destructive tendency. On this side are found the young man and his lover, waiting for the train that would take them to Madrid where the woman would have to abort the child she is carrying. The woman is being denied an opportunity to have a child: it is a denial of motherhood, a natural blessing for a woman, like Mother Nature. Man destroys nature and denudes space to build his railways; man seeks to destroy the woman’s womb so that he can sojourn through life without burden. When man cuts down trees for his greed, nature is passive and silent. In the same way, the protagonist of the story expects his lover to be silent and acquiescent, and get rid of the pregnancy, because he does not wish to burden himself with responsibility.

The setting of the story is the railway station, which is treeless and shadeless on that hot summer day. The lovers sit outside the bar, and talk over their problem. It is about abortion: the girl is pregnant, and the young man wants her to get rid of the child. Unwilling for the drastic step of abortion, the girl is yet forced to agree to it, because the young man is insistent and domineering.
There is no action, only exchange of words between the lovers. Ironically, they sit facing the hills lush and green. The girl looks at the hills that reflect her condition and her natural desire for motherhood. The utterances and movements are orchestrated in such a manner as to reveal her feelings of identity with the hills, prompting her to initially decide as to what to do about the child she is carrying, and also what direction she would wish to take, to make her life most rewarding.

The location they are placed in, the railway station, stands for sterility, denudation, the result of man’s rapacity and greed. From where they are sitting, the young woman can look across and see the green hills standing for fertility and fruitfulness. Hemingway very deftly uses the implied significances of the location to bring out the innate characteristics of the man and the woman, and their deeper wishes. The woman, in her natural condition is cheered by the mountains: “They look like white elephants” she says, using a beautiful simile, reflecting the natural as well as wild condition of the situation, in contrast to the manmade condition of the station. Elephant may be wild and a part of nature, but “white” elephant is not. It is perhaps a “cultural construct” and hints at an ambiguity in the woman’s attitude. But it indicates an imaginative streak in the female protagonist which is absent in the male one. He looks puzzled at the comparison because he cannot see the association between the swelling belly of the pregnant woman and the mound-like hills.

At the end, the woman makes the decision to destroy the baby, in spite of her initial desire to keep it. This is because she is more interested in keeping her lover than her baby. (In this regard she differs from Marjorie of the earlier story). The bitterness she must have experienced while making the decision comes through, in her outburst: “Would you please please please please please please please please stop talking?” (222).
The name of the young woman, Jig, suggests a dance and music for the dance, and may have been used by Hemingway to imply that for the male protagonist, she is but a source of entertainment, an interlude, and not anything more lasting. Apparently, Hemingway’s “negative” experience with his own mother had colored the character’s resistance to have a family.

The above analysis of the story clearly illustrates the “iceberg theory” of Hemingway. The description of the hills suggests the young woman’s desire for children and family. And, while the word “abortion” is not used in the entire story, many hints of sterility direct the reader straight to that conclusion.

This story is also important for the depiction of both the feminist and ecological concerns in it.

* A Very Short Story is one of these writings of Hemingway that are directly based on war experiences. The shortest story of the collection of stories, this story presents the course of love between an American Soldier and an Italian nurse, Luz. The nurse attends on him, for three months, long enough to fall in love with him. They want to marry. “They felt as though they were married, but they wanted everyone to know about it, and to make it so they could not lose it” (121). They cannot marry straight away because they do not have their birth certificates with them. And they decide to get married only after the war is over, and after he finds a job, and is able to provide for her.

After his recovery and after the war, he returns to America. But during his absence, Luz comes across an Italian Major, and has an affair with him. She writes to her American lover that their relationship was only an interlude, a passing affair, and nothing more. The story ends there, Luz had neither heard from the American, nor had she married the Major.
This is a “pacifist” story. Full of implications, the story touches upon the impact of war on nature, and on woman. Woman is close to nature, the two vibrate in unison. But man is insensitive and belligerent. He indulges in war. Evidently the war had ravaged the woman’s sensitivity to the same degree that it had damaged Mother Nature.

*Indian Camp* is one of the stories in the third group. Indians are presented as living in the wilds, on the creatures of nature, and by cutting and peeling bark. Though living in nature, they are not in harmony with nature.

In their midst is a woman in advanced stage of pregnancy. When they find that they could not manage the delivery with their skills, they send for a doctor from the city. In response, Dr. Adams comes along with his son Nick, across streams, plains, wood lands and hills, to find the pregnant woman in the bottom bunk, above which lies her husband who had cut his foot badly with an axe three days earlier. Dr. Adams did not have any anesthetic with him, and so is not able to prevent the woman from moaning and screaming. “I don’t hear them because they are not important” (87), he says. For want of an anesthetic he forces her to go through much physical pain. She is held down by four men: yet she bites the doctor’s arm, unable to bear the pain. Cursing her, he cuts open her belly, and delivers the baby through a caesarian operation. He is jubilant because he could now report to the medical journal how he had done a caesarian “with a jack-knife” and sewed up “with nine foot, tapered gut leaders” (89). The story arouses curiosity in the reader if to applaud the doctor for his ingenuity in delivering a baby safely in the midst of nowhere with skillful improvisation, or charge him with being callous and insensitive to the pain the woman experienced in child birth? The doctor’s son could not bear the screams of the woman, and her husband, suffering from his wounded foot, could not tolerate the screams in addition to his own pain and commits suicide by cutting his throat.
Again, in this story too, the reader notices the ambivalence of the writer. The Indians are uncivilized, and to that extent are children of nature, almost like animals. Does the writer identify them with nature, or does he indict them for ravages caused to nature? And, as seen above, does one applaud the doctor, or call him domineering and oppressing? This story is a strikingly profound story with many multifaceted layers of meaning. It appears to have attracted considerable critical attention, particularly in terms of defining the perceptions of masculinity. Lisa Tyler’s article helps the reader to understand the male character. She says,

In rereading the story, the feminist theories enable us to discover new ways of looking at Nick Adams and to read this paradigmatic male’s development differently than we have in the past. I also want to examine what Hemingway has to say about violence and empathy, dominance and submission, war and peace (42).

The story implies that Nick’s response to the violence and suffering inflicted on others will ultimately define his own sense of masculinity. Thus an exploration of how racism, sexism, violence, suffering, and stoicism impact the process of defining perceptions of masculinity in the story sheds light on the essence of the literary work itself, and furthers a deeper understanding of these complex issues as they arise. The final message of the story hinges on the reactions of men towards the story’s objects of suffering and how these reactions impact their essential qualities of perceived masculinity and survival.

Ernest Hemingway grew up on the outer banks of Michigan, a section of the country with extensive integration of Native Americans and whites. This story contains several biographical parallels to Hemingway’s life as his father was a physician who often took young Ernest fishing at a camp in the Michigan woods.
similar to the one in his story. Because of these obvious biographical parallels, Hemingway has an understanding that enables him to write in a postcolonial fashion. By reading this story using a post-colonial approach a deeper understanding of the colonization and treatment of the Native Americans by the white Americans can be gained.

Hemingway uses an almost allegorical story as he exposes the injustices inflicted by the white oppressors. Nick embodies innocence, the Doctor represents dismissal or denial, and George represents oppression. The nameless natives in the story jutjapose the white characters highlighting traits such as loss of identity, inability to properly cope with colonization, and fear of extinction.

Thus nature and women undergo suffering simultaneously. While the Indians are engaged in destroying the forest, the Indian woman suffers without any facilities and is oppressed by a white doctor.

The last story under this category is *Mother of a Queen*. Once again one sees in this tale the irresponsible and negligent attitude of a son to his mother. The mother had died and was given a temporary place of burial, pending a permanent solution from her son. Paco, the son, is asked to pay and make her grave permanent, failing which, the authorities say, her body would be dug up and thrown out on the public bone heap. He keeps getting notices and keeps ignoring them. When his Manager offers to do it on his behalf, he replies rudely, “keep out of my business” (343).

Paco is altogether insensitive to the need to honour his mother in death, need to show love to her even in death, and is indifferent even to his public responsibility and answerability. The Manager, more thoughtful, is shocked to see this limitless callousness of Paco, and tells him with contempt, “What kind of blood is it in a man that will let what is done to his mother? You don’t deserve to have a mother”. Again,
Paco bursts out angrily that she was his mother, and that the Manager should keep out of it. How is one to deal with such a person? He proves to be not only a bad son, but perhaps no son at all; he displays his thinking which is certainly lower than human. And he is not sensitive to his moral, social or filial obligations.

The feminist dimension in the story is obvious. Yet, perhaps, there is more than what meets the eye. Apart from the title, which is a puzzle in itself, there are many questions a reader faces as he reads the story. J. Nolan says,

> The Mother of a Queen” is one of the more interesting and one of the more puzzling stories. Composed probably over the period from the fall of 1931 to August of 1932 and published in the collection *Winner Take Nothing* (1933), the story demands that the reader answer a series of questions to understand just what Hemingway is doing in this small but provocative work (1).

The analysis of the stories from an ecofeminist point of view, as is done in this chapter, shows that the society being presented in these stories is patriarchal, and man oriented and that man in his greed and through insensitivity has dominated both nature and woman, resulting in destruction of the former and demoralization of the latter. Both nature and woman suffer damage and destruction at his hand. Whether he is a husband, a lover or offspring, still man is a man; exploitative, negligent and insensitive. The feelings of a woman, which move fully in tune with nature, are not considered. Her needs and wishes are not noticed. Her motherhood is not respected, and her being a mother is not honored. Woman is either disregarded, suppressed or dishonoured. The damage done to nature is displayed through felling of trees, destruction of the landscape, and hunting and killing of animals for pleasure and pride.
In terms of what results at the end, woman and nature are not too different from one another. They are co sufferers at the hands of man. Ecofeminists believe in the close connection between woman and nature. They believe that when nature is protected, women will be protected and respected too. Both nature and women go through the experience of mothering, and they nourish their offspring. In other words both of them are sensitive to the needs of those they created. Val Plumwood says that there are reasons why one cannot brush aside the whole issue of a woman-nature nexus and that it has to remain central to feminism because both have suffered at the hands of man, the common enemy, and both have been degraded to an inferior status.

In contrary to the above analysis the next chapter discusses the effects of the physical environment on man. The influence of place on man is studied in a broader aspect under the head ecosphere.
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