

**Voice Against Subjugation of Non-Human World
in Hemingway's *The Old Man and the Sea***

It is not all right to systematically exploit and kill nonhuman animals simply because of their species. (Cary Wolfe)

Hari Krishna Lamichhane

M. Phil. (English), Tribhuvan University

E-mail: hklamichhane@gmail.com

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0008-2273-3914>

Received: Sep, 13, 2016 Revised: Feb, 03, 2017 Accepted: Feb, 08, 2017

Abstract

This article on Ernest Hemingway's novella, The Old Man and the Sea, explores Hemingway's worries about subjugation of non-human world due to anthropocentric hubris of human beings encroaching and exploiting nature in the modern society. In the novella, he presents the selfishness of the human world where people mercilessly go on fishing in the sea considering the act of killing fish as 'heroic deed'. The article applies eco-critical insights to study consequences of human encroachment upon nature in the novella. It mainly borrows ideas from Paul W. Taylor's "Respect of Nature", Val Plumwood's "The Blindspots of Centricism and Human Self-enclosure" and Arne Naess' "Deep Ecological Movement: Some Philosophical Aspects". The article shows Hemingway's critique of nature exploitation and his appeal for the need of love for nature that he does through his choice of the protagonist, Santiago, and the big marlin who have a combat that Santiago wins after struggling for a long time, but gets defeated by the sharks ultimately. Hemingway, by presenting the protagonist Santiago's situation, appeals all human beings to love nature.

Keywords: eco-criticism, subjugation, anthropocentric hubris, apocalypse, organicity, human- nature reconciliation

This article explores Hemingway's critique of nature exploitation and valorization of organicity in the novella, *The Old Man and the Sea*, and attempts to explore how he critiques subjugation of non-human world in the novella. It focuses on the inhuman and selfish picture of the world that the novella presents as a result of massive exploitation of nature and anthropocentric hubris of human beings, and Hemingway's call for the reconciliation with nature through love for nature and the non-human world in nature. The article highlights the serious environmental issue: anthropocentric attitude of human beings destroying the world of the non-humans mercilessly. As the protagonist, Santiago continues fishing till his old age and still desires to go on fishing even after he gets defeated by the sharks, Hemingway presents the merciless picture of the world where there is no love for nature in the heart of human beings.

This article seeks to study the feelings, expressions and activities of the protagonist, Santiago, in Ernest Hemingway's novella, *The Old Man and the Sea*. Santiago, the old Cuban fisherman struggles to catch the greatest fish of his life, but the big marlin that he catches is attacked by the sharks while being taken to the shore and the old man has to lose it. The article analyses Santiago's (over)confidence, hope and despair narrated in the novella, and argues that

his *hubris* about his intelligence and fishing tricks lead him to complete failure. For this purpose, the article examines the key ideas like hubris, failure and anthropocentrism in relation to the protagonist's character. Finally, the article concludes that Santiago's failure is a voice against subjugation and denial of non-human world due to anthropocentrism that was prevailing during the mid-twentieth century when Hemingway wrote the novella.

Since its publication, the novella has received a lot of commentaries and reviews. Muthanna Makki Mu hammed in his article, "Individuality in Ernest Hemingway's *The Old Man and the Sea*" talks about the protagonist Santiago as a hybrid character of modern and classical type comparing Hemingway's work with that of Emerson and Thoreau. Mu hammed argues:

Hemingway's protagonist is a hybrid of the modern type and the classical one. [. . .] The transcendental merits of Hemingway's protagonist which are achieved through his natural intuition elevate him above human and physical restrictions and frustrations. Such an attitude was declared by Emerson and later by Thoreau. The latter, in his book entitled *Walden* emphasized the advantage of living simply within nature; an attitude established on the necessity of survival in hostile circumstances. (2-3)

Here, Mu hammed focuses on the technique of characterization that Hemingway applies in his writing. He discusses the human nature relation in the novella comparing it with other novels by Emerson and Thoreau.

Similarly, in "The Helpless Hero of Ernest Hemingway", Lois L. Barnes also talks about the characters in Hemingway's writing. He argues:

Hemingway's "heroes" are not alive, merely in motion; not simple, only empty. They do not love: they merely enjoy themselves. They do not have strength: they are only aggressive; not proud, only arrogant; not dignified, only close-mouthed; not intelligent, only knowing; not realistic, only cynical; not sensitive but cautious; not kind but patronizing. (25)

Here, Barnes talks about the characters that Hemingway portrays in his writing. Barnes also talks about the lack of society and people in Hemingway's writing. He writes, "... in most of Hemingway's writing, as in *The Old Man and the Sea*, there is neither society nor people. There is an observer: shadowy, faceless figures move around him; there are voices, objects, colors, smells." (11) By this, Barnes highlights upon Hemingway's theme of the loss of humanity in the society.

In, "Ernest Hemingway: A Tribute," C. Hugh Holman argues that Hemingway is an autobiographical writer as his characters embody his personal life experiences. Holman claims, "Ernest Hemingway was one of the most autobiographical writers which the twentieth century has known." (5) Holman defines his characters as "fictional creations who so closely parallel literal characteristics and experiences of their maker that it has been difficult for the contemporary reader to examine them without the intrusion of strong autobiographical implications into his understanding." (5-6) Holman also highlights over the symbolic account in the novel. He argues, "...many read *The Old Man and the Sea* as a symbolic account of the writing of *Across the River* and its destruction by the shark-like critics." (6) He compares the critics with the sharks in the sea that devour the big marlin that he catches. He further argues, "These readings are justified, at least on one level, because Hemingway's theories of art make such uses of experience an inevitable subject matter for him." (6)

In spite of his failure to take a fish for eighty-four days, the old man sets out again for "a truly big fish" (Hemingway 10) believing that "[e]ighty-five is a lucky number" (12). In spite of Manolin's (the boy's) request to go with him and serve in some way, Santiago doesn't take

Manolin with him because the old man thinks that the boy is "with a lucky boat" (6). 'Lucky boat' means they did not have to return without catching some fish as the old man had to. Here, the number 'eighty five' and 'the boat' are neither lucky nor unlucky in themselves, but they are defined in that way as they bring benefit or loss to the people in concern. It's clear that the word 'unlucky' is contaminated with the politics of anthropocentrism.

On the eighty-fifth day the old man has decided to go "far out" (10, 25) believing that it is "going to be a good day" (10) because "his hope and confidence had never gone. But now they were freshening..." (9). Santiago's confidence and hope on his capability is also shared by Manolin, the boy. The boy says, "And the best fisherman is you" (19). Both of them are quite optimistic about his success in getting a big fish. Though he is "*salao* - which is the worst form of unlucky" (5) so far, he has "cheerful and undefeated" eyes (6). He thinks that he is "a strange old man" strong enough now for a truly big fish (10). Receiving the well-wish of the boy and hoping his "big fish must be somewhere" (31), he sets out alone. It shows as if he has innate rights to go to the sea and collect fish whenever he wants. Santiago's attitude reminds us of Val Plumwood, who says: "In anthropocentric culture nature's agency and independence of ends are denied, subsumed in or remade to coincide with human interests, which are thought to be the source of all value in the world" (109). As Santiago sets out for fishing, he bears the image of the White colonizers who would collect whatever they liked or needed from the colonized countries. Reflecting the attitude of White colonizers of the past, Santiago neither recognizes the 'agency' of the fish nor has any respect for nature. Borrowing the term of Plumwood, fish is an "instrument" for his desire, need and pride (107).

In contrast to the anthropocentric theory of environmental ethics, Paul Taylor favours the biocentric (life-centered) theory which holds that it doesn't view our duties to nature arising from the duties we owe to humans but from certain moral relations holding between ourselves and the natural world. Taylor argues:

From the perspective of a life-centered theory, we have prima facie moral obligations that are owed to wild plants and animals themselves as members of the earth's biotic community. We are morally bound to protect or promote their good for their sake. Our duties to respect the integrity of natural ecosystems, to preserve endangered species, and to avoid environmental pollution . . . stem from our obligation to recognize their inherent worth. (351)

Here, Taylor advocates for human duties and responsibilities of protecting and preserving the endangered non-human world. So, according to this biocentric theory the natural world and its living creatures are not just objects to be exploited by us. Just the opposite, biotic communities of natural ecosystems deserve our moral concern because they have an inherent value.

Taylor examines the distinction between anthropocentric and biocentric theories of environmental ethics as for their views of "moral agents and moral subjects" (355). For both anthropocentric and biocentric theory a 'moral agent' is any being that possesses those capacities, by virtue of which it can act morally or immorally, can have duties and responsibilities and can be held accountable for what it does. Moral subjects on the other hand are beings that can be treated rightly or wrongly and toward whom 'moral agents' can have duties and responsibilities. 'Moral subjects' are entities that can be harmed or benefited. Their conditions of existence can be made better or worse by the actions of 'moral agents.'

Santiago's (over)confidence on his capability and strength to catch a big fish reminds us of the overconfidence of King Oedipus on his capability and determination to solve the problem of Thebes. With his "confident loving eyes" (Hemingway 9), the old man says, "I know many

tricks and I have resolution" (20). His expression of the 'resolution' is his *hubris* reflecting that he has undermined the possible barriers that could come in course of fishing "far out" alone (10, 25). When the boy reminds him that they are in September, the month when the great fish come, the old man says, "Anyone can be a fisherman in May"(35) indicating that he is not a common fisherman. The night before his voyage for fishing 'far out', he dreams of lions on the beach. Lions are supposed to be the king of the jungle and the bravest of the beasts. Likewise, both Santiago and Manolin think that old man Santiago is going to prove himself the bravest of the fishermen. It is justified by the expression of the boy Manolin, "There are many good fishermen and some great ones. But there is only you" (19). With this compliment, the old man is happy, and he responds, "I hope no fish will come along so great that he will prove us wrong" (19-20). Ignoring the limitations of his situation, the old man shows his *hubris* exactly like the Greek tragic hero Oedipus does. Harold Bloom comments: "His great triumph is reduced to a miserable failure and what he brings home is only the skeleton of the magnificent fish lashed to his skiff" (27). The magnificence of the fish is something unimagined by the 'veteran fisher' Santiago.

In the same line, the old man says to himself, "You didn't kill the fish only to keep alive and to sell for food... You killed him for *pride* because you are fisherman..." (Hemingway 107, emphasis mine). His sense of 'pride' is shattered when the sharks take pieces of the giant marlin leaving it just a skeleton and make Santiago realize: "I should not have gone out so far, fish" (110). The enthusiasm for going 'far out' is no longer in him towards the end of the story. He says to himself, "You are tired old man... you are tired inside" (110). In spite of the tiredness, he continues the struggle to bring the marlin safely to shore to save his dignity: "I told the boy I was a strange old man... Now is when I must prove it" (64). When he sees that his harpoon is lost while fighting the sharks and only "broken knife and bad hands" are left to him along with mere skeleton of the marlin, he confesses: "I ruined us both" (110). This 'ruin' indicates the failure of his *hubris*. Bloom notes it as "the tragedy of the fatal flaw of *hubris* in the sense of overreaching" (33).

The old man who didn't need help of the boy in the outset, repeatedly misses him and his help in the sea. Not only that he prays to God(ess) to help him in fishing: "I promise to make a pilgrimage to the Virgin de Cobre if I catch him. That is a promise... Blessed Virgin, pray for the death of this fish" (Hemingway 63). These prayers and promises clearly show that his "many tricks", which made him so confident in the beginning, also failed at the end. It indicates that he is in real crisis losing his confidence. Otherwise, why doesn't he pray and promise to God(dess) before starting the voyage?

The old man is "clear enough in the head... Too clear" (76) when he begins the fishing trip. 'Head' can be his physical head or the mental state, but he says he is 'clear' in it. Also, he believes that human beings are more intelligent than the species of fish: "[T]hank God, they are not as intelligent as we who kill them; although they are more noble and more able" (60). This pride on his/his species' intelligence is also broken towards the end of the text when he says, "I am only better than him through trickery" (99). Towards the end, the old man is "getting confused in the head" (92), which he apparently expresses: "My head is not that clear" (96-97). The references of clear head and intelligence can be interpreted as the failure of his capacity to calculate the hardships in fishing far out alone in September. His realization can be seen in the sentence: "Christ I didn't know he was so big" (63). Earlier he says, "I wish I could show him [the fish] what sort of man I am" (62). This idea of 'showing' and proving his capacity leads him to suffer along with the fish. The man who says "I must kill him" (86) is forced to say later: "You are killing me fish... Never have I seen a greater... thing than you, brother. Come and kill me, I

do not care who kills who" (92). This shift in his monologue inviting the fish to kill him is sufficient to understand that he has realized the defeat in the struggle against the marlin. Even then he shows his hypocrisy: "But man is not made for defeat... A man can be destroyed but not defeated" (104). But in practice, the old man is not destroyed but defeated. At least his hubris is shattered. If we read the crying face of the boy at the end of the story, the old man's defeat is clear. The old man doesn't talk to anyone and stays sleeping "on his face" (127). His confidence on his intelligence and his tricks and his experience all fail. "They beat me Manolin... They truly beat me" (124). With this confession of 'being beaten' we find him pitiable like Oedipus at the end of Sophocles' play. Harold Bloom rightly comments that the prize that [the old man] brings home finally is regret (27).

The old man repeatedly says that the fish is his "brother" (Hemingway 57, 99) and "friend" and, reiterates: "I must kill him and keep strong to do it". This determination/action to kill a 'brother' is a fratricide. In this context Harold Bloom comments, "It is interesting to note that Santiago stops wishing for the boy after killing the marlin, which fills him with a sense of guilt, almost fratricidal" (25). Santiago's repetition of "I must..." reminds us of the overconfidence of King Oedipus in revealing the culprit of the patricide. The only difference between the status of their *hubris* is that Santiago is about to commit the fratricidal crime, whereas Oedipus has already committed patricide unknowingly and is determined to find out the 'secret culprit'. But ultimately, both of them get 'despair' (in varying degree) as a result of their *hubris*.

According to William Rueckert, "In ecology, man's tragic flaw is his anthropocentric (as opposed to biocentric) vision, and his compulsion to conquer, ..., and exploit every natural thing" (113). In the novella, Santiago as a representative of the human race shows his anthropocentric vision that he has to conquer the fish. He exploits fish as his snacks, as the bait, as source of pleasure of sight when they jump up from sea, and a game. Due to this anthropocentric flaw, he meets the tragedy at the end.

The narration of the novel reveals anthropocentric ideology when the writer says, "They talked at night or when they were storm-bound by bad weather" (Hemingway 36). In the same line of evaluating weather, old Santiago says, "[W]hen there are no hurricanes, the weather of hurricane months is the best of all the year" (59). The 'weather' is neither good nor bad when we see it from neutral perspective. For example, if the rain helps us in planting crops, it is 'good', but if it ruins the crops while harvesting, we call it 'bad'. So, people interpret the weather 'good' or 'bad' on the basis of the profit or loss it makes for them.

In narrative discourse, nature is not given agency. For example, in English, we often see sentences like "It is raining." The term "it" is a pronoun, which is given agency in the sentence but "rain" is not given agency. Similarly, we see sentences like "They are clearing the jungle." This is anthropocentric attitude of people. People cut down trees for their selfish purpose. Instead we should use the sentences like "They are butchering the trees." In this sentence, the trees as the representative of nature are sympathized. Human beings construct language as per their own interest. They never take nature into consideration. Furthermore, we have been saying the weather as bad if it is raining and if it is cloudy. Rain and cloud are really needed phenomena for life on earth. So, human discourse always neglects nature and gives priority to human beings themselves. This anthropocentric attitude of human beings will be critiqued throughout the proposed research.

Not only 'weather', but also the sea is taken differently by the people. Some people, including Santiago, take the sea as feminine, *la mar* in Spanish. But many younger fishermen

take her as *el mar*, which is masculine (26). Showing people's varying perspectives on nature the narrator says, "They spoke of her as a contestant or a place or even an enemy" (26). Actually, a sea is a sea, but people's language gives it different images and positions. This is an example of 'anthropomorphism'. John Andrew Fisher writes in *Encyclopedia of Animal Rights and Animal Welfare* that anthropomorphism is, "thinking in human terms about an object that is not human" (70). He further claims that this thinking 'assigns qualities to non-human animals'. The above mentioned terms— 'lucky day', 'bad weather', 'lucky boat' and 'friendly fish'— are the examples of anthropomorphism. Here, human beings are treating 'non-human as human,' or attributing them to certain value or quality. It's 'social construction of nature'. 'Nature is not innocent' as Terry Gifford says (176).

The old man watches birds, fish and sea (Hemingway 31). Like all common people he watches the sky, the clouds, the moon and the stars. "He looked at stars and checked his course" (45). He watches fish flying above water level and dipping into the water again. Layers of cirrus and cumulus clouds are quite pleasing to him when he is fatigued (99). He seems to be a lover of nature: "He loved green turtles and hawk- bills with their elegance and speed and their great value" (33). Within his love there is selfishness exposed when the narration says 'value'.

He knows that the fish also have affection with one another. He remembers when, once, the female fish was hooked, "all the time the male had stayed with her" (47). Knowing their pain has made no difference in his determination of killing them. Making sardines the bait, he dips the hooks deep into water and says, "Eat it so that the point of the hook goes into your heart and kills you" (41). He represents mercilessness of human beings in their treatment with animals.

The fishermen like Santiago catch fish which keep them "alive" (108). There are ice trucks to carry them to the market in Hawana. So, after getting the marlin on the hook, the old man thinks: "What a great fish he is and what he will bring in the market if the flesh is good" (46). This consumerist ideology is reflected again when he repeatedly thinks that he [i.e. the fish] "will feed many people" (74,106). He further says that there are people who are paid to do it. If he took the fish safely to the shore, "it would bring the highest price in the market" (108). But this commercial plan of the old man fails at the end when he is able to take mere skeleton of the giant marlin with him. This discussion shows that the fish have the utility in the form of food or money, nothing more.

Discussing three types of anthropocentrism as dominionism, stewardship and evolutionary anthropocentrism, Michael Allen Fox writes in *Encyclopedia of Animal Rights and Animal Welfare* that the first of them is "strong anthropocentrism". He says:

Rooted in the Old Testament and in ancient Greek philosophy, dominionism is the position that nature and individual things in nature exist only in order to serve the needs and interests of humans. Dominionism... commonly associated with such ideas as mastery of nature and nature's possessing merely instrumental (or use) value, with the collective pride of species self-glorification. Dominionists think of nature as a boundless storehouse of resources. The frontier mentality and entrepreneurism are representative modes of dominionism (66-67).

From the plan, activities and monologic expressions of the old man, it's clear that he is an anthropocentrist. He chews fish, fights and kills fish, loves and admires fish, birds, star, sea and cloud. He judges and evaluates them from a human being's perspective indicating every time "us-them" attitude. The discussion of the novella above reflects that old man Santiago fails to "respect for the dignity" (Bekoff and Meaney xiii-xiv) of the fish. What he thinks is "human [his] interests, needs, and desires are all that matter" (66). This is a display of anthropocentrism.

Hemingway's 'hero' Santiago, in *The Old Man and the Sea*, displays strong type of anthropomorphism rampantly. He thinks that the sea, the fish and the birds exist to serve the needs and desires of his. He also thinks that he has a long experience and mastery over fishing profession. The fish is a commodity/ an instrument to fulfill his desire. He has always taken the sea as a storehouse of fish, beauty and wonder for him. As Michael Allen Fox says in the above quotation as a characteristic of a dominionist, Santiago is also seen to be guided by Christian belief which is clear in his prayers to Virgin de Cobre, Virgin Mary and Christ. It is justified by Harold Bloom also: "Santiago's ordeal, first in his struggle with the big fish, and then fighting against the sharks, is associated by Hemingway with Christ's agony and triumph" (2). In the same line Lynn White, Jr. says, "Especially in its Western form, Christianity is the most anthropocentric religion that the world has seen. ... [It] insists that it is God's will that man exploit nature for his proper ends...Christianity made it possible to exploit nature in a mood of indifference to the feelings of natural objects" (148-49). White means to say that Christianity encouraged the ruthless exploitation of nature and promoted an anthropocentric world view in which humans are superior to and in charge of the rest of the nature. Santiago expresses his Christian belief time and again in the novella and, side by side, he shows his anthropocentric attitude. But ultimately, he fails.

After three days and two nights of fishing trip, the old man has to return to the shore like a defeated soldier 'fallen' in his own eyes. If he had realized the value of life of the innocent fish, he would neither have to suffer in fruitless struggle with the fish and return self-humiliated, nor would he have to carry the 'sin' of killing his 'brother' and 'friend', i.e., the fish. He realizes, "Perhaps it was a sin to kill the fish" (Hemingway 106). He further says to himself, "Do not think about sin, it is much too late for that" (106). It indicates that he has realized the crime he has committed. Very wisely, Hemingway has shown his arrogant hero realize his mistake at the end. This is a significant voice against anthropocentric arrogance.

In "The Deep Ecological Movement", Arne Naess argues for the respect for every species of life on the earth. He claims, "Present human interference with the non-human world is excessive, and the situation is rapidly worsening. Policies must therefore be changed." (50) The emphasis on the human reason thus is the self-assessed supremacy of the human being that considers human as rational and the non-human as irrational, barbaric and ignorant. It is the socially and culturally constructed version of nature. Looking from the perspectives of Deep Ecologists, "all life is fundamentally one" (Naess 8). From this view, Santiago's efforts are suicidal. The old man seems to be insensitive in "understanding the widest 'Self', one with capital S" (6) which Naess says "Self-realization" (8). If he had realized that the fish is also a part of the larger self as important as he himself, he would have hesitated from killing the fish. So, what Santiago lacks is "identification" (10). If he had identified his life with that of the fish, he would have known the intrinsic value of the life of the fish. With identification, "[w]e discover that parts of nature are parts of ourselves. We cannot exist separate from them. If we try, our Self-realizing is blocked. Thus we cannot destroy them if we to exist fully" (10). Not knowing this insight is almost common blind spot of humanity today.

Presenting a White, Christian male chauvinist hero and showing his failure at the end, Hemingway tries to open the eyes of human beings about their belief on the trivial victory, domination and exploitation over the fellow beings on the planet. Analyzing the ugly anthropocentric face of the protagonist unmasked and his 'ego' shattered at the end in this beautiful narrative, one can easily say that the prizes and praises that the novella has received are justified from eco-critical perspective.

Hemingway through this novella appeals that people should have a moral obligation not to inflict pain and suffering on any individual, including non-human animals. The moral consideration to both human and non-human should be given but that does not mean treating them like or holding their lives to be of equal value. Human beings are also chained within the great chain of being of a greater whole, which is nature in totality. Within the nature the non-humans are suffering from environmental degradation and have become the sufferers because of human activities. So people should understand the fact as human beings they are parts not only of the community of humanity but of the natural environment, which makes up nature as a whole. "We are all one life" in the words of Coleridge, therefore, a bell tolls for us not only when a fellow human being dies but at the destruction of any member of that vastly wider community which is nature itself.

Reconciliation is the positive relationship between nature and culture, which is influenced mentally and physically for the adjustment in new environment and reconciliation with the laws of nature and culture both is mainly focused in this study. Reconciliation prompts social harmony with the existing circle with mental satisfaction. At the level of ideas, environmental ethics challenges the dominant and deep-rooted anthropocentrism of modern mainstream ethics and extends the object of our duty to future generations and non-human beings. At the practical level, environmental ethics forcefully critiques the materialism, hedonism and consumerism accompanying modern capitalism, and calls instead for a 'green lifestyle' that is harmonious with nature. In short, as the theoretical representation of a newly emerging moral idea and value orientation, environmental ethics is the full extension of human ethics. It calls on everyone to think and act locally as well as globally. It calls for a new, deeper moral consciousness to protect environment.

Human duties are to respect the integrity of natural ecosystem, to pressure endangered species to avoid environmental degradation and for the sustainable development of nature. Because human beings and nonhuman beings are all in the Great chain of Being, where all exist in a web-like relation to other species, every species is valuable as what it is and should understand its value. The togetherness of human and nonhuman can make the sustainable world for the upcoming generation. In the novella, Santiago along with other young men involve in the act of killing and destroying the life of other creatures in general and the fish in the sea in particular. By presenting Santiago's act of fishing and destroying nature and other non-human beings in the novella, Hemingway critiques the anthropocentric attitude of human beings, appeals for love for nature and reconciliation with nature needed to be in each and every human being because the world is the common house of every living being.

In this way, this article has come to the conclusion that Ernest Hemingway raises his voice against subjugation and denial of non-human world and critiques the exploitation of nature in his novella *The Old Man and the Sea*. He depicts the consequences of the destruction of nature, and at the same time, he strongly suggests a solution for the problem that is the urgency of human-nature reconciliation. It is true as the novella depicts the apocalyptic world that is possible. Due to their anthropocentric attitude, people keep on killing other creatures in the world. They continue to exploit nature and other species till eternity. Furthermore, Hemingway's work offers a threatening and bleak account of a devastated world. In this way, Hemingway through his novella *The Old Man and the Sea* critiques the anthropocentric attitude of human beings that considers nature as 'other' concerning only on human interest. This attitude of human beings, as Hemingway implies, results into apocalypse. So, as a solution, he calls for the urgency of human-nature reconciliation.

Works Cited

- Barnes, Lois L. "The Helpless Hero of Ernest Hemingway". *Science & Society*. Vol. 17, No.1 Guilford Press. (Winter, 1953), pdf. pp. 1-25. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40400162>
- Bekoff, Marc and Carron A. Meaney, eds. *Encyclopedia of Animal Rights and Animal Welfare*. Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1998. Print.
- Bloom, Harold. *Ernest Hemingway's The Old Man and the Sea*. Infobase Publishing, 2008. Print.
- Gifford, Terry. "Social Construction of Nature". *ISLE*. 3 (2), 1996. Print.
- Hemingway, Ernest. *The Old Man and the Sea*. Surjeet Publishing House, 2000. Print.
- Holman, C. Hugh. "Ernest Hemingway: A Tribute" *Books Abroad*. Vol. 36, No. 1 (Winter, 1962), pdf. pp. 5-8 <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40116342>
- Mu hammed, Muthanna Makki. "Individuality in Ernest Hemingway's *The Old Man and the Sea*". *Journal of Kerbala University*. Vol.9. No.1. Humainies . 2011. Print.
- Naess, Arne. "Deep Ecological Movement: Some Philosophical Aspects". *Ecocriticism: The Essential Reader*. Ed. Hiltner, Ken. Routledge, 2015: 49-60. Print.
- — —. *Ecology, Community and Lifestyles: Outline of an Ecosophy*. Trans. David Rothenberg. CUP, 1989. Print.
- — —. "Self-realization: An Ecological Approach to Being in the World". *Deep Ecology for the Twenty- First Century*. Ed. George, Session. Shambhala Publication, 1995. 225-239. Print.
- Plumwood, Val. "The Blindspots of Centricism and Human Self-enclosure." *Environmental Culture: The Ecological Crisis of Reason*. Routledge, 2002: 97-122. Print.
- Rueckert, William. "Literature and Ecology: An Experiment in Ecocriticism". *Discourse on Nature and Culture: Course Packet*. CDE, TU M. Phil, 2015-016. Print.
- Taylor, Paul W. "Respect of Nature." *Environmental Ethics: An introduction with Readings*. Ed. John Benson. Rutledge, 2000. 351-359. Print.
- White, L. Jr. "The Historical Roots of Our Ecological Crisis". *Science*. Vol. 155. N. 3767. 10 March 1967, 1203-1207. Print.
- Wolfe, Cary. *Animal Rites: American Culture, the Discourse of Species, and Post-humanist Theory*. University of Chicago P, 2003. Print.