Ernest Hemingway and the Politics of the Spanish Civil War

Anton Nilsson

The Hemingway Review, Volume 36, Number 1, Fall 2016, pp. 81-93 (Article)

Published by The Hemingway Foundation and Society
DOI: *https://doi.org/10.1353/hem.2016.0022*

Ernest Hemingway and the Politics of the Spanish Civil War

Anton Nilsson
Independent Scholar

During the Spanish Civil War (1936-1939), Ernest Hemingway was unusually politically active and outspoken. As the war dragged on, the author embarked on many kinds of projects that he had never attempted before, and would never try again; in 1937 alone, he produced a film, wrote a play, gave a public speech, and organized a fundraising campaign during which he visited the White House to solicit support from the President and Mrs. Roosevelt. Although Hemingway was initially opposed to American involvement in the war, his work as a correspondent in Spain caused him to abandon his former isolationist stance and become an active proponent for military intervention in Spain.

During the 1930s, Ernest Hemingway observed with dismay the rise of fascism in Europe. In the article "Notes on the Next War," published in *Esquire* in September 1935, Hemingway predicted that with the imperial ambitions of Mussolini's Italy and Hitler's Germany threatening the stability of the continent, the next great armed conflict of Europe was imminent. He urged the United States not to get involved: "No European country is our friend nor has been since the last war and no country but one's own is worth fighting for. Never again should this country be put into a European war through mistaken idealism" ("Notes"). Hemingway was a scarred veteran of the First World War and wanted to avoid a similar catastrophe at all costs. If the American people distanced themselves from the political affairs of Europe, and if the people of Europe refused to take up arms in the power struggles, Hemingway believed the coming of the next great war could be evaded. The article ended on a cautionary note: "We were fools to be sucked in once on a European war and we should never be sucked in again" ("Notes").

Nevertheless, in July 1936 when a group of military conspirators attempted to overthrow the leftist Popular Front government of the Spanish Republic—which had taken power after winning a narrow victory in the general elections a few months prior—Hemingway regretted that he had not been present. He expressed this regret in a letter to his friend and editor Maxwell Perkins that September: "I hate to have missed this Spanish thing worse than anything in the world but have to have this book [*To Have and to Have Not*] finished first"

The Hemingway Review, Vol. 36, No. 1, Fall 2016. *Published by the University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho.*

(*SL* 454). Hemingway's thirties had up to this point largely been a period of professional hiatus, during which he occupied himself writing short stories and magazine articles. But after the outbreak of the Spanish Civil War, Hemingway accepted an offer by the North American Newspaper Alliance (NANA) to go to Spain and cover the conflict as a reporter.

Hemingway had a longstanding interest in Spain and its culture. The author's relation to Spain dates back to his first visit in 1923, the same year the parliamentary government of Spain was overthrown in favor of a military dictatorship with Don Miguel Primo de Rivera as head of state (Preston 4). That year, Hemingway traveled to Spain from France, where he was living at the time, with the intention of seeing first-hand the Spanish novelty of bullfighting. During the 1920s, Hemingway made many visits to Spain, and judging from his writings at this time, he seems to have been uninterested in or unaware of domestic Spanish politics, despite showing great affection for Spanish traditions and culture. Many of his works written during the 1920s, including the celebrated novel *The Sun Also Rises,* were set in Spanish milieux; the first non-fiction work of his career, published in 1932, was an historical and cultural analysis of the bullfight titled *Death in the Afternoon.* As he was preparing for his first visit to the Spanish front lines in March 1937, Hemingway explained his intentions in letters to friends and family, claiming the war was "the dress rehearsal for the inevitable European war" and that he was traveling to Spain to "write anti-war war correspondence that would help to keep [the Americans] out of it when it comes" (*SL* 258). A letter to Harry Sylvester in February 1927 provides a clue to Hemingway's view on the conflict prior to his initial visit, as well as an indication of his embryonic class-consciousness: "The Spanish war is a bad war, and nobody is right. [However,] my sympathies are always for exploited working people against absentee landlords even if I drink around with the landlords and shoot pigeons with them. I would as soon shoot them as the pigeons" (*SL* 456). While espousing the sort of detached neutralism he had advocated in his freelance writing, Hemingway nonetheless found himself instinctually in support of the Loyalist cause, believing the Republic represented the true will of the Spanish people. A few days later that February, he wrote to the Pfeiffer Family, "The Reds may be as bad as they say but they are the people of the country versus the absentee landlords, the moors, the Italians and the Germans" (*SL* 458). This letter also alludes to another aspect of the conflict which naturally put him on the side of the Republic: the orchestrators of the military uprising, as soon as the matter evolved into a full-scale civil

war, had begun to receive substantial military aid from the fascist powers Italy and Germany (Little 232). Hemingway, the isolationist, could not accept that foreign powers were threatening the liberty of the people of his beloved Spain. If Hemingway's basic understanding of the war at this point rendered him a casually detached observer with sympathies towards "the people" as opposed to "the absentee landlords" and foreign invaders, his first visit to the front lines would not only give him a firmer grasp of the inner workings of the war, but also convince him that his outspoken support for the Republic could aid its cause.

In Spain, the partial success of the military coup had drastically different consequences in different regions of the country. While much of the northwest and Andalusia immediately surrendered to the rebel onslaught, the uprising was quelled in central Spain and the northeast, which held the two major cities Madrid and Barcelona (Graham 20). The coup itself was the culmination of a period of sociopolitical tensions within the Republic, which had not only pitted the parliamentary left and right against each other, but also saw the more radical segments on both sides of the political spectrum lose faith in the Republican democracy. Since the Second Spanish Republic had been proclaimed in 1931, following the bloodless fall of Primo de Rivera's royally-backed military dictatorship, numerous attempts at revolution had been made, primarily by workers in regions where anarcho-syndicalism was influential, such as Asturias and Catalonia (Graham 15-16). The military also challenged the Republic with a failed *coup d'ětat* in 1932 (Graham 10). What was contested from both sides was the reform program of the liberal Republicans, an agenda that included the separation of state and church, agrarian reform, and restructuring the army. Broadly speaking, the right—culturally conservative, religious, and militaristic—saw these ideas as disruptive to social order, if not antithetical to the very nature of the Spanish nation. The radical left, meanwhile, rejected the reforms, believing they were insufficient to combat class oppression, and called for a revolutionary transformation of society. Armed trade unions, in particular the anarcho-syndicalist *Confederación Nacional del Trabajo* [National Confederation of Labor] (CNT), were instrumental in suppressing the military revolt of July 1936. In several regions where their defense held, most significantly in Catalonia with its capital Barcelona, their successful resistance allowed the workers to take control of the streets and local political institutions (25-26). Thus, in many places the outbreak of civil war and revolution occurred simultaneously, resulting in a power struggle between not only

the Republic and the rebels, but also between revolutionary and liberal forces within the Republic.

For the United Kingdom, France, the United States, and other Western powers, the military uprising presented a dilemma. On the one hand, the conservative elements behind the conspiracy represented the more promising alternative for foreign capital investments in Spain, as opposed to the revolutionary left, which supposedly would, if given the chance, seize power of and collectivize industries and agriculture (Little 32). On the other hand, the involvement of the fascist powers in the war was an unsettling development. While no one wanted to provoke an armed conflict with Germany and Italy, their continued aggression was already tearing at the seams of stability within Europe. A pact of non-intervention was agreed upon, which implied that no state would support either side of the conflict. Ironically, both Italy and Germany were among those that signed the agreement. They continued to supply the rebel war machine—directed by the young general and Rif War veteran Francisco Franco—with arms and men while the rest of the members of the Non-Intervention Committee turned a blind eye. Apart from a few minor contributions from France and Mexico at the start of the war, the Spanish Republic, subject to a virtual arms embargo, received material support only from the Soviet Union, also a member of the Non-Intervention Committee. The Soviet Union, at this time controlled by Joseph Stalin—who had initiated a large-scale purge of former political allies—not only supported the Republic with Russian equipment and soldiers, but also organized the International Brigades, consisting of thousands of volunteers, and became the main agency for promoting the Republican cause internationally. While about half of the Spanish army had joined the ranks of the uprising, armed union and party militias had in the early months of the war largely been responsible for handling the military defense of the Republic (Payne 109). Partly because the militias were seen as ineffective and disorganized, but surely also because their autonomy undermined the authority of the Republican state, the militia system was subject to much criticism and was duly restructured in the fall of 1936 into the Popular Army, which incorporated both loyal troops and militiamen. Soviet military intelligence personnel oversaw the reorganization of the army, ensuring the Kremlin's lasting influence over the Republican war machine and state (Payne 160-73).

Before leaving for Spain in February 1937, Hemingway had, in addition to signing a contract with NANA, agreed to serve on the board of directors of a

new film production company called Contemporary Historians (Baker 300). With the celebrated Dutch filmmaker Joris Ivens as director of photography, a short documentary on the Spanish Civil War had already been shot, and a longer one entitled *The Spanish Earth* was in the making. Hemingway met up with Ivens in Paris before crossing the Spanish border, and the two reunited in Madrid shortly thereafter, where Hemingway accompanied Ivens's film crew as they were shooting *The Spanish Earth.* In one of his early NANA dispatches, filed on 15 March, Hemingway bitterly notes that while journalists were being held up by the Franco-Spanish border authorities, "12,000 Italian troops were landed at Málaga and Cádiz" ("Dispatch 2" 4). Already, as his implicit criticism of non-intervention shows, Hemingway was beginning to publicly deviate from his earlier isolationism. Meanwhile, Joris Ivens, who was already familiar with the internal politics of wartime Madrid and with contacts among its powerful Soviet military intelligentsia, served as Hemingway's guide and made sure he made the right connections: "I introduced Hemingway to [the Russians] so that he would know some […] communists [other than myself]. That gave him an edge and with it came more confidence, which for him was very important […]. I had a plan for Hemingway, and I think I used the right tactics" (Watson, "Joris Ivens" 12). Hemingway's introduction to the war, centered on Madrid and its nearby front lines and experienced in the company of Ivens and his Soviet acquaintances, set the framework in which he from then on would conceptualize the conflict.

The Spanish Earth was completed in the early summer of 1937 and endorsed in the United States by Hemingway, whose promotional efforts included giving the only speech of his career at the American Writers Congress in New York City and showing the film at the White House. In a letter to Pauline in August 1937, Hemingway noted, "[Mr. and Mrs. Roosevelt] were very moved by the Spanish Earth picture but both said we should put more propaganda in it" (*SL* 460). The film, which features narration written and read by Hemingway, follows two parallel plots. The story of the rural village of Fuentidueña and its population's efforts to construct an irrigation system "to raise food for the defenders of Madrid" is crosscut with shots depicting the military operations of the Loyalist army in and around the capital. The main theme of the film is the interdependency between the people of Spain and the earth off which they live and on which they fight against foreign aggressors for their right to self-determination. In terms of the film's simplistic framing of the war, it did not represent much of a departure from Hemingway's earlier views: the

film, just like Hemingway in his private correspondence, refers to the two warring sides as the people, or the People's Army, versus "the enemy," at different times specified as "fascist landlords" or as the Germans and Italians. It is notable that Hemingway publicly endorsed the project in the way that he did. The author was now using his celebrity status to support the government of Spain, and most remarkably, was openly calling for an end to non-intervention and for increased foreign involvement in the war.

Returning to Madrid in the fall of 1937, Hemingway was living in the Hotel Florida with the rest of the foreign press corps and—in another career first—working on a play. The script, entitled *The Fifth Column,* was published in book form in 1938 but not produced for the stage until years later in a heavily revised rendition (Baker 338). Apart from being a commercial flop, the play is notable for being one of Hemingway's crudest and most ethically questionable works. Told in the style of a romantic espionage drama, it is the story of Philip Rawlings, an American undercover agent posing as a journalist, who is hunting for traitors and fascist infiltrators on behalf of the fictional intelligence organization *Seguridad,* based on the real-life *Servicio de Información Militar* (SIM). Most of the play's characters lack depth and behave in stereotypical ways: The hotel manager, one of the few Spanish characters, is overly polite and simpleminded, constantly begging the wealthy Rawlings for food; and the main female character, possibly modeled after Hemingway's mistress and fellow journalist Martha Gellhorn, is a naïve woman who does not understand Rawlings or his mysterious ways. The portrayal of fascists in the play is likewise one-dimensional; a sinister German gloatingly refers to dead civilians as "a beautiful sight" and "Marxist bastards" (*FC* 84), while another is characterized by Rawlings as simply "this thing" (*FC* 89).

However, it is the play's main theme, the search for "fifth columnists," that makes it a problematic piece. The term refers to a claim by General Emilio Mola that his four rebel columns marching on Madrid would be met by a fifth that had been secretly infiltrating the city (Bolinger 47). In 1937, hostilities between different factions within the Republic, mainly the Spanish Communist Party, (*El Partido Comunista de España* [PCE]), and the anarchists, had led to increased tensions and infighting. In May, street battles broke out in Barcelona after the regional government, the *Generalitat*, tried to take over a vital communications office from the anarcho-syndicalist trade union, the CNT, which had more or less been in control of the city since the civil war broke out. The fighting ended only after the Republican government sent in the military to

take control of the situation, and as a result, the anarchists lost much of what revolutionary gains they had acquired over the preceding month (Graham 64-67). In the aftermath, the socialist Prime Minister Francisco Largo Caballero was forced to resign, and Communists who had supported the government's suppression of the anarchists dominated the new government that took office after him (Payne 244). In the tense political climate that ensued, the hunt for "fifth columnists" became an obsession within the Republic, and large numbers of people belonging to non-conformist or revolutionary political parties were denounced as fascist sympathizers, imprisoned, and executed, partly made possible by the intelligence gathering of the SIM (Payne 244). The anti-Stalinist, revolutionary Marxist party (POUM), whose members had taken part in the battles against the government during the Barcelona May Days, was subjected to especially fierce suppression as a result of these events (Payne 226-27).

In Hemingway's play, there is no allusion to the fact that the SIM was created in response to internal strife and aimed mainly at neutralizing opponents of the Communists. Its activities are legitimized by the author as an integral part of the Republic's defense against fascism, when in fact, the organization served mainly to preserve the Communist Party's hegemony in Spain's internal political affairs (Payne 260). If Hemingway was aware of the scale of the Communist purges of political opponents that were occurring while he lived and worked in Madrid, he must have been indifferent towards them or otherwise believed that they were necessary. Regardless, the very absence of a discussion of the moral implications associated with internecine violence is noteworthy, especially considering that the question of means and ends is a major theme in the novel Hemingway authored thereafter, *For Whom the Bell Tolls*.

With that book, the author hoped to tell a story of the war that would shed light on its many complex ethical and political aspects. In a March 1939 letter to his friend, Russian literary critic Ivan Kashkin, Hemingway explained,

> I try to show all the different sides of it, taking it slowly and honestly and examining it from many ways. […] But it is very complicated and difficult to write about truly. […] I would like to be able to write understandingly about both deserters and heroes, cowards and brave men, traitors and men who are not capable of being traitors, […]. (*SL* 480)

In 1939, after Hemingway had returned from the war for the last time and at a moment when the Republic had already lost and there was no longer any need for unbalanced partisanship on behalf of its cause, Hemingway was able to write *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, a work that is refreshingly contemplative and profound in comparison to his earlier works on the subject of the war.

The story, like much of Hemingway's Spanish Civil War work, is anchored in Spanish soil; the novel begins and ends with Robert Jordan lying on the "pine-needled floor of the forest" in harmony with nature, yet at all times under the threat of the enemy's industrialized violence. Jordan, an American college professor and Hispanophile, has left his career behind to serve the Spanish Republic as a dynamiter behind enemy lines. He teams up with a group of Spaniards who have been waging a low-intensity guerrilla campaign against Franco's troops since the war started, hiding in the mountains and biding their time. Their group dynamics and relatively safe existence in the backwoods are upset by the entrance of Jordan, whose devotion to his dangerous mission of disabling a bridge as part of a larger Republican offensive reveals a deep rift in the unity of the guerillas. In addition, *For Whom the Bell Tolls* is partly a romance. Jordan falls in love with the young Maria, who has been living with the guerillas since Franco's troops raided her village and executed her family; their relationship is explored—as is typical for Hemingway—as a tension between love and duty. In the end, Hemingway's hero makes the ultimate sacrifice for the Republic, and the life "Roberto" and Maria imagined they would spend together comes to naught.

There are many indications in the novel of Hemingway's ambition to give a multifaceted and dynamic account of the war, and it is the fulfillment of this aspiration that is the reason *For Whom the Bell Tolls* is considered an important contribution to the literary canon of the Spanish Civil War, unlike forgettable works such as *The Fifth Column.* For one, there is the omniscient third-person narration technique, which, unlike some of Hemingway's earlier novels that were written in the first person, allows the author to express the private feelings of characters other than the protagonist when needed. Another is Robert Jordan's stream of thoughts, in which certainties, truths, contradictions, and dilemmas are juxtaposed and turned over in a ceaseless pursuit to make sense of the war:

> Don't you know it is wrong to kill? Yes. But you do it? Yes. And you still believe absolutely that your cause is right? Yes. It is right, he told himself, not reassuringly, but proudly. I believe in the people and their right to govern themselves as they wish. (*FWBT* 321)

That central dilemma—how to justify the killing of one's political enemies—is brought up continuously throughout the novel and explored from many different perspectives. A poignant example of this can be found when Pilar, one of the book's two female characters (the other one is Maria) and the *de facto* leader of the group, details the preemptive weeding out all fascist elements in her hometown at the onset of the war. In one of the longest and most memorable chapters of the book, Pilar describes to a horrified Maria and an amazed Robert Jordan how the townspeople united in what started out as collective anti-fascist resistance but soon turned into a drunken and brutal lynch mob. The way in which Hemingway cast the incident, having characters recall "the start of the movement" with feelings of uncertainty and horror, even regret, serves two main purposes. Partly, Pilar's story complicates the thoughts of an already pensive Jordan, who struggles to rationalize the death that surrounds him: "I've always known about […] what we did to them at the start. I've always known it and hated it and I have heard it mentioned shamelessly and shamefully, bragged of, boasted of, defended, explained and denied. But that damned woman made me see it as though I had been there" (*FWBT* 149). Most importantly however, the fictionalized account of Loyalist atrocities allows Hemingway to acknowledge that neither side of the war was completely innocent of committing immoral acts, while still making an argument in support for the Republic. Above all, while its supporters have the right to defend their chosen government, they need to be suspicious of "any sort of *clichés* both revolutionary and patriotic" (*FWBT* 179).

In Pilar's story, there is an overall sense of grief regarding "the depriving of life which, as we all have learned in these years, is a thing of ugliness but also a necessity to do if we are to win, and to preserve the Republic" (*FWBT* 132). Hemingway here and elsewhere in the novel questions the generic labeling of the enemy as "fascists," asking whether they, too, are not people. Indeed, we are told, there are different degrees to which a person can be a fascist: Some of those killed in Pilar's village were actually not fascists at all but merely shopkeepers or landowners; one person was "only a fascist to be a snob" (131), while another was "a fascist of the first order" (123). Regardless, one of the villagers had pleaded as the crowd grew meaner and drunker, "If it is necessary to kill them all, and I am not convinced of that necessity, let them be killed decently and without mockery" (133). Although Robert Jordan is an adamant anti-fascist, he, too, is uneasy about killing his enemies: "How many of those you have killed have been real fascists?" he wonders, and then immediately

answers himself, "Very few" (321). His troubled mind stands in stark contrast to that of Philip Rawlings in *The Fifth Column,* who brags to his friend about propping up the corpse of a fascist soldier and sticking a lit cigarette in its mouth in order to terrorize an enemy detainee into submission, calling it "very jolly" (*FC* 94).

One thing that Jordan and Rawlings have in common, however, is that they are both "insiders" who, because of to their connections within the Russian intelligentsia in Madrid, are more well informed and given more important assignments than their fellow Spanish combatants. In the sense that *For Whom the Bell Tolls* asserts that the Communists are the only ones capable of leading the Republic to a victory, it follows the political line of *The Fifth Column:* "Here in Spain the Communists offered the best discipline," Jordan at one point declares. "He accepted their discipline for the duration of the war, because, in the conduct of the war, they were the only party whose program and whose discipline he could respect" (*FWBT* 178). Hemingway also vents his frustration with those segments of the Republic that have political ideals different from those who are in charge, and who for that reason are preoccupied with "politics" when they really should be focused on war. Especially the anarchists, "the crazies; the ones with the black-and-red scarves," are targets of his loathing (*FWBT* 396). The anarchists, in Hemingway's account, have no sense of solidarity with the rest of the Republic and are only interested in themselves and their libertarian "discipline of indiscipline" (391). In Pilar's story of the drunken mob, the anarchists are the drunkest; one of them, while struggling to get a glimpse of the violence, shouts in ecstasy, "'Long live me!'" Looking back, Pilar wishes the violence had been directed towards them instead. "'If we ever have another revolution,'" she says, "'I believe [the anarchists] should be destroyed from the start'" (141). Apart from remarks such as these, it is also implied in the novel that the anarchists were directly responsible for some of the Republic's failure. The animosity towards the anarchists that is evident in *For Whom the Bell Tolls* is also reflected in some of Hemingway's private correspondence from the time. In a letter to his sons Patrick and Gregory sent in August 1939, Hemingway urges them to behave well and not act according to "the glorious discipline of indiscipline, [because] you remember where that got the Spanish Republic to" (*SL* 496). Although only a joke, the resentful undertone of the remark is telling of Hemingway's bitterness at the loss of the war.

Hemingway's admiration for the Communists in Spain had less to do with their particular vision of society than their ability to enforce discipline and

order. Indeed, as Hemingway explained in an August 1935 letter to Ivan Kashkin, "I cannot be a communist now because I believe in only one thing: liberty. First I would look after myself and do my work. Then I would care for my family. Then I would help my neighbor. But the state I care nothing for. […] I believe in the absolute minimum of government"(*SL* 419). Hemingway's only concern was that the Republic should win the war; what kind of governmental system Spain would end up with once Franco's rebels were beaten was less important, as long as it was not fascism. According to this logic, a disciplined and coordinated war effort was the only thing that mattered, and all political indifferences along the Loyalist ranks had to be set aside for the duration of the war.

Many at the time held similar views, although not all. George Orwell and his autobiographical novel *Homage to Catalonia* serve as a good example of an opposing viewpoint. Orwell, an Englishman, served with a POUM militia unit on the Aragon front until the spring of 1937, when, back on leave in Barcelona, he was caught up in the aforementioned street fighting against the Republican authorities. When the POUM was subsequently outlawed, he was forced to flee across the border to France to escape imprisonment. Though Orwell naturally would have agreed with Hemingway that what was most important was to win the war, he believed that this could be accomplished without the centralized, hierarchical structure of the Popular Army:

> Later it became fashion to decry the militias, and therefore to pretend that the faults which were due to lack of training and weapons were the result of the equalitarian system. Actually, a newly raised draft of militia was an undisciplined mob not because the officers called the privates 'Comrade' but because raw troops are *always* an undisciplined mob. In practice the democratic 'revolutionary' type of discipline is more reliable than might be expected. (Orwell 28)

Moreover, as he watched the Republican government suppress the anarchists and the POUM, reversing the revolutionary transformation of Barcelona that he had observed when he first came to the city, Orwell concluded that a war against fascism could not be fought in the name of liberal capitalism without running the risk of ending up with an authoritarian state. He wrote, "If the workers do not control the armed forces, the armed forces will control the workers" (61), asserting that the Communist-influenced Republican government was aiming at just that.

Hemingway, on the other hand, did not show much sympathy for those subjected to political repression during the war, nor did he care for revolutionary Barcelona as an idea. In a letter to his mother-in-law written in February 1939, Hemingway betrays his bitterness towards the revolutionaries of Catalonia: "The Catalans would never fight. They never fought in the whole war" (*SL* 476). He then cites a xenophobic joke he had learned in Spain that sardonically concludes, "Thank *God* I am a negro; And *not* a Catalan"(*SL* 476). Another suggestion of this animosity appears in *For Whom the Bell Tolls* when the Russian character Karkov, who throughout the novel teaches Jordan about the intrigues that take place behind the scenes of war, explains the situation in Barcelona:

> You should see Barcelona. […] First it was the paradise of the crackpots and the romantic revolutionists. Now it is the paradise of the fake soldier. The soldiers who like to wear uniforms, who like to strut and swagger and wear red-and-black scarves. Who like everything about war except to fight. (*FWBT* 263)

These lines are followed by an exchange about the POUM, which Karkov claims is an "infamous organization of Trotskyite murderers" with "fascist machinations" and "a little fascist money" (*FWBT* 263). While Hemingway's feelings about the supreme importance of war over revolution may or may not be justified, the claim that POUM worked for the fascists is a very serious accusation. The same charge was made continuously in the aftermath of the Barcelona May Days, resulting in the incarceration and death of many innocent people.

Hemingway's "Madrid-centric" outlook on the war helps explain why—in his writing and political activism—he was so fully supportive of the Communist hegemony in Republican affairs and loathing towards Catalan anarcho-syndicalism and other dissident anti-fascist ideologies. Orwell, who received his introduction to the politics of wartime Spain in Barcelona shortly after the revolution had occurred, wrote in *Homage to Catalonia* that the war was "above all things a political war," and that "no event in it [was] intelligible unless one had a grasp of the inter-party struggle that was going on behind the Government lines" (46). For him, spending time in Barcelona in the midst of the revolution made it impossible to ignore the party politics behind the war. Hemingway, on the contrary, was exposed to the war through the world of intrigue and machination that was Madrid after the Republican government had relocated to Valencia. He got his scoops among Russian commissars, high

military officials, and insiders like Joris Ivens, sources that were not likely to promote the importance of inter-Republican policy struggles in times of war. In that environment, and so close to the front lines, the Communist model of traditional warfare must have seemed more credible than whatever benefits social revolution would bring in the rear.

As his works concerning the Spanish Civil War show, Hemingway was not shy about taking sides. He suspected that the outbreak of war in Spain would be a major step towards the larger European conflict that had been looming on the horizon for years. However, he knew instinctively which side he supported and began publicly promoting the Republic shortly after his first visit to the front. A closer look at the politics of the war compared with the views expressed in Hemingway's writing from the time reveals that the author not only sided with one of the two belligerents in the war, but that he also promoted the political line of one particular faction within that group. Hemingway was not only one of the most renowned writers of his time, but he was also one of America's loudest voices who spoke on behalf of the Spanish Republic.

WORKS CITED

Baker, Carlos. *Hemingway: A Life Story.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1969. Print.

Bolinger, Dwight L. "The Fifth Column Marches On." *American Speech* 19 (1944): 47-49. Print.

Graham, Helen. *The Spanish Civil War: A Very Short Introduction.* Oxford: Oxford UP, 2005. Print.

Hemingway, Ernest. *The Fifth Column.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1940. Print.

—. *For Whom the Bell Tolls.* New York: Scribner Classics, 1940. Print.

—. *Selected Letters: 1917-1961.* Ed. Carlos Baker. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1981. Print.

—. *The Spanish Earth*. New York: Contemporary Historians, 1937. Print.

—. "Notes on the Next War: A Serious Topical Letter." *Esquire* Sept. 1935. Web.

—. "Ernest Hemingway's Spanish Civil War Dispatches." Ed. William B. Watson. *The Hemingway Review* 7.2 (Spring 1988): 4-92. Print.

Little, Douglas. *Malevolent Neutrality.* Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1985. Print.

Orwell, George. *Homage to Catalonia.* San Diego: Harcourt Brace & Company, 1952. Print.

Payne, Stanley. *The Spanish Civil War, the Soviet Union, and Communism.* New Haven: Yale UP, 2004. Print.

Preston, Paul. *The Coming of the Spanish Civil War.* London: MacMillan Press Ltd., 1978. Print.

Watson, William B. "Joris Ivens and the Communists: Bringing Hemingway Into the Spanish Civil War." *The Hemingway Review* 10.1 (Fall 1990): 2-18. Print.