

Západočeská univerzita v Plzni

Fakulta pedagogická

Bakalářská práce

**HUCKLEBERRY FINN:
MARKOVA TWAINOVA KRITIKA „SIVILIZACE“**

Michaela Hofrajterová

Plzeň 2012

University of West Bohemia

Faculty of Education

Undergraduate Thesis

**HUCKLEBERRY FINN:
MARK TWAIN'S CRITICISM OF "SIVILIZATION"**

Michaela Hofrajterová

Plzeň 2012

Tato stránka bude ve svázané práci Váš původní formulář *Zadání bak. práce*

(k vyzvednutí u sekretářky KAN)

Prohlašuji, že jsem práci vypracoval/a samostatně s použitím uvedené literatury a zdrojů informací.

V Plzni dne 27. dubna 2012

.....

Jméno Příjmení

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank the supervisor of my undergraduate thesis, Brad Vice, Ph.D. for his help and also my parents for their patience .

ABSTRACT

Hofrajterová, Michaela. University of West Bohemia. April, 2012. *Huckleberry Finn: Mark Twain's Criticism of "Sivilization"*.
Supervisor: Brad Vice, Ph. D.

The object of this thesis is to show, within the criticism of society depicted in the *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*, the hypocrisy and the groundless superiority of the white inhabitants of the Southern areas of the United States to Negroes. On the following pages I am going to illustrate that the Southern pseudo-aristocracy, the devout or common white people had no reasons to consider unbelievers or Negroes to be subordinate to them.

The whole work is divided into several sections. The first one briefly focuses on the crucial moments in Mark Twain's life. It depicts the change of Twain's viewing of the institution of slavery, from the boyhood days when he regarded it as a commonplace, to his days spend with the Langdon family when he felt pangs of conscience because of the existence of slavery. The second section indicates that Twain's criticism could be considered just, as it in many cases reflects the real persons and the real events. The next sections deal with the so-called aristocracy and its alleged superiority to common people, the inhumane institution of slavery, the approach to Negroes and various "myths" enabling the whites to deny the humanity of the slaves, the religion and its role in the days of slavery and the hypocrisy of the believers. The sixth section shows the morality of whites and compares it to the morals of Jim and Huck. The final section focuses on the criticism of mob and lynching and illustrates the cruelty of the whites.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	1
Mark Twain’s Life.....	4
Connection between Huckleberry Finn and Criticized Society.....	8
Criticism of “Sivilization”	
Aristocracy.....	11
Slavery, Racism.....	13
Religion, Conscience and Hypocrisy.....	22
Morals.....	27
Mob and Lynching.....	37
Conclusion.....	40
Bibliography.....	43

Introduction

The *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* has always been considered to be one of the America's most controversial books. It has been banned, reworked with replacement of certain words and many critiques have argued about the meaning of its legacy. Someone claims it is a racist book, as for instance a teacher at the Mark Twain Intermediate School in Northern Virginia, John H. Wallace who in "The Case against Huck Finn" states that it is the most grotesque example of racist trash ever written (Leonard, Tenney, and Davis 16). On the other hand, many authors as well as Professor of English, Shelley Fisher Fishkin, believe it is an anti-racist book: "Twain presents a devastating critique of the racism of a society that classifies Jim as less than human," she says and adds that the book, *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* is, "An important weapon in the ongoing battle against racism" (PBS). It is not for me to judge who is right, but it seems sad that the book which is written by the man who used to live in a slaveholding society, loved to spend his time with the slaves on the farm of his uncle and later was remorseful because of the wrong whites did Negroes and supported them, as stated below, is being accused of being racist. And sadder thing is that most of the people consider it racist just because it contains over two hundred words "nigger".

However why the book has been so controversial? In the time of its publication it was mainly because of the fact, that in the post-war South the racial prejudices and the approach toward former slaves still had not changed. Professor of Literature at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Alan Nadel illustrates this fact in his book *Invisible Criticism* when saying, "As the free black in the South, after the war as much as before, knew, the best way to loose a legal right was to try to exercise it; the best way to guarantee oppression was to display freedom"(14). The people in South simply did not want to understand the fact that the Negro, their former property, should have the same rights as they have. Furthermore, the thirteenth and the fourteenth amendment caused that the Negroes could theoretically be as educated and wealthy as the whites, and may be one day, they could perform better positions than the whites. As visible in Nadel's book, it was the thing the whites were afraid of: "Southern whites feared, according to Ranson and Sutch, that their social position in Southern society would be eroded by the existence of educated, independent, landowning blacks. They feared, in short, that the Negro might not prove to be inferior"(qtd. in Nadel 9). And does not Twain depict very similar reaction to Negroes in chapter six, where Pap Finn feels offended by the fact there lives a Negro who is richer, well educated

and has better position in society than he himself and moreover, he is allowed to vote as well as the whites? We can feel the indignation in his speech when he says, “He was a p'fessor in a college, and could talk all kinds of languages, and knowed everything. And that ain't the wust. They said he could VOTE when he was at home. Well, that let me out. Thinks I, what is the country a-coming to?”(Twain 38). This passage precisely points to the disinclination of whites to let the former slaves live their way and to accept their rights in the post-war period. In addition, the book provokes hypocritical Southern “aristocracy” considering itself to be the best part of the society, when it totally ridicules aristocracy’s excessive sense of honour by showing the absurdity of its feuds. Moreover, Twain mocks at its belief of the superiority over other people and skilfully shows the antithesis between this belief and the behaviour and moral qualities of the “aristocracy”, as mentioned below. Finally, what was the most disquieting was the fact the book was a sequel of *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer*, a book popular with children. And even the Jesuits knew the best way to destroy the opponents was to influence their children. No wonder the book was being banned. As Professor of Humanities, Sanford Pinsker in his essay “Huckleberry Finn and the Problem of Freedom” says, “Well meaning members of Concord (Mass.) Public Library committee decided to exclude the book from its shelves on the ground that the story was, in their words, 'trashy and vicious!.'” But later he explains, “What they was worried about, between the words of their carefully crafted objections, is that Twain’s novel would corrupt the young - of Concord and, presumably points west and south (Bloom 68). For instance, if the children of South realized the slaves are good and feeling people and decided to treat them as equal beings would the institution of slavery be still able to exist?

However, even today one hundred and twenty-seven years after its publication, the criticism of society in the *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* still pains both whites, when showing their hypocrisy and Negroes when reminding them of slavery and their former status. And it should be noted that it will still cause pain to people until there exist such things as hypocrisy, racism, rapacity and haughtiness.

In the *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*, the society is depicted from uncommon point of view. The lowest persons of society, Huck without proper Christian education and upbringing and escaped slave, a creature not considered to be a human being, are the heroes of the novel. In addition, they both exhibit much more humanity and rational thinking than other, “nobler” characters of the novel. Twain derides alleged superiority of Southern “aristocracy” and virtuous Christians to people of low birth or low education by

showing, there is no difference in their qualities owing to “title” or religiosity. In the book, “aristocracy” kills people just because of insult, religious persons commit the crimes against humanity and when they do something beneficial to other people it is mainly because they want to go to heaven. On the other hand, Huck and Jim do want to kill nobody, even though many persons harm them. Huck helps others by reason of his compassion for them not because he expects some reward after the death. In the eyes of this little boy, who is not properly “sivilized” and so he does not know what is appropriate to say and thus he judges society only according to his own common sense, is the superstition more logical than Christianity because the later does not make sense to him.

The aim of this thesis is to demonstrate, within the criticized flaws of the “sivilized” society, Twain is not a racist author who mocks at primitiveness of negroes, but on the contrary, that he is trying to show how unfounded and nonsensical the belief of the whites they are superior to Negroes is, as well as the belief of “aristocracy” in their superiority to common people, and the conviction of believers that regular praying and churchgoing make them more virtuous than the rest of the population. Clearly, that it depends neither on the class you were born to nor on the colour of your skin nor on the religion you worship whether you are virtuous and good person or not. In other words, that being “aristocratic” or religious person is not synonymous with being honest and morally excellent. All people were born equal and it is the influence of the society which shapes them to humiliated slaves or lofty aristocrats. The only thing which makes people different is good or evil heart.

Mark Twain's Life

It is very important to be familiar with Mark Twain's family, hometown, opinions and his life as all these aspects had influenced his literary work. Both the society of the time of his childhood and the events which happened to him are reflected in the *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*. The depiction of his life provides us with adequate draft of shape of the society of that age and also the life story of a boy who was not born to high society, attended school only until he was twelve and the church did not inspire confidence in him yet still, he was a good, sympathetic and more morally excellent than the literary critics and the snobs of the upper class who initially scorned him.

John M. Clemens and Jane Clemens nurtured little Sam to become a good Presbyterian. He attended Sunday school and church services but as his daughter Susy wrote, he did not like it very much: "Grandma couldn't make papa go to school [and]... how readily would [he] pretend to be dying so as not to have to go to school" (Twain, *My Autobiography* 54). And as Twain's father's stance on the church in general was not very good, little Sam instead of going to the church would rather play with other boys outside. Not surprisingly, as Twain was getting older, his approach to the religious institutions became quite distrustful and lasted for his whole life. Twain did not believe in miracles of Saints etc. and regarded religious institutions rather as a kind of business as illustrated in e.g. in *Life on the Mississippi*.

He spent his childhood in Hannibal which served as a model to many towns in his books. Mark Twain describes it as sleepy town with slaves: "In the small town of Hannibal, Missouri ...we lived in a slaveholding community... However, there was nothing about the slavery of the Hannibal region to rouse one's dozing human instincts to activity" (*M. T.'s Autobiography* 124).

It was really sleepy town on the bank of the Mississippi river which awoke along just with arrival of the steamboats and so every boy in this town dreamt about becoming a pilot of such steamboat. But before was Twain able to make his desire come true, he worked as typesetter at *Hannibal Courier*, after he had to stop studying because of the death of his father. Two years later he started to co-operate with his brother Orion who founded new journal called *Western Union*. This foreshadowed his future job.

In the journal office he knew about all important events which happened in the town. For instance, Samuel typeset announcements, advertisements and columns about missing slaves, about slaves' abnormalities and crimes they committed. The role of the

newspaper was very significant at that time as it supported the slavery in Southern areas. Terrell Dempsey, the attorney from Hannibal, Mo. in *Searching for Jim* claims, “The papers also kept people informed on the value of their human stock by reporting prices and trends across the country. Beyond their importance to the economics of slavery, newspapers fulfilled another function ... They churned out a constant stream of racist propaganda that perpetuated and supported slavery” (Dempsey 159). This brought Sam much wider awareness of slave community he lived in. Furthermore, his later employment in other various journals e.g. *Muscatine Journal* or *Daily Post* provided him with experiences for his writings.

Later, when travelling to New Orleans he decided to become a steamboat pilot. This job was also of great benefit to Twain. Faultless knowledge of the Mississippi river, new experiences, heard stories and numerous encounters with various types of personalities from fraudsters to high society, those are the aspects which were of great importance to creation of the *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*.

As soon as the civil war began the traffic along the Mississippi river stopped. Firstly Samuel joined the Confederate States Army, but after two weeks he ascertained that it is foolish to die for nothing and deserted. The next period of his life took place in Nevada where Samuel worked with Orion at political field, as prospector and as contributor of articles for the *Virginia City Territorial Enterprise* where he used the pen name Mark Twain for the first time. Then he travelled to San Francisco, Hawaiian Islands, New York and in 1867 to Europe as the correspondent of journal *Alta California*. On the boat sailing to Europe he beheld the picture of his future wife Olivia Langdon.

Although Mark Twain was raised in the family which used to possess slaves and was in favour of slavery his views on this institution deeply changed while living with Olivia. In his childhood, slavery seemed to him natural as he says in *My Autobiography*:

...I had no aversion to slavery. I was not aware that there was anything wrong about it. No one arraigned it in my hearing; the local papers said nothing against it; the local pulpit taught us that God approved it, that it was a holy thing, and that the doubter need only look in the Bible if he wished to settle his mind--and then the texts were read aloud to us to make the matter sure;...(129).

However this lax view on slavery disappeared together with newly gained experience from travelling and with the sojourn in the North at the Langdons and their friends.

The Langdon family resided in Elmira, New York, and belonged to the wealthy, devout and conservative ones. The father of Olivia, Jervis Langdon was republican and he was fighting against the slavery. Thanks to him Mark Twain had the opportunity to meet many eminent personalities e.g. Harriet Beecher Stowe, William Dean Howells or Frederick Douglass, who also influenced his opinions, convictions and stance on life, slavery and society in general.

The older and wiser he was, the more he realized inhumanity of slavery and felt sorry about former slaves in South. He had been full of remorse for everything since his childhood and the matter of the institution of slavery was no exception. He criticized it in his books, articles, performances, helped African-Americans to study at Lincoln University and he even financed the studies of black boy at the Yale University. Later Twain explained it, "I do not believe I would very cheerfully help a white student...but I do not feel so about the other color. We have ground the manhood out of them and the shame is ours, not theirs, and we should pay for it" (*twainquotes*).

After the marriage with Olivia Langdon the couple moved to Hartford, Connecticut. Since he had lived with Livy the life was great. Gradually, they had three daughters, a wonderful big house, their mutual relationship was harmonious, his books brought him fame and he became noted and respected author.

That time he felt truly happy, but a couple of slight incidents disrupted his bliss and slowly brought him into pessimistic moods. It was the start of the dismal period. Firstly, after a sensation called *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer* his career seemed to be on the decline as he had written no successful books for a long time. From 1875 to 1880, he did not finish any significant work and he was afraid that his creativity was exhausted and the profession of writer was slowly going to end. Secondly he tried to write two plays *Ah Sin* and *Simon Wheeler Detective* which were not very good. And finally he found himself in embarrassing situation because of his speech about Longfellow, Holmes and Emerson at the birthday celebration of John Whittier in 1877 (Stawiński 137). The reaction of press was shattering for Twain and worried him very much. He wrote in his autobiography, "During the first year or two after it happened, I could not bear to think of it. My pain and shame were so intense, and my sense of having been an imbecile so settled, established and confirmed, that I drove the episode entirely from my mind..."(Twain 259).

In 1881 Twain's self confidence was restored by publishing *Prince and Pauper*. One year later he sailed down the Mississippi river and returned to Hannibal to recall his piloting days, because of intention to write another piece *Life on the Mississippi*. It seems that one short visit of the region of his boyhood days provided him with plenitude of inspiration and helped him to finish the *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*, the book he had been working on since 1876.

In that year he had written almost 400 pages and put them into the "drawer". Three years later he started to write again, but he managed to create only chapters XVII and XVIII. Eventually, in 1883 the plot of the book was complete. The edit of the text took Twain almost another year and in 1884 the *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* were finally published. At first in England and Canada, in 1885 in the United States by Mark Twain's company Charles Webster and Co. The book became very popular with people and earned a lot of money. From 1885 to 1960 there was sold over eight millions copies only in America (Stawiński 162).

Connection between Huckleberry Finn and the Criticized Society

Even though a bit modified, the society Twain criticised in the *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* had many features in common with the society of real life and many characters from the book had their living models. In 1895 in the interview for the Portland Oregonian Twain said:

I don't believe an author, good, bad or indifferent, ever lived, who created a character. It was always drawn from his recollection of someone he had known...even when he is making no attempt to draw his character from life, when he is striving to create something different, even then, however ideal his drawing, he is yet unconsciously drawing from memory (*Complete Interviews* 174).

We can speculate about the veracity of this courageous assertion but in Twain's case the statement is evidently true. He was forming the characters of the books according to the real living people either by mixing features of many persons and creating one character or by modifying the real features of people. The persons he met, the stories he heard, the events he experienced, the places he visited, everything is somehow reflected in his work. Therefore we can observe flaws of real society which are later reflected and criticised in Twain's work.

For instance the below mentioned drunkenness of the father of Tom Blankenship, who does not care for the family or the deed of Benson which seemed as bravery to Twain, but it would have been better if it have been a commonplace rather than an exception, those are the things which appear in the *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*. Other aspects of the society Twain well known and depicted them in the book are Quarles' farm full of slaves, the drunkard living in the streets together with hogs, the endeavour of people to belong to aristocracy and last but not least, the shooting of a man just because of one's honour and the fact he is irritating.

Huckleberry Finn was Tom Blankenship in real life. It was a friend of little Samuel when living with family in Hannibal. His way of living with no education and good nature helped Twain to shape Huck as plausible as possible. In *My Autobiography*, Twain says that [Tom] was ignorant, unwashed, insufficiently fed; but he had as good a heart as ever any boy had. His liberties were totally unrestricted. He was the only really independent

person--boy or man--in the community, and by consequence he was tranquilly and continuously happy and envied by the rest of us (215). Tom really did not have to go to school, because his family was poor and there was no public school in Hannibal and so he had a kind of “self upbringing”. However he was good and that is why all the boys wanted to go outside with him, even though their parents did not tolerate it. The difference between Tom Blankenship and Huck was that Tom had parents and seven siblings and even though, Tom’s father was shiftless and often drunk, he was not a model for “Pap Finn”. It was another person living in Hannibal, local drunkard Jimmy Finn who was used in the book as Huckleberry’s father.

But may be, it was a deed of Benson which inspired Twain with the idea of a soft-hearted boy who is not spoiled by the rules of civilized life. Benson Blankenship, the older brother of Tom, did something which impressed itself on Samuel’s memory and later served as an inspiration for the relationship of Huckleberry and escaped slave. While fishing in swamps Ben met fugitive slave. Despite the fact that it was a crime not to return escaped slave, that there was offered a reward for returned slave and that Ben’s family had no money, Ben had decided to help the slave to survive. Nevertheless, later was the slave discovered and while chased in the marshes, attempting to cross the river he drowned. Even though he was not saved, the moral lesson of this event probably remained forever in Twain’s mind.

Jim, the slave escaping together with Huck was in fact the slave of Samuel’s uncle, John Quarles. From the age of four to twelve, Samuel used to spend few months a year there. As John Quarles owned about fifteen to twenty Negroes Sam came into the contact with them quite often. Soon he got acquainted with their rituals, speaking manners and their nature and gradually got to like them. One of them called “Uncle Dan’l” was a friend of children, especially little Samuel. He was “faithful and affectionate good friend, ally and adviser...whose sympathies were wide and warm, and whose heart was honest and simple and knew no guile,” wrote Twain in *My Autobiography* (129). May be just through the relationship with Daniel, Samuel gained warm feelings about Negroes. Later he stated, “The black face is as welcome to me now as it was then” (*My Autobiography* 129)

The relative of Twain’s mother, Jesse Leathers was a living prove of the desire of people to belong to aristocracy. Just as many persons in America purported they are Louis XVII, the lost son of French king, Jesse believed he descends from old aristocratic family and called himself Earl of Durham. Whole his life he was abortively trying to get his heritage and died poor.

Finally, the event which happened in Hannibal gives the evidence about the excessive emphasis on honour in South. A proud man called William Owsley shot cattleman Samuel Smarr because Smarr slandered him openly in the street. Little Sam Clemens witnessed it and later used it in chapter twenty-one of the *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*. Here, the incident is quite authentically depicted just the names were changed to Sherburn and Boggs.

In brief, we can say that the criticism of “sivilization” by Twain is justified. He criticized the society he knew well and used for that purpose basis of real events and real characteristics of living persons. It follows that the *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* is valuable picture of the life and demeanour of antebellum slave community.

Criticism of “Sivilization”

Aristocracy

“The South was dignified, traditionalist, social stratification had stabilized seemingly forever, and nobody questioned feudal hierarchy. The beautiful residences of rich planters surrounded with lawn and flower beds, multitude of magnolias, elder and mimosas, resembled castles of French aristocracy before the revolution ...”, that is how Julian Stawiński, the writer and translator describes the South and its “aristocracy” in his book *Mark Twain* (10). He also speaks about ladies in brocade dresses, spending their time by embroidering and about gentlemen as elegant and courtly as the marquises, whose “Conversation maybe was not so glittering, perhaps they had also some difficulties with grammar, but their sense for honour, when speaking about ladies and gambling debts, was highly developed ... and so the duels took place on daily basis” (10). It was the “aristocracy” which was trying to imitate the aristocracy of romantic world of Sir Walter Scott’s work. Its wealth originated mainly in slavery and land, the education was not of great importance to them and their cruelty was hidden behind the disguise of the sense of honour.

This is the depiction of the class regarded as the top of the society; society wherein common people desired to count among the aristocracy. Many of those people were claiming they are the true Dauphin or that their family used to be aristocratic one. However, why? Does the fact someone is of noble birth signify he or she is good, virtuous, intellectually or morally higher? Is “The Grangerford family, representing the best of the Old South’s society, the world created by the image of Sir Walter Scott” (Leonard, Tenney, and Davis 211) somehow better than the rest of the population? Are they real aristocrats? In *The Medievalist Impulse in American Literature*, a book of Kim I. Moreland, Professor of English at The George Washington University, we can find the truth which is that, “With their tacky parlor and bad poetry, are [the Grangerfords], as Robert Lowrey points out, ‘Obviously only imitations of sophisticated culture whose feet of clay show through the facade’”(Moreland 44). Really, the poetry and drawings of Emmeline Grangerford with intended pathos seems rather ridiculous than touching or refined. The statement of Robert Lowrey is veracious, because when talking about “aristocracy” in America, we refer to rich and powerful families with no privileges or titles granted by state as the Constitution of the United States excludes formal aristocracy. The “aristocracy” in America just imitated genteel manners of English aristocracy, but in fact

they were ordinary low people which only became wealthy. In reality, they were flawed and spoilt as well as the common people. The opinion of Professor of English at Brown University, Charles H. Nichols characterizes this social class precisely when he says in his essay “A True Book with Some Stretches: Huck Finn Today”, that [the *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*] was rightly perceived as an attack on the values of genteel America- its pseudoaristocratic pretensions, its primitive religion, and its absurd boasts of Confederate “honor” (Leonard, Tenney, and Davis 210). It is possible to find all those features in the Grangerford family. In spite of the fact that the Grangerfords act really respectfully and courteously to each other, they do not hesitate to kill other persons just because of the reason none of them remembers. The father is proud, his fourteen years old son called Buck, nearly shot dead other person, but also he is a bit disappointed, as the son shot from hiding place instead of standing vis-à-vis his enemy. Although the father of Grangerford family loves Buck and other sons, he let them die in senseless feud. All these things happen because of extremely developed sense of honour of Southern “aristocracy”. Moreover both the Grangerford as well as the Shepherdson families are believers. When going home from the church, the place of peace where they sit with the guns ready for the next potential battle, the Grangerfords admits the sermon about brotherly love was a good one and as Huck says, “They all talked it over going home, and had such a powerful lot to say about faith and good works and free grace and preforeordination ...”(142). Nevertheless, only one day after the preaching about brotherly love and speaking about good works, the Grangerfords want to kill young man of the Shepherdson family because he is in love with their daughter. Where is the “Thou shalt love thy neighbour” then? It seems the preacher was not persuasive enough as the sermon had evidently no effect. In chapter eighteen, we finally realize what Stawiński means when talking about “fictive religiousness” of this pseudo-aristocracy (167) as there is description of the church full of hogs lying on the floor because they feel good here and Huck appositely notes that most folks don't go to church only when they've got to; but a hog is different (Twain 143). Many hypocritical people often go to church so that every one of their neighbour and also the preacher know they are decent Christians. But it has nothing to do with their inner belief, because the genuine Christian who believes in God, heaven and hell should not be able to kill anyone.

Slavery, Racism

In 1840, the time of Twain's boyhood, there lived 383,702 inhabitants in Missouri out of them 58,240 were slaves (Dempsey 9). It was believed slavery is something blessed, given by God and almost nobody had any doubts about it. If so, the Bible was the instrument providing people with logical explanations why is that so. Moreover, people were persuaded Negroes were inferior to the white race and slavery is good for them. For instance, George Fitzhugh, pro-slavery author and social theorist in his essay, "The Universal Law of Slavery", claims that the Negroes are not capable to survive in free society and that the institution of slavery protects them from extermination. He continues with the statement that, "The Negro slaves of the South are the happiest, and, in some sense, the freest people in the world," and demonstrates this theory on several examples of relaxed regimen of Negro children, women and men. In comparison with Fitzhugh, Twain calls Southern plantations to be "hell" in his autobiography and speaks about chained Negroes waiting for ship to the Southern slave market and adds, "Those were the saddest faces I had ever seen" (*My Twain's Aut.*, 124). The institution of slavery is especially delicate subject to Mark Twain and so the criticism of slavery and racism infuses the whole book.

Firstly Twain criticizes the mistreatment and attitude to slaves. The stance towards slaves, no matter if the persons are "aristocratic" or godly, is perfectly visible in chapter forty-two and seventeen. When Jim, the main slave depicted in the story and property of Miss Watson, Huck and Tom are escaping from Phelps' farm Tom is wounded. The doctor, who was sent to the place where is Tom located, is trying to rescue him but he needs aid. Jim concealed from local people decides to help the doctor even though he knows he will be captured again. On the farm both Jim's hands and legs are chained and he is incarcerated in an old cabin. People are angry, beat and berate him and Jim is promised to be given only bread and water until his owner comes. When the doctor praises Jim for the help and good behaviour, men appreciate it and undertake not to swear at Jim anymore. But that is all. Jim remains chained, locked and receives just bread and water. Even though Jim acted honourably and saved children's lives, still he is only a Negro.

Miss Watson, godly person, is treating Jim quite harsh as Jim says, "...she pecks on me all de time, en treats me pooty rough" (Twain 57). Nevertheless she has at least promised Jim not to sell him to New Orleans. However, she later breaks her word and wants to sell him. Even though Jim was unhappy at Miss Watson as he had been separated

from his family, he knew everything is better than the life of slave in the South and so he was unresisting to her treatment. So evidently, it was the fear of cruel behaviour of masters in South which forced him to escape when discovering Miss Watson's intentions, not the lack of respect or obedience as would white people often think as illustrated in chapter thirty-one, where Huck claims that [Miss Watson] would be mad and disgusted at [Jim's] rascality and ungratefulness for leaving her ...(Twain 270).

Furthermore, the adversity which happened to Jim occurs again in the Wilks episode. The Dauphin, who is also called the king, sells Negroes of Wilks family. Two sons are taken to Memphis and their mother to Orleans. In the book, Mary Jane Wilks is sad because of the incident, but it is necessary to admit that such separations of the slave families were not uncommon as Professor Michael Tadman, lecturer in economic and social history documents in his book *Speculators and Slaves* when saying, "In 1850's, ...perhaps thirty percent of Missouri slaves sold locally were children under fifteen who were sold without either parent" (397), as the whites believed Negroes do not mind being separated from their family. According to Chancellor Harper of South Carolina, "...Blacks always lacked any real capability for domestic affection and showed insensibility to ties of kindered"(Tadman 213).

In brief, as obvious neither Miss Watson who "behaves in that way so that she can go to heaven", nor well educated doctor or reputable believer Uncle Phelps, treat Jim as well as Huck does. Only Huck is able to see Jim as friend, kind- hearted human being and treats him as if Jim was equal to him. Also the "aristocracy" did not treat the slaves well. Although it is not possible to deduce the attitude to slaves in "aristocratic" family of Grangerfords from the book, the fact they own over one hundred slaves is sufficient. Everyone knows the condition on farms with large number of slaves were much worse than those of slaves working in household. The work of slaves and ownership of land were the main sources of Southern so-called aristocracy's wealth and so it is hard to imagine the slaves working in fields as fast as possible without whip of overseer.

Secondly, Twain points to racial prejudices people usually had against Negroes. There existed popular myths about Negroes which were universally applied to all slaves. For instance, people assumed Negroes were meant to be creatures serving mainly for hard work. According to the politician from South Carolina and the U.S. Senator, James Henry Hammond , the Negro is "A race inferior to [Southern white men], but eminently qualified in temper, in vigor, in docility, in capacity to stand the climate, to answer all purposes [of South]". Also, it was believed Negroes are inferior to the white race, which among others

signified they are more stupid, morally lower and unfeeling. Michael Tadman documents it when saying, “Proslavery literature and the magazines and prints of antebellum South generally were ...persistently arguing for innate black laziness, inferior intellectual capacity, and natural promiscuity and instability in family and sexual matters” (212).

And so we cannot be surprised that when Jim weeps because he misses his family Huck on his own comes to a conclusion that Negro Jim cared just as much for his people as white folks does for their'n, and adds that it don't seem natural, but [he] reckon it's so (Twain 196). In a similar way Huck confronts his adopted knowledge of stupidity of Negroes in chapter fourteen and concludes that in spite of the fact Jim is a Negro, he is quite clever. It seems to him Jim must be exceptional slave because Huck knows slaves are generally considered as primitive and his Jim can apparently deliberate about things quite reasonably. However, what is the indicator of stupidity? Is a sagacious person who is able to use his or her common sense stupid just because he or she does not know who the Shakespeare is? In fact slaves came from a culture very different from American. Moreover they were not allowed to be educated, to be taught to read and write and so it is obvious they did not shared general knowledge of white people. But does it signify they are stupid? How about the Negro professor who was allowed to study mentioned in chapter six then? And similarly when talking about the “instability in family matters”, it is important to say, it is foolish to asses the approach of Negroes to family matters while they are enslaved in the surroundings unnatural to them and judge it in compliance with American norms. Furthermore, Twain on the character of Jim and the Wilks slaves obviously shows, the Negroes cared about their families a lot. When we consider the way Jim regrets hitting his little daughter years ago and how Pap Finn regrets beating Huck, it is pretty different, is not it? Pap Finn wants Huck's money that is why he returns to get him back, but Jim remembers his family almost daily and wants to get money to redeem them. Similarly it is possible to observe that Negroes feel love for family members as intensively as the whites in Dempsey's *Searching for Jim*:

In Hannibal, Franklin Harriman encountered a scene he remembered all his life. He observed a coffle of slave marched onto a riverboat ...As the boat pulled away, a Negro drayman came running to the riverfront. His wife was among the slaves being sold South. The drayman screamed and cried inconsolably as the steamboat chugged past Lover's Leap and dissapeared downriver. Harriman recorded that he had never seen such agony (97-98).

Is it possible then, to believe that the Negroes does not care so much about their family as claimed in Tadman's book: "As for the[Negro] husband, he mattered little, showing ' a feeble and capricious love of his wife and indifference to his offspring'"(215)? No, it is only one of the many white myths proving the rightness of white people's superiority to this low "animals".

However the most paradoxical situation, which disproves Negroes are morally low, arrives when Jim refuses to continue down the river because he wants to rescue Tom Sawyer. Huck is happy about Jim's right decision and the fact his belief, Jim is warm-hearted person, affirmed and says that he knew Jim was black only externally and "white inside" (Twain 350). Jim sacrifices his freedom to Tom, a boy from good family, who has been making fun of him, lying to him and endangering his life just for childish adventure. The lost hope of freedom and of family reunion is here in contrast with the game of white boy, maybe future master of another slave. Popular opinion about the low morals of Negroes did not proved. That is why Huck claims Jim is white inside, he simply wants to say Jim is good. However, there are not many white people in the *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* who would have behaved the same way as Jim did. Far from it, no white person in the book exhibits such empathy and patience with the boys as Jim. When we look at the way Widow Douglass and Miss Watson are trying to "sivilize" Huck and compare it with Jim's genial approach and real love to the boy, without any attempt to change Huck's personality, it is completely different. Jim behaves like caring father unlike his legitimate white father.

In summary, Twain disproves the beliefs Negroes are morally and intellectually lower, lazy and instable in "family matters". Just because Jim's skin is black it does not mean he is somehow inferior. On the contrary, it transpires he is neither morally low as the Grangerfords and Colonel Sherburn who killed people or the con men yearning for money, nor lazy and stupid as white Pap Finn or the rustics from Arkansas. Even though Negroes' skin is black, they are superstitious and their social status is as low as possible still in many cases they behave better than white "aristocracy" and the devout. The Uncle Daniel or good old Aunt Hannah from Quarles' farm mentioned below, the Negro professor in chapter six or the black students studying at universities Twain supported, were the living proves of this statement.

All the more so incomprehensible is the fact that Negro was often even not considered to be human being. It is graphically illustrated in chapter thirty-two where Huck

arrives to Phelps' farm. He explains to Aunt Sally he is belated for the cylinder-head on the steamboat had broken. Aunt Sally is frightened and cares if someone has been injured. Huck answers, "No'm. Killed a nigger" (Twain 281). The reaction of Aunt Sally is much more shocking than the one of Huck. She feels relieved and says that ... it's lucky; because sometimes people do get hurt (Twain 281). It denotes Negroes are not people to Aunt Sally and even Huck knows well if he mentions in his story a Negro died, instead of white person, there won't be any other questions about the incident.

The evidence of such "inhuman" perception of Negroes could be also found in the period articles in the newspapers, where were among others published information about genetic peculiarities and curiosities of newborn slaves in a similar way as a cattle breeder's showpiece. Dempsey in his book publishes one of these articles. It says, "A Negro woman belonging to Capt. John D. Moss, of Grand Pass, in Saline Country, was delivered of three fine wealthy children at single birth. They are all boys, and are likely to live and do well" (200). It is totally humiliating approach to human being to write about he or she in the newspaper article without mentioning his or her name. The owner's name is the only name mentioned there. Here it is possible to observe the cruelty of white people. It is true the church claimed that the slavery is approved by God and supported it with certain texts of the Bible. However, anybody told people neither slaves are not human beings nor that they should be beaten, whipped or even killed because of disobedience, slow work or being insulting to white person. No one told them to treat Negroes like livestock. Terrell Dempsey claims that according to *Priest's Bible Defence of Slavery* such cruelty was allowed: "Under the curse of Ham theory, cruelty to black slaves was fully justified. The black race was serving a sentence imposed by ...God. Accordingly, a slave could be lashed, chained, or sold away from his family ..." (73), but still nobody told people they should be cruel to their slaves. The "morally superior" white people invented such things as the theory that "... African Americans do not experience pain in the same fashion as other human beings" (Dempsey 200), or the above mentioned myth about the "instability in family and sexual matters". On the myth about "family matters" Tadman shows how useful such myths were:

This almost universal racism could theoretically have led to one of two main outcomes- a tendency to protect "innately weak" black families and institutions, or, on the other hand, a tendency for the majority to exploit the myth that only "temporary hardships" occurred when families were wrecked

or arbitrarily disturbed by masters. Despite the layers of myth which the Old South generated to make itself comfortable at home and acceptable abroad, the trade shows that the second tendency was clearly dominant. In effect, the vast bulk of the Old South's literary output on the black "character", family, and "amalgamation" ingeniously constructed a framework of fable whereby masters could both separate families whenever they wished and regarded themselves as paternalists whatever they did (212).

So the people themselves invented fable about instability of Negroes in family matters but instead of protecting and supporting family attachment of slaves, the whites abused such myths to their own profit. How simple! Which means that there might have been a clever "godly" author who invented the distorted theory of cursed race, as stated below, but the people were those who followed it and "improved" the rules of slave "breeding" with considerable amount of violence and cruelty.

In fact, in the *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* there is one short passage which inconspicuously indicates the slaves behave the same way as the whites. Therefore there should be neither superiority of white men nor the difference in understanding of black and white race. In negligible depiction of arrival of Huck on Phelps' farm in chapter thirty-two it is possible to observe the same behaviour of white and Negro children. The slave woman comes in the courtyard and from behind her dress peep out little Negro children. In a moment there arrives a white woman and white children peep out from behind her dress identically. Those children act exactly the same way as the black ones. It illustrates there is no difference in their mentality or logic. Therefore it must be true Negroes are as well human beings as the whites and without establishment of institution of slavery and then the backing of religion, white persons could not feel superior. In simple terms, both the whites and the Negroes should be treated equally.

On the other hand, to avoid distorted portrayal of slaves Twain epitomizes not only the positive attributes of Negroes. However it does not mean he belittles Negroes' values or somehow disparages their qualities as John H. Wallace thinks. He believes that *Huckleberry Finn* is an American classic for no other reason than that it ridicules blacks to greater extent than any other book given our children to read (Leonard, Tenney, and Davis 23). The following paragraphs will demonstrate the opposite is true.

On the character of Jim, Twain demonstrates Negroes' superstition and wisdoms originating in their connection with nature, curative procedures and also their occasional

obstinacy. The superstition of slaves is clearly visible through the whole story. For instance, in chapter thirty-four there is a slave who should feed imprisoned Jim. He has threads snarled in his hair which serve as a protection against spells of witches. No matter how it seems fictional, it is a detail from Twain's boyhood days. In *My Autobiography* he writes about a Negro woman called Aunt Hannah from the Quarles' farm. "Whenever witches were around," he says, "she tied up the remnant of her wool in little tufts, with white thread, and this promptly made the witches impotent"(129). Jim is also superstitious. He possesses a hair ball of a stomach of an ox and thinks he can foresee a future. When Huck is afraid of his father he asks Jim for help but Jim prophesies him just general things similar to a weather forecast. Next Tom and Huck are making fun of Jim while they are escaping out of the house of Widow Douglass and hang his hat on the branch of the tree under which Jim sleeps. After Jim wakes up he believes the witches were riding him whole night all around the world. Gradually he becomes proud of the event, fabricates new circumstances of the trip and starts to believe he has the power to cure. It may seem funny to Christians who do not believe such fairy tales, but just because they find it laughable it does not mean Twain ridicules beliefs of Negroes. Moreover, is not it the same thing as miracles the devout believe in? Does not it resemble the assertion of Christians who have seen the Holy Virgin or God, who told them what to do or cured their cancer? However, in the forest on Jackson's Island it proves Jim's superstitions are not completely senseless as only three days after Huck touches the snake skin the disaster happens and Huck promises to believe Jim next time. But is not it only a coincidence? Just suggestion? Nevertheless, does not it work on the same principle on which the Christianity has been based? Because, is it miracle when someone prays to God for the recovery of the grandmother and she recovers? Or is it just combination of good job of the doctors, willpower of the grandmother, and contentment of the person he or she did something to help her? And still the whites were trying to inculcate Negroes with Christianity. Is not it absurd? It is like to tell the Negroes that the "fairy tale" they believe in is primitive and meaningless. Therefore they are morally and intellectually low if they are able to believe in such things. That is why now they are going to believe in white fairy tale of white people, which is much better than theirs. Thus when Uncle Phelps claims the witches do not exist as Nat says to Tom and Huck, "Please to don't tell nobody 'bout it sah, er ole Mars Silas he'll scole me; 'kase he say dey AIN'T no witches" (Twain 301), it is the same situation as if Negroes scold Uncle Silas for believing in "his" God and told him, God does not exist as nobody has ever seen him. Simply, how can Christians think their belief is superior to others?

Another feature typical of Jim is captured in chapter fourteen. There is a dialogue between Huck and Jim illustrating the fact that Jim is unsophisticated, quite obstinate and solves each problem with his own logic and common sense. For instance, he is not able to admit the Solomon's decision, to settle the dispute of two women over a baby by cutting it into two pieces, was wise. He simply cannot understand the theoretical meaning of the verdict and still repeats that to cut a baby into two pieces would be bad. In a similar way he argues with Huck about foreign languages. Why should French speak French and Americans English even though both French and Americans are people? But still he exhibits more sagacity, wit and rational thinking than Pap Finn or the people from small towns deceived by the king and the duke.

The last attribute of Jim is his imagination and inclination to exaggeration. It can be observed for example in chapter fifteen where Huck makes fun of Jim, pretending they have never separated in the fog and that it was just a nightmare of Jim. Jim starts to retell Huck what happened in the dream but he "painted it up considerable" and immediately tries to interpret it as bad at good omens.

However what is Negroes' inclination to exaggeration, to superstition or to obstinacy in comparison with white persons' hypocrisy, selfishness and cruelty. Those "flaws" of slaves may look comical in the book, but they have nothing to do with moral degeneracy, whereas, those of whites are rather lamentable. Ultimately, the Negroes unspoilt by civilization, its deceit, duplicity and rapacity are morally better than their "virtuous" masters. Of course there were also the slaves who killed their masters or families, but who is to blame? Who knows about working or living conditions they had to bear?

In brief, Twain criticizing the society endeavours to be objective if possible. Even though, the Negroes in the *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* are depicted mostly in positive way as Twain had warm feelings about them and believed that "... They actually constitute a part of nature and only nature is not morally bad"(Stawiński 169), he also demonstrated their less attractive characteristic- to make plausible image of society. Therefore, it would be wrong to say Twain mocks at primitiveness of Negroes by showing their superstition or some of their negative features. Moreover, the superstition of Negroes and lower class might seemed stupid to educated people, but in fact it partially originate in European Christian legends as emerges from Stawiński's example of the approach to snakes in African voodoo, where the snake is admired and in Christianity, where is the snake something people should be afraid of, some kind of devil. So the rich people, writers and

scientists from Hartford, who preferred rational thinking to all kinds of witchcraft because it is just for coloured wretches, (Stawiński 30) as a matter of fact partially and unconsciously, spurned also the Christianity.

Religion, Conscience and Hypocrisy

The religion has always been a tool by means of which people have been able to comfort their desperation, affliction, worries and which provided them with hope in the worst times of their lives. But on the other hand, in the hands of wise persons who needed to influence people's minds and opinions it could have changed into powerful weapon very easily. The hypocritical speeches of the Senator Albert Beveridge and the President William McKinley, persuading the people about the rightness of the "help" to the Philippines, should be convincing enough. Both were trying to make people believe this is the way God wants it. While Albert Beveridge openly stated that God intended the nation of the U.S. to civilize the world (Stawiński 227) McKinley expressed it more cagily.

"Night after night, I walked the floor of my bedroom and I am not ashamed to tell you, that I went down on my knees and prayed Almighty God for light and guidance. When one night, it came to me-I don't know myself, how it happened. I realized that there was nothing left for us to do, but to take all the islands, to educate the Filipinos, civilize them, Christianize them and with the help of God, do everything we can do for those our fellow men for whom Christ also died"(Stawiński 227).

Both William McKinley and Albert Beveridge misused the name of the God to make people support their decisions and opinions, which evidently were given to them by "God". And as God is not here to say what is right or to say somebody misinterpreted the text of Bible, it was easy for church to make Southerners believe slavery is a just institution God endorses, as well as for Beveridge and Kinley to make other people believe it is necessary to "save" and Christianize mostly Christianized Filipinos.

Not surprisingly the religion played very significant role in attitude to slavery and in forming of morality of people in the South. It was the main institution which vindicated and endorsed slavery, mainly by its distorted theories. One of these theories, proving slavery is a just institution, speaks about Negroes as about a cursed race which should serve others. Josiah Priest says in the *Bible Defence of Slavery*, there were three sons of Noah- Ham, Shem and Japheth. Ham was black, Shem was red and the best out of the three sons was Japheth, the white one. Once Ham saw his father naked and told his brothers about it. Noah got angry and cursed Ham's son Cannan to be a "servant of servants unto

his brethren” (Dempsey 69). That is why the servitude of Negroes within the institution of slavery is nothing sinful or immoral. Similar proofs were sufficient to make people think their behaviour towards Negroes is fair and sanctioned by God. Thanks to it, religion planters believed it is a will of God to be superior to Negroes and to “take care of them”. Negroes on the other hand were taught that, “Their servitude had a biblical basis and that to question slavery was to question God Himself “(Dempsey 68). Furthermore, slaves were not allowed to learn read and write and so they were not able to look into the Bible and understand the texts their own way.

As a result, inhabitants of South were confident that slavery is justifiable and fair. It was religion which saved people from feeling pangs of conscience because of having slaves in possession, and which supported violence of bad people when it did not denounced cruel behaviour towards Negroes. Thus cruel people had hypocritical blessing of their bad treatment of slaves and so they did not have to feel guiltily when giving slaves a whipping or killing them. However, even the kindest people such as Uncle Phelps in the *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* or Twain’s good mother Jane had not guilty conscience for having slaves and did not considered the institution of slavery to be reprehensible as Twain illustrates in his autobiography:

... Yet, kind-hearted and compassionate [my mother] was, I think she was not conscious that slavery was a bald, grotesque and unwarrantable usurpation. She had never heard it assailed in any pulpit but she heard it defended and sanctified in a thousand; her ears were familiar with Bible texts that approved it, but if there were any that disapproved it they had not been quoted by her pastors; as far as her experience went, the wise and the good and the holy were unanimous in the conviction that slavery was right, righteous, sacred, the peculiar pet of the Deity, and a condition which the slave himself ought to be daily and nightly thankful for (M. Twain’s *Autobiography* 123).

In the same way Uncle Phelps, who is described in the book as “the innocentest, best old soul” Huckleberry has ever seen and the person who is not just a farmer but also a preacher and “has a little one-horse log church down back of the plantation, which he built it himself at his own expense, for a church and schoolhouse, and never charged nothing for

his preaching...” (Twain 288), owns many slaves and buys and incarcerates Jim without feeling guilty.

It seems, people at that time really trusted their churches and believed the things the preachers said. And so if the Bible approved the slavery they had no reason to ruminate over its rightness. However, is it only the church to blame? Should not people by themselves realize there is something wrong and do something against it? Does not this unquestioningly following of the authorities resemble Tom Sawyer’s approach to the life? Is not the trust in rightness of slavery just on the basis of Biblical consent with it, similar to the belief of Tom Sawyer who thinks the best way how to do something, is to do it in the manner of European literature which he dogmatically follows without using his own brain and wit? Nevertheless, how could be common people able to use their intellect when even the “aristocracy”, the best of the Southern society, is also not able to use their own reason when following European model of sense of honour described in the books of Sir Walter Scott. For instance, the pseudo-aristocratic family of Grangerfords does not try to stop the gratuitous slaughter even though they do not remember why the feud began. In addition, although they go to church regularly, they also do not feel pangs of conscience for killing so many people and for letting die their own children because it is part of the chivalric tradition to participate in the feuds and to be as brave and remorseless as possible. Conversely, even the “intellectually low” and uneducated Negro Jim uses his brain for instance, when speaking with Huck about languages. Also simple Huck uses his common sense before he starts to act according to tenets someone educated or religious told him. For instance, he does not “succumb” to teachings of Miss Watson and realizes it would not be fair to return Jim. Instead he sacrifices himself for Jim and decides to go to hell. No treat of Christianity will discourage him from helping his friend. Only Huck of low birth, understanding the religion his own way, is able to have a think about the given principles of the society.

Here it is convenient to touch the matter of religious hypocrisy. Its representative is for example Miss Watson, who behaves decently, does good works and together with her sister she tries to rescue and to reform Huck. But does she do it because she is good person or only for her own profit? The behaviour of Miss Watson resembles the behaviour of Negro Nat on the Phelps’ farm, who puts the threads in his hair and makes the witch pie to break free from the spells of the witches. That is the only goal of his endeavour. The goal of Miss Watson’s endeavour - to go to heaven, is more Christian. And so instead of putting threads into her hair she is trying to do good works. She decides to civilize Huck even

though she has no sympathy with him. When Huck says, “Miss Watson she kept pecking at me, and it got tiresome and lonesome (Twain 6), it looks as if Miss Watson was doing just her boring job. She does not care about Huck, she does not exhibits love or warm feelings for him. Instead of receiving gentle explanation of the things, Huck does not understand, he learns only he is “fool”. She does it simply for herself. It seems the Widow probably did not tell her the “secret of good Christian” she revealed to Huck, that is, “[He] must help other people, and do everything [he] could for other people, and look out for them all the time, and never think about [himself] (Twain 17). On the other hand, when Huck in chapter thirteen want to save the lives of criminals on the wreck of the steamboat, he does it mainly because he is compassionate as he even does not understand the notion of reward in form of heaven. In addition, he feels good because he had done something according to the Widow’s teaching and thinks the Widow would be proud of him as “... Rapsallions and dead beats is the kind the widow and good people takes the most interest in” (Twain 97). But why do Christians want to help criminals and bad people to be better? Is not it because they are keen on doing good works to go to heaven? Does not Twain mock here at the Christian desire to help all spoilt people more than any other? When we remember how amusing is the endeavour of the judge to reform Pap Finn in chapter five or the generous contribution of the people at assembly to pirate who suddenly started to be strongly religious, it seems quite probable. After all nobody of the bad characters is reformed, but those people who have tried to help them, feel much better because of good work they did. Twain mocks at the hypocrisy of such Christians through Huck’s and Jim’s morally excellent conduct without understanding of principles of heaven and hell and spiritual gifts.

In conclusion, from the example of Huck and Jim, Twain within the whole book shows it does not matter whether we believe in God and go to church regularly or we worship evil spirits and bad signs, as we do not have to be familiar with Christian doctrines to distinguish what is good, what is bad and how we should behave. All we need to do is to listen to the voice of our heart. Simply, that we do not have to act well just because of fear of the fire of hell. That is the reason why Twain laughs at “virtuous” Christians, organized religion and “Makes fun of prayer and churchgoing ...” (Leonard, Tenney, and Davis 210). Simultaneously Twain illustrates a degeneracy of church and what happens when people blindly trust it. Instead of becoming better persons they become worse as the church disguises and defends such crimes against humanity as the institution of slavery is. So there is no reason to think, “decent” Christians are morally superior to unbelievers or

superstitious Negroes. And when they are not more virtuous is their endeavour to redeem and reform others righteous?

Morals

The morals of people living in Southern parts of the United States became another target of Twain's criticism. Charles H. Nichols speaks about these people as about wicked society, "...Where respectable Christians, bred on the democratic teachings of the Constitution, abuse children, shoot their neighbours in mindless feuds, rob and cheat those weaker than themselves, and enslave the black population"(Leonard, Tenney, and Davis 208).

Twain's *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* can be perceived as an answer to the Southern "myths" about stupid, unfeeling, lazy and morally low Negroes, which both traduced Negroes and vindicated slavery. It appears Twain wanted to ask the Southerners: Who are you to judge someone's intellectual capacity, morality, laziness or stability in family matters? Take a look at yourself. And even though the book was written in the post-war period and criticized the pre-war period, its criticism was still valid as neither the attitude toward slaves nor the morals of the Southerners had changed as stated in the introduction of the thesis. Ill-formed morality, materialism, rapacity, lies, hypocrisy, selfishness, deformed conscience, laziness and obtuseness, those are the main features of the whites he assails.

Firstly, Twain adverts to selfish behaviour of white people. For instance, Pap Finn acts selfishly when forbidding Huck to go to school, church and to live in the widow's house. Pap is so jealous and selfish that even though he realizes it is advantage to be educated and it is good for Huck's future live, he is not able to accept Huckleberry's education and perceives it as if Huck is "putting on airs over his own father" and thinks he is better than Pap (Twain 28). Does not it resemble the endeavour of the whites to keep slaves uneducated and submissive?

In the same way, we can mention the selfish behaviour of the men on the raft in chapter sixteen. As soon as they discover the man on another raft has smallpox they escape. Although they feel sorry for crying Huck who is worried about his "father" Jim, they sail away. In order to save themselves from pangs of conscience, each of them gives Huck twenty dollars and counsels him to go to another town and do not tell anyone what is the matter with his father. Their only aim is to be safe and what is going to happen to Huck, his "father" or to people from another town is not important to them. Another example of selfishness is the conduct of the king and the duke who let Huck and Jim attend

to them. Moreover in chapter twenty, they went to sleep to the wigwam on the raft and left Jim and Huck in the storm outside.

Also Tom Sawyer acts selfishly when pretending he is trying to set Jim free, although he knows Jim has been already freed by Miss Watson. Tom is just playing with Jim and makes him to do the craziest things only because of an amusing adventure. Thus it is possible to say, Tom is going to be a real Southerner when mature. He does not feel sympathy for Jim, regards him as obtuse when he says Jim would not be capable of understanding why he needs to cut his leg off (Twain 305) and mocks at Nat's superstition, even though his own excessive fantasies are much more ridiculous. Also Tom loves adventurous stories full of chivalry and he is not able to use his own brain. He could be an example of genuine and submissive of inhabitant of South, perhaps future master of Negroes, who will accept slavery just because his authorities and "knightly" aristocratic heroes endorse it. One may say that he is still only a child, but Sanford Pinsker indicates what such an admiration of chivalry heroes may cause when he claims, "...Romanticism of the sort behind blood-curling oaths taken by would-be members of Tom Sawyer's gang is one thing; when it generates the ongoing feud of the Shepherdsons and Grangerfords, however, this is another matter altogether" (Bloom 70). So prospectively, little Tom could one day behave the same way as the Grangerfords, who, incidentally, own over one hundred slaves.

Moreover, even though Tom is Huckleberry's friend, he behaves very arrogantly towards Huck as if he was superior to Huck as visible e.g. in chapter thirty-five. Simply he has a tendency to act like a superior master of everyone. On the other hand, Huck is the really good person with the heart full of compassion for others and empathy with Negroes. He is unselfish as he is willing to sacrifice the thing which is the most precious to Christians—"the trip to heaven after death", because of the Negro, as well as he is willing to sacrifice his peace because of the criminals on the wreck. Furthermore, Huck treats Jim as equal, not as a property. Thus he provides the children, as well as the non-Southerner readers of that age, with the example of the equal approach to other human beings, without regard of their colour of skin or social class. This is one of the real legacies of the *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*. As Charles H. Nicholas states, " ...It reaffirms the values of their democratic faith, their celebration of the worthiness of the individual, however poor, ignorant, or despised; [and] it gives them a vision of the possibility of love and harmony in their multiethnic society"(Leonard, Tenney, and Davis 210). That is why Huck should be the example to

future generations. He listens to Jim, is able to admit Jim is right and is able to demean himself by begging Jim for pardon as in chapter fifteen. And what is more, Huck is able to use his common sense instead of stupid following traditions and religious tenets. That is the reason, why the society does not accept his personality and tries to civilize him. He is simply different, and it is obvious that to civilize Huck in fact means forcing him to do the things he does not like to do and changing his way of thinking. Even Tom, does not approve of Huck's "untraditional" way of thinking when he says, "Huck, you don't ever seem to want to do anything that's regular; you want to be starting something fresh all the time" (305). Here it seems Tom represents the traditional Southern society, which is looking up at the heroes and their lives described in the novels of Sir Walter Scott, and which wants, "To make certain that African-Americans would not get the idea they were on equal footing with the white people..."(Dempsey 12) come what may. Huck in contrast to Tom seems to represent the new way of perception of Negroes and interpersonal relationships.

Contrary to the Southern society, Twain depicted in his book unselfish Jim who embodies the lowest form of being to the Southerners. Not only he is a slave, but moreover, he is ungrateful because he escaped. Huck illustrates it when saying that ... everybody naturally despises ungrateful nigger, and that [people] would make Jim feel it all the time, and so he 'd feel ornery and disgraced (271). And still when viewing Jim objectively, he is not ornery or ungrateful, but the one of the best characters in the book. He loves Huck more than his father, does not envy Huck the money he has and wishes the best for him. In the night Jim let Huck sleep and keep watch. Unlike the men on the raft in chapter sixteen, Jim is willing to sacrifice his life and also his freedom to save Tom. In addition he treats well the con men even though he knows they are bad. It seems Twain created the character of Jim to show who is morally superior and to ridicule "virtuous" Southerners.

Secondly, Twain alludes to the area of the criticism of materialism and rapacity. In several chapters of the book, he shows what are people obliging to do because of money. In contrast to the laughable chase for money there appears Huck and Jim again, who do not yearn for money at the expense of humanity as other respectable persons of South. For instance, "virtuous" Miss Watson breaks her promise not to sell Jim to slave traders because she discovers she can receive eight hundred dollars if she sells him. As Jim is scared of being sold south, he escapes and so Miss Watson loses both the slave and the money.

Similar is the demeanour of other people within the story- the lady from St. Petersburg, watchman, the king and the duke and the crowd on Phelps' farm, all mentioned below.

It is amazing, how the lady from St. Petersburg desires to capture the fugitive slave Jim in chapter eleven. Even though she knows anything neither about the living conditions in which he was kept nor about the circumstances of his escape, she is resolved to catch him because of three hundred dollars reward. She is seeking for information, makes a strategy to capture him and hides everything from her neighbours so that she can be the one who gets the reward for Jim. Paradoxically she helps Huck, as she supposes he is a runaway apprentice and assures him of her consent to the deed: "There ain't no harm in it. You've been treated badly, and you made up your mind to cut," she says (Twain 78). So, when escapes a property of somebody because of mistreatment and there is announced a reward for it, it is completely different case than an escape of a white boy who has been also treated badly? It seems it is. The question is whether it is caused by the differences in viewing of Negroes and whites or the fact, that there is no reward for returned apprentice.

Both laughable and lamentable is the immediate willingness of the watchman to help other persons in chapter thirteen. When Huck and Jim leaves three criminals on the wreck of the steamboat Walter Scott, Huck decides to save them. In search for anybody who can rescue them from death, he discovers the watchman of the boat near some town. Huck explains him his parents, sister and Miss Hooker are trapped in the wreck and implores watchman to go there and save them. The watchman would like to go there but the main thing he is concerned about is who will pay him for it. He says to Huck, "By Jackson, I'd LIKE to, and, blame it, I don't know but I will; but who in the dingnation's a-going' to PAY for it?" (Twain 96). Luckily, even a boy as little as Huck knows people love money, so he readily uses the information about the rich man called Hornback and invents a story Miss Hooker is his niece. This is the fact which would make the watchman to sail anywhere, even in the darkest night and wildest tempest. He does not wait for any additional details of the story and set sail to the wreck. Huck is hidden and waits to ascertain whether the criminals were rescued. But all he sees is watchman trying to find the corpse of Miss Hooker around the sinking wreck, so that he can give it to rich Mr. Hornback and receive money for it. Nevertheless, it is really amusing to observe the change in watchman's approach to the family in danger, when he learns about the kinship of Miss Hooker and Mr. Hornback. On the other hand, it is sad the watchman firstly asks the little boy about money and only then he decides to go and rescue the family. But even

more regrettable is the fact that the watchman probably would not try to rescue the family if there is no one to pay for it. Clearly, the watchman hesitates whether he should save the family of little boy from death because of money. On the contrary, Huck, the little boy knows, there are criminals on the steamboat not worth rescuing as it is their rapacity which brings them into this dangerous situation, but he feels sorry for the persons who should be drowned and so, even though Huck is motivated by no reward he immediately endeavours to help them. This is how a good person should behave.

Noticeable criticism of the depravity and rapacity of white people in Southern areas of the United States in the first half of nineteenth century can be also observed in chapter forty-two. Here is perfectly demonstrated that the power of money is stronger than the power of anger. When the crowd of locals catches runaway Jim, the first group of them immediately determines Jim should be hung as a deterrent to other slaves who would intend to escape. But the second group of the men does not want to kill Jim by hanging as it is aware of the fact that it is a possession of somebody. In case they kill Jim, they will have to pay for him and that is much less entertaining than to hang him. Huck appositely comments on it, "...The people that's always the most anxious for to hang a nigger that hain't done just right is always the very ones that ain't the most anxious to pay for him when they've got their satisfaction out of him" (Twain 360). Clearly, it is very sad the only circumstance which saves the life of Jim is the disinclination of the crowd to pay money to the owner of killed slave. If they were not obsessed with money, one of the most virtuous persons of the book would be dead. Luckily, according to Alan Nadel there existed an "extralegal code of honor which respected another white man's property (or the laws of slavery which protected his investment) ..." (13) and that is why the crowd in the *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* controlled its emotions and let Jim live.

The duke and the king represent two of the wickedest members of society. They combine almost all kinds of immoral behaviour enumerated above, but still they are at higher position of social hierarchy than slaves, who work hard, take care of white children etc. One of many vices of these con men is also rapacity. As the king claims in chapter twenty, "I'm in, up to the hub, for anything that will pay..." And within the whole story of the *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* we can observe it is true. Both of the con men are ready to deceive everyone and do not have an aversion to the most perfidious and the ignoblest things. Everything they do is just because of money and remorse is unknown feeling to them. They do not feel embarrassed even though people are angry at them when they are performing Shakespeare's plays or the Royal Nonesuch, as the disappointment

and wrath of the spectators are not as important to them as the money of the spectators. Besides taking advantage of people's credulity and stupidity, the duke also endangers the health of many persons when selling a preparation against tartar which removed tartar but also the enamel of the teeth. But, the real acme of their endeavour begins in chapter twenty-four when learning about the death of Peter Wilks. Pretending they are brothers of the deceased Peter, the duke and the king feign the sadness, grieve over the coffin and make the whole city cry and sympathize with them. Moreover they simulate love and understanding for the girls who remained lonely after the death of Peter. The impostors even commence to play with orphans' feelings when they promise the girls to take them to England while auctioning their inheritance. But the only target of this attachment and love to girls is to profit by selling their estate, slaves and to steal the money from them.

However, the most perfidious thing the king and the duke did was to sell Jim back to slavery. Twain once said, "If you pick up a starving dog and make him prosperous, he will not bite you. This is the principal difference between a dog and a man" (*twainquotes*). The proof is the behaviour of the king and the duke. Huck and Jim saved their lives, protected them from lynching, helped them with their wicked plans, fed them and involuntarily ceded their own wigwam to the king and the duke and the gratitude to Huck, for all those things he did for them, was the sale of Jim, the slave who is true friend of Huck, kind and warm-hearted person, longing just for his family and freedom. The saddest side of it, is the fact, they have betrayed Huck and Jim for the amount of forty dollars. Moreover as well as the criminals on the steamboat Walter Scott, the king and the duke do not hesitate to try to betray and rob one another. On the other hand, the slaves in chapter fourteen do not envy Jim he is going to be free and readily help him instead of extorting him or giving him to their master. It shows the way people should behave and attests how treacherous people are. Is this the reason of white moral superiority to Negroes? If Jim had been as "good" as the con men, he probably would have been extorting money from Huck, would have drown him so that he could not report Jim to the whites or would have taken Huck hostage to reach free lands successfully. But Jim is not white. He is not able to do the atrocities because of money. His attitude to money is rather dispassionate. Jim has money then loses it, and although he is sad he has no money, he never wants to take revenge on the people because of the loss. For instance, he does not wish to lynch the Negro who founds a bank in chapter eight, take money from all slaves around and then says his bank went bankrupt.

The criticism of materialism and rapacity are to be found plentifully in the book. The desire to have as much money as possible have been present in the nineteenth century as well, as it is in the twenty-first century. It seems it is eternal, imperishable feature of human character which occurs in all classes of society. In the *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*, Twain illustrates the bad deeds people do in order to gain money. When foolishly trying to obtain it, they disregard the feelings of other human beings, as demonstrated for example on the king and the duke, the watchman, on Miss Watson or so-called aristocracy, and become much lower creatures than the animals are, not only in terms of cruelty but also in sophistication of their “maltreatment”. As Sanford Pinsker says, “...Slavery was the most visible manifestation of man’s cruelty to man - not just the shackles and beatings, but also in the systematic way in which the entire people was reduced to chattel property”(Bloom 70). Even Huck with no education is able to realize that the conduct of people chasing for money is not good or righteous but very low.

Clearly in the *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*, Mark Twain criticizes how unscrupulous people can be when trying to get more money. To rob orphans who have lost the family of their property, to deceive common people by performing inferior plays, to destroy their teeth, all those deeds are reprehensible, however they were committed by the persons of low birth. But what about the respectable Judge Thatcher? Is he good when he buys Huck’s money? Harry G. Segal, lecturer in psychology, thinks he acts like a con man who is happy to get money of Huck. He claims that although [Thatcher] returns Huck’s money at the end of the novel, there is no suggestion in the present passage that [he] wants to do so (Bloom 35). And what about Miss Watson’s broken promise? Is not she considered to be decent Christian? How can she betray Jim’s trust because of money? And what about the institution of slavery in general? Does not Southern “aristocracy” possess as many slaves as possible to gain more and more money by slave work on plantations? This exploitation took place not only in lower class but mainly high class who possessed slaves on a large scale because of profit. So is there something more acceptable about slavery than about the swindling common people out of money? The former seems crueller, does it not? And still, the later is the one which is denounced by decent Christians. It is not the Grangerford family, owning over one hundred slaves, who is going to be lynched in the book. Here Twain again proves that the so-called aristocracy, virtuous Christians and the con men of low birth, exhibit similarly immoral behaviour when hungering for money. None of them could consider itself to be superior to Huck or Jim.

Thirdly, another feature of human nature Twain criticizes by satirizing, is laziness and primitive amusement. He demonstrates it for instance, on the rustics from Arkansas or the duke and the king. In this passage it is possible to observe again, why the Southern “aristocracy” should not consider itself to be superior to others, because the only thing which it does not have in common with other people is wealth.

In chapter twenty-one, the renowned laziness of Southern areas mingles with the tedious way of living in the portrayal of “one - horse town” somewhere in Arkansas. The desire of local people to work, their shrewdness and plenitude of amusement is evident all around the place. Huck describes it vividly:

The stores and houses was most all old, shackly, dried up frame concerns that hadn't ever been painted... The houses had little gardens around them, but they didn't seem to raise hardly anything in them but jimpson-weeds, and sunflowers, and ash piles, and old curled-up boots and shoes, and pieces of bottles, and rags, and played-out tinware. The fences was made of different kinds of boards, nailed on at different times; and they leaned every which way, and had gates that didn't generly have but one hinge -- a leather one. Some of the fences had been white- washed some time or another, but the duke said it was in Clumbus' time, like enough ... All the stores was along one street ... There was empty drygoods boxes under the awnings, and loafers roosting on them all day long, whittling them with their Barlow knives; and chawing tobacco, and gaping and yawning and stretching -- a mighty ornery lot ... [they] talked lazy and drawly, and used considerable many cuss words. There was as many as one loafer leaning up against every awning-post, and he most always had his hands in his britches-pockets, except when he fetched them out to lend a chaw of tobacco or scratch (Twain 177).

Even though, the condition of the buildings, the gardens and the streets in the town is very bad, as visible the locals do not have anything to do. They are bored, lounge and wait for some entertainment. And so they invent the simplest kind of amusement, which must have been considered to be primitive and cruel even in the times of Twain’s life and should be totally unacceptable to people in the twenty-first century. It is quite stupid to set the dogs against a breast-feeding sow or to watch dogs fighting and laugh at it. But to set dog on fire

or to let him to run himself to death by tying a cans to his tail just for amusement, is inhumane and has nothing to do with the civilized society. Nevertheless when speaking about civilized society, what the aristocracy used to do when bored in their luxurious residences and having no need to work in order to survive? They invented exactly the same primitive kind of amusement, but they made it nobler by adding pedigree horses, dogs and newest weapons, and called it hunting.

Also the king and the duke could be regarded as representatives of laziness. After all, it is very nicely depicted five chapters before Huck and Jim meet these con men, when Huck explains to Jim what are the kings obliged to do, to gain their wealth: “THEY don't do nothing. They just set around-- except, maybe, when there's a war ... But other times they just lazy around ...” (100). So it is not a coincidence that in chapter nineteen two men occurs who claim they are a king and a duke. Their behaviour pretty fits into Huck's description of royal manners. Instead of endeavour to find a job, the king and the duke lounge all the days and invent the ways how to gain money without extra exertion. Only in the times of emergency they are able to do anything. But otherwise, they are so indolent they even do not want to prepare food for themselves. Instead they make Huck and Jim attend to the needs of them. So their manners are exactly the same as those of true aristocracy. Furthermore, Twain illustrates all such con men need to become indistinguishable from the aristocracy, apart from a mite of talent for acting, is nice clothes as stated in chapter twenty-four. There Huck says:

I never knowed how clothes could change a body before. Why, before, he looked like the orneriest old rip that ever was; but now, when he'd take off his new white beaver and make a bow and do a smile, he looked that grand and good and pious that you'd say he had walked right out of the ark, and maybe was old Leviticus himself” (Twain 199).

It is necessary to admit that the comparison of aristocracy to lazy, impostors and scoundrel of low birth must have outraged more than the nobler part of society.

In brief, Twain's depiction of a lazy way of living in Southern areas shows not only Negroes should be regarded as lazy. The Southern “aristocracy” has its slaves to serve them, to work instead of the white people on their plantations and still it wants the slaves to work harder, no matter whether the overseers had to use whips. The common people also do not exhibit inclination to do some work. They were used to hire slaves to do the hard

work and were so proud they would rather “Let the work go undone than to embarrass themselves by doing 'nigger' work” (Dempsey 10). So there is another reason for common white people and “aristocracy” to stop believing they are somehow better than Negroes.

Mob and Lynching

The last target of Twain's criticism was the demeanour of a mob. He strictly condemns its cowardice as well as its false power originating in quantity, the fondness for lynching, the cruelty and the deeds mobs are responsible for. Since Twain used to live in Missouri and was aware of Southern character of white men, he knew well how a mob, no matter if originating from religious assembly or from onlookers in the streets, behaves. The lynching which is connected with it was a commonplace in these parts of the country. Moreover, while working on the *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*, the Ku Klux Klan had already done its most brutal deeds and discontinued their activity for a time. Its existence could not help Twain to better his opinion on a justice and a courage of a mob. And so Twain's negative attitude to it and to the masses in general, is visible every time mob they appear in the book.

The most obvious criticism of a mob occurs in chapter twenty-one and twenty-two, when Colonel Sherburn, in order to maintain his honour, shoots Boggs. There is described the whole process of inception of lynching, which is very "complicated" and "many times pondered" as Huck supports when saying, "Well, by and by somebody said Sherburn ought to be lynched. In about a minute everybody was saying it; so away they went, mad and yelling, and snatching down every clothes-line they come to do the hanging with"(Twain 184). It is so simple to make people follow somebody's decision. However the mob's determination and bravery end as soon as Colonel Sherburn shows he is not afraid. When Sherburn comes on the roof with a gun and stands there steely, looking in everyone's of the mob eyes, the uproar in the garden turns into stony silence. Sherburn derides people and pronounces them all cowards. Stawiński believes that although Colonel Sherburn is an unlovable character of the book, it is Twain who speaks directly through him and considers Sherburn to be "the interpreter" of Twain's opinions on the mob (168). The speech Sherburn gives, criticizes not only the cowardice of people but also their villainous nature, as they do not hesitate to lynch poor lonely woman, who has nobody to protect her. He claims, "...The pitifulest thing out is a mob; that's what an army is -- a mob; they don't fight with courage that's born in them, but with courage that's borrowed from their mass, and from their officers" (Twain 186). And the truth is that it is hard to imagine just two or three men going to kill someone by hanging. This is the "speciality" of the masses.

The above mentioned fondness for lynching which occurs in the Southern United States is perceptible also in other chapters. For instance in Wilks episode, when the real

brothers of deceased Peter Wilks arrive, nobody of locals knows who out of those four people is the impostor. However after short interrogation of the men, everyone is confident that the best way to resolve the problem is to lynch them. People are not patient enough to wait for logical clarification. Moreover the lynching is much faster, easier and entertaining solution than to consider all statements and proofs. The eagerness for lynching is perfectly visible during the whole investigation. Finally in chapter thirty-three the mob gets its chance to lynch and Twains demonstrates one of its favourite techniques, already mentioned several times in the book, which comprises of ridding the rail, tarring and feathering.

In conclusion, Sanford Pinsker claims that Huckleberry Finn "... Is the satiric lens through which we see the world's endless capacity for cruelty (Bloom 71)" It is possible to observe it in the Grangerfords chapters, the chapters about Pap Finn and many others, but it is the most obvious in those, where the mob is depicted. From many examples of its behaviour when lynching, it is easy to see that it is not only justice what leads people to do the deed, but mainly their inclination to cruelty and vindictiveness. People do not want to apprehend the criminals and let the court to punish them, instead they are looking forward to the vicious punishment of their own, the sooner the better. Moreover, in many cases e.g. in chapter twenty-three, the people are trying to maintain their honour when humiliated and offended by such rapsallions as the king and the duke are. There we can observe certain similarity with the "logic" of the "aristocratic" feuds. The Southern "aristocracy" also acts very cruelly when slandered and instead of rational or at least just settlement of the alleged insult, their reaction is rash, instinctive and often exaggerated. In proof of it, there could be mentioned that in truth, the Grangerford- Shepherdson fierce conflict is based on the true feud of two families, the Darnells from Tennessee and the Watsons from Kentucky which purportedly lasted for almost sixty years. Where is the difference then between the cruel behaviour of these pseudo-aristocratic families and ordinary people? Even though the form of revenge is different, the way so-called aristocracy acts does not differ so extensively. Maybe, only the reasons of "aristocratic" conflicts are sometimes more senseless than those of people who were robbed of their money.

But on the other hand, is the reason for killing the Negroes by hanging by mob just because of their colour of skin, which took place after the Civil war more meaningful? In addition, although it may seem only the common people of low birth participated in such lynchings, it is possible to discover the opposite is true. Also the "aristocracy" indirectly took part in lynching, but of course in more genteel way. In the American South in the pre-war

period, there was a rumour the slaves are planning a revolt against their masters on the fourth of July, 1835. In order to avoid it, the so-called gentlemen, via their loyal servants killed by hanging eight white adherent of abolitionism and countless number of slaves, everything in accordance with the regulations of lynching (Stawiński 11). And is there a difference between the situation when a person participates in lynching and helps to kill somebody and between this “aristocratic” purity, when a person does not participate in lynching, just gives an order to it?

Conclusion

In brief, the *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* is a book which had the courage to assail the arrogant belief of white Southerners in their superiority to Negroes, to show self-styled aristocracy there is not a big difference between its demeanour and the conduct of people of low class, and to point to the fact, the virtuous Christians are not always as moral as they think of themselves; all those things in the period when the South still maintained its pre-war order and morals. It was the period, when it was unacceptable for the Southern whites to let their Negroes live an ordinary, peaceful and equal life. I believe it was one of the reasons why the book was written. The institution of slavery was abolished and the Negroes were supposed to become equal citizens of the South. However it did not happen. Instead the whites found the way to circumvent Negroes' rights and later established "separate but equal" society. And so Mark Twain published the book where the Negro is morally excellent human being and where the hero, Huck Finn decides to go against the flow and help a friendly, kind-hearted and loving person-Jim. Furthermore, to make people think about their behaviour Twain shows their flaws and hypocrisy in contrast with the moral conduct of Jim and Huck. The aim was to show to the whites they are not better persons than the Negroes. In addition, in the last chapters of the *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*, where Tom degrades and frees already free Jim, Twain reflects the post-war play with the freedom and the rights of the Negroes, which occurred in the South. Here Tom represents the Southerners as he does not perceive Jim as an adult and feeling man, and totally destroys Jim's self-esteem when playing with him without regard to his feelings as with a stupid submissive puppet. In the book, Jim gains his freedom for a moment and then he loses it because of Tom's tricks. However at the end he discovers that in fact, he had been free all the time. Similarly in reality, the Negroes of the South became free, later they practically lost their freedom again after the Reconstruction era, even though theoretically they had been free all the time. Only now when there is no Jim Crow etc. are Afro-Americans really free.

The legacy of equality of all human beings pervades the whole book. From the examples of Southern "aristocracy", the institution of slavery, religion, morals and lynching, it is easy to observe certain similarities in immoral behaviour of high and low classes, no matter whether "devout" or not, which represent the superior part of the Southern society. "Aristocracy", regarded as "the best of Old South's society", is lazy, pretends to be godly but kills other people as well as the lowest criminals on the steamboat

do and exploits slaves, who are the main source of its money. Common people desire to become part of the so-called aristocracy, without knowing how much they resemble it. They are as amoral as these aristocrats. Laziness, selfishness, inhumane treating of Negroes, lynching, hypocrisy, violence and cruelty are nothing unfamiliar to them. The devout believe they behave virtuously, but in fact they are not able, or rather willing to see there is something wrong with the slavery and so the worst crimes are committed with the “consent of God”. The racist belief in the intellectual and moral supremacy of the whites is the same fallacious myth as those the whites fabricated about the Negroes. The myths of alleged stupidity, immorality, laziness and “instability in family and sexual matters” of the Negroes were present in Southern literature and magazines. Also the religion supported the inferior position of the Negroes by its proofs of the curse of this race which could be found in the Bible. But the truth is, those myths about the Negroes served mainly as a hypocritical justification for mistreatment of the Negroes. Thus to whip the Negroes, who do not feel pain so intensively as the whites, is not cruel as well as selling their children away, because they lack family relation etc.

On the other hand, Huck, Jim and other Negroes of the story represent the inferior part of the Southern society which fails to meet requirements of its “civilized” and morally superior members. Here Twain demonstrates their inferiority is just “artificially” induced by the distorted principles of this society. For instance, according to these principles a person is regarded as spoilt and bad when he or she helps a slave to escape. But from the human point of view it is a good deed to enable human being to live free. And so Huck violates the rules of his society but simultaneously he shows the reader the way people should treat others, regardless of their colour of the skin and what the rest of the society think about it.

Here it is convenient to touch the problem of the masses and crowd mentioned in the final chapter of the thesis. In the *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*, the masses represent the evil and the individual represents the good. Why is only Huck able to help the Negro? Is it because he is kind-hearted? However, are not Uncle Silas and Aunt Sally Phelps or the Grangerfords also kind-hearted people? One of the he main reasons why Huck helps Jim and treats him as equal person, is that Huck was not used to live in accordance with the rules of civilized society and therefore, he does not care what the people think about him. When he decides to help Jim he says, “ People would call me a low-down Abolitionist and despise me for keeping mum-but that don’t make no difference”(Twain 57). As Huck is free boy who has decided to escape from the civilization and who does not need it because

he is able to live just on his own, he acts in accordance with his common sense and could not care less about the opinions of others. Simply Huck acts on an individual basis. Similarly, Jim and other slaves do not care so much about the principles of civilized society or Christianity and so they distinguish good from evil only from their own experience and the voice of their hearts. On the other hand, all those Christians, “aristocrats” and common Southerners behave according to the principles and requirements of their social class or the religious group they belong to. They care so much about what others think about them that they act in compliance with the opinions of their surroundings. Therefore, if e.g. a religious group considers slavery to be just institution, the rest of its members would probably also think so. The “aristocrats” kill each other to demonstrate their chivalry and bravery, people beat slaves because the rest of the city do the same and so it cannot be regarded as reprehensible etc. It follows that the evil of civilized society depicted in the *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* originates mainly from the masses and their endeavour to comply with the requirements of their social class or religious group.

Moreover it is also the cruelty which is connected with masses of people. The quantity, similarly as in the case of the lynching crowd in the final chapter of the thesis, provides people with the feeling they are right and all-powerful. With the support and consent of thousands of people it is not difficult at all to beat or kill somebody else.

In a similar way, within the whole book it is possible to contrast Huck’s and Jim’s good-natured and sincere demeanour with the vicious behaviour full of pretensions of the superior Southerners. To each example of bad deed or character of those people influenced by their surroundings it is easy to find its good opposite embodied by two individual beings-Huck and Jim.

In conclusion, Twain shows there is no reason for the whites, no matter whether devoted Christians or “aristocracy” to believe they are superior to slaves, people of low birth or to the people who are not Christians. The only thing which makes people different is their good or evil heart, however the main aspects which influence their behaviour are the surroundings they live in and the way of their upbringing. However, the Southerners are not shining example of intelligent, moral, caring and loving persons who have to “protect” their Negroes from evil, and bad persons from hell, rather they are spoilt by their chase for money, heaven and “lost” honour.

Bibliography

- Bloom, Harold. *Mark Twain's The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn: Bloom's Modern Critical Interpretations*. 2nd ed. New York: Infobase Publishing, 2007. *Google Books*. Web. 2 Mar. 2012
- Dempsey, Terrell. *Searching for Jim: Slavery in Sam Clemens's World*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2003. *Google Books*. Web. 16 Mar. 2012
- Fishkin, Shelley F. "Mark Twain's America". *PBS*. PBS. 11 Apr. 1997. Web. 16 Dec. 2011
- Fitzhugh, George. "The Universal Law of Slavery." *The Black American: A Documentary History*. Ed. Leslie H. Fishel, and Benjamin Quarles. 3rd ed. Illinois: Scott, Foresman, 1976. *PBS*. Web. 10 Mar. 2012
- Hammond, James Henry. "The 'Mudsill' Theory." *The Black American: A Documentary History*. Ed. Leslie H. Fishel, and Benjamin Quarles. 3rd ed. Illinois: Scott, Foresman, 1976. *PBS*. Web. 10 Mar. 2012
- Leonard, James S., Thomas A. Tenney, and Thadious M. Davis. *Satire or Evasion?: Black Perspectives on Huckleberry Finn*. Durham, DC: Duke University Press, 1999. *Google Books*. Web. 2 Mar. 2012
- Moreland, Kim I. *The Medievalist Impulse in American Literature: Twain, Adams, and Fitzgerald, and Hemingway*. Charlottesville, VA: The University Press of Virginia, 1996. *Google Books*. Web. 20 Feb. 2012
- Nadel, Alan. *Invisible Criticism: Ralph Ellison and the American Canon*. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1991. *Google Books*. Web. 23 Feb. 2012
- Stawiński, Julian. *Mark Twain*. Trans. Štefan Drug, Michaela Hofrajterová. Bratislava: Obzor, 1982. Print.
- Tadman, Michael. *Speculators and Slaves: Masters, Traders, and Slaves in the Old South*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1996. *Google Books*. Web. 14 Jan. 2012
- Twain, Mark. *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*. 1884. Forgotten Books, 2008. *Google Books*. Web. 12 Mar 2012
- . *Mark Twain: The Complete Interviews*. Ed. Gary Scharnhorst. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2006. *Google Books*. Web. 16 Mar. 2012
- . *My Autobiography: "Chapters" from the North American Review*. Mineola, NY : Courier Dover Publications, Inc. 1999. *Google Books*. Web. 10 Mar. 2012

- . *Mark Twain's Autobiography Part 1*. 1924. Ed. Albert Bigelow Paine. Whitefish :
Kessinger Publishing, 2003. *Google Books*. Web. 8 Feb. 2012
- . *twainquotes*. Barbara Schmidt. n.d. Web. 20 Mar 2012

SUMMARY IN CZECH

Cílem této práce je ukázat, že kniha Dobrodružství Huckleberryho Finna není ani rasistická, ani nezesměšňuje kulturu a mentalitu afroameričanů. Právě naopak. Na následujících stránkách bude moji snahou potvrdit jedno z mnoha poselství této knihy a to, že zde není důvod aby se bílí obyvatelé jihu Spojených států amerických považovali za morálně či intelektuálně nadřazené černochům, aby se křesťané cítili ctnostnější nežli vyznavači jiné víry či nevěřící, či aby se samozvaná aristokracie považovala za vrstvu nadřazenou prostému lidu.

Celá práce je rozdělena do několika částí. První část se zabývá životem Marka Twaina, na kterém je ukázán autorův postupný vývoj od dítěte považujícího otroctví za jev zcela přirozený, přes mladého hochu pracující pro tisk hemžící se rasistickými texty, až po dospělého muže, který kvůli existenci otroctví cítí výčitky svědomí. Druhá část se snaží demonstrovat oprávněnost Twainovy kritiky, reflektující často reálné postavy, situace a příběhy z Twainova života. Třetí část, která se věnuje otázce aristokracie a stručně popisuje rodiny zachycené v Dobrodružství Huckleberryho Finna, začíná samotné srovnávání chování „nadřazených“ jedinců společnosti a těch, kteří jsou na samém dně této hierarchie. Další části této práce ukazují nelidskost otroctví a neoprávněnost podřadného vnímání otroků, různé mýty o černoších, usnadňující bělochům popírání lidskosti otroků, náboženství, jeho roli v otrokářské společnosti a náboženské pokrytectví. V pořadí šestá část se zabývá morálkou společnosti a na příkladech srovnává chování Hucka a otroka Jima s chováním ostatních, společensky nadřazených postav příběhu. Poslední část pojednává o dalším z projevů krutosti bílých obyvatel jihu-lynčování. Závěr pouze potvrzuje fakt, že se běloši nechovají podle toho jak káží, že i pobožní lidé jsou zkažení, že chování aristokracie se nijak neliší od chování nižších vrstev, a že otroci jsou lidé stejně tak jako běloši. Jediné čím se od sebe lidé liší je добрota a schopnost rozumně uvažovat.