Silences for Education: Cross-cultural Negotiations of Mark Twain's Children's Fiction

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of Arts, Jadavpur University in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree

Of

Master of Philosophy in English

Submitted by:

Ritwika Roy

M.Phil 2016-2019

Examination Roll No. MPHFEN1901

Class Roll No. 101600403005

Registration No. 128520 of 2014-2015

Jadavpur University, Kolkata 700032

Declaration

I, Ritwika Roy, hereby declare that this M.Phil dissertation entitled "**Silences for Education: Cross-cultural Negotiations of Mark Twain's Children's Fiction**" has been written under the supervision of Dr. Nilanjana Deb, Associate Professor of English, Jadavpur University, Kolkata. No part of this dissertation has been published anywhere/ used/submitted for any other degree/diploma anywhere else.

Signature of the Candidate:

Date:

For Baba.

Contents

Acknowledgements

These last two years, the time I had for writing this thesis, were the worst years of my life so far. There were days, weeks and months when I felt certain that I would not be able to complete this. The last two years drained everything out of me and if it not been for the support, friendship and guidance of a group of extraordinary people, I would not have pulled through.

To **Dr. Nilanjana Deb**, my supervisor, to whom I owe all my gratitude. You have been an enormous source of support, strength and comfort to me over the last two years, and have been endlessly patient with me and my faults, more so than I deserve. Every scolding you have given me has been well –deserved for I have been a less than model candidate. You have talked me through the darkest days and held me together when I broke down and shown me kindness I can never repay. Thank you for being my Teacher.

To my friends, the greatest friends anyone could ask for. I'm not sure why any of you are friends with me because I don't deserve it but I shall not look a gift-horse in the mouth.

Misha, **Morticia** and **Suchi,** the three of you have been my anchor through the best and the worst of times and it is not possible to articulate how much I love the three of you, my sisters-in-all-but-blood, and how grateful I am for you three. Please know that I would not have made it this far if the three of you had not held me up every step of the way.

Sri, you are the only person capable of panicking for me from the other end of the world. I cannot begin to tell you how dreadfully I miss you when you are not here and how blessed I feel to have you as a friend. You scold me, guide me, gossip with me, put up with my whining and listen to me and you send me books whenever I ask for them.

Surojit, I'm not sure I would have survived my pursuit of this degree if you did not remind me to submit forms and complete things on time, but mostly if you had not quietly supported me when I was at my worst. Thank you.

Arka, even at your busiest you found time to send me books from halfway across the world and listen to me grumble, which I absolutely apologise for.

Subhashree di, the debt I owe you is immeasurable. I have joked about it before, but you truly have been the older sister I always wanted. You have been my teacher, my friend, a source of strength and you have borne my faults gracefully and patiently. Thank you so much for being in my life; please never disown me.

My family, without whom I would be nothing;

My little **Puchkuli**, my beloved baby sister, you have lit up the darkest days in the last year and dragged me out of my grief. You are the blessing I do not deserve, but I am proud to be your big sister.

My wholly inadequate thanks to **Ma** and **Kaku**. I am nothing without you; everything I am, everything I have ever done has been because of you. I cannot express my gratitude in words. Even as I write this, it overflows in tears of thanks. I will work for the rest of my life doing my best to make you proud of me. I love you both more than I can ever express.

To **Baba**. I wish you were here. I wish I could see you and know you are well wherever you are. I miss you every day. You saw the beginning of this; I wish you had seen the end. Everyone tells me you are watching me, so I suppose you are, and I suppose you know that I wish you were here. I love you Baba. Be happy wherever you are. I love you.

Introduction

Stories survive by being retold over and over again, as translations, abridgements, adaptations into various media and in the oral form. They can pass the story on exactly as they received it or it can be rewritten as it is adapted into different media, reflecting the temporal and spatial location of the adaptation. In doing so what has been not said, what has been silent in the earlier versions, can be opened up and filled in, thereby adding a new dimension to the text. A simple example would be of the live-action adaptation of *Cinderella* in 2015, where the wicked stepmother, Lady Tremaine, is given a back-story explaining her cruelty towards Ella. Retellings of Cinderella and other fairy tales with Wicked Stepmothers in them, have long fostered the perception that stepmothers will be cruel, though that is obviously not true. But the silence regarding the cause of the stepmother's cruelty has, unfortunately, made this a widespread view and stereotyped stepmothers.

In the last decade, Disney has adapted its own animated films as live-action productions, and has in the process ironed out plot holes, re-written the stories, returned to the source material and most importantly, updated them in ways that are inclusive, representative and appropriate without appropriation. In doing so Disney has given a fresh lease of life to multiple pre-texts and introduced them to new readers and viewers, yet the influence Disney wields on popular imagination, also means that in most cases they become the defining texts – the films are watched before the source material is read and judged against the film. The adaptations usurp authority from the pre-text, especially when the pre-text is written in a language that becomes increasingly inaccessible for each generation of the child reader, who turn to simplified abridgements and adaptations instead.

Adaptations of children's texts therefore, bear greater responsibility than adaptations of texts which belong to mainstream fiction, for they, by virtue of being targeted at children, must

balance pleasure with educational didacticism. To his end, matters like inclusivity and representation, and construction of rounded characters who embody human conflicts as reflective of reality, past or present, become crucial, for it must be kept in mind that there is no Universal child[12] and adapting a text without taking care to maintain authenticity only serves to erase cultural, racial, gender, class differences without attempting to resolve them.

The didacticism is a shadow remaining from the early days of children's literature, when literature for children was didactic literature. Children's literature as a separate sphere of literature developed in the West in the 18th century, alongside a growing concept of childhood, and unsurprisingly some of the first children's texts were conduct books and didactic books like *The Pilgrim's Progress* (1678). From there developed a literature specially for children but by adults and hence the didactic impulse will deliberately or inadvertently remain. Even in books by Enid Blyton, who apparently thought like children as she wrote, there is a strain of didacticism that children will consume as they read, imbibing the prejudices held by the author, unless their personal experience counters that. As Charles Sarland writes, "all writing is ideological since all writing either assumes values even when not overtly espousing them, or is produced and also read within a social and cultural framework which is itself inevitably suffused with values – that is to say, suffused with ideology."[3]

This is complicated by the fact that most of what constitutes products for children, be it literature, or toys, or clothes, or cartoons, is created, approved, and distributed by adults. This makes adults the dominant group over children, allowing them to manipulate what the child

---

1 Emer O'Sullivan, "Internationalism, the universal child and the world of children's literature", in *International Companion Encyclopaedia of Children's Literature*. 2nd edition, Volume 1, ed. Peter Hunt (London and New York: Routledge, 2004) 19.

2 Jacqueline Rose, "The Case of Peter Pan: The Impossibility of Children's Fiction", in *The Children's Culture Reader*, ed. Henry Jenkins (New York: New York Press, 1998), 62.

3 Charles Sarland, "Critical tradition and ideological positioning", in *International Companion Encyclopaedia of Children's Literature*. 2nd edition, Volume 1, ed. Peter Hunt (London and New York: Routledge, 2004) 57.

reader and viewer consume. The formation of the children's literature canon through the Caldecott, Newberry and Touchstones lists was initially controlled by white, educated, privileged men, who would inevitably manipulate and control the reading choices available to children by choosing to promote one book over the other.[45]

Retellings therefore serve a radical purpose, for each retelling should expectedly offer a new interpretation of the pretext. As John Stephens says, "A different impulse to retell stories stems from a desire to challenge the cultural hegemony attributable to the metanarratives that shape notions of heritage and universality...a retelling may be enabled to interrogate the tradition simply through changes in the mode of discourse entailed in any retelling, since the language and style of the pre-texts are usually not then reproduced."[6] The "different impulse" is that which subscribes to the Universal child and homogenous culture idea, by positing that all cultures, however diverse are inherently similar in their human desires. To this end, Stephens identifies three elements which affect retellings: 1) "the already known story"; 2) "the current social preoccupations and values (...) which constitute its top-down framing and ideology"; and 3) "the textual forms through which the story is expressed."[7]

When retellings happens cross-culturally however, an extra element is added – the values and ideology of the culture adapting a text foreign to its own culture, and its relationship with the culture the pre-text is from. The culture adapting the text therefore, must appease both cultures with the adaption, which, in most cases, makes the adaptation something of an inadequate hybrid, unless it is a truly well-done adaptation, for in trying to appeal to both sets of audiences, the text is not explored to its full possibility, as happens with *Tom Sawyer no*

4 Jill P. May, *Children's Literature and Critical Theory: Reading and Writing for Understanding*. (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 34.

5 Sarland, "Critical tradition", 59

6 John Stephens, "Retelling Stories across time and cultures", in the *Cambridge Companion to Children's Literature*, eds. M.O. Grenby and Andrea Immel (Cambridge University Press: 2009), 94.

7 Ibid, 92.

Bōken (1980), where much gets lost in translation, and the Japanese audience fail to receive a cohesive, coherent, picture of the American South – "the translated literature of other countries, cited as a main site of exposure to foreign cultures, is often so heavily adapted that the 'foreign' elements supposed to foster understanding between nations are obliterated or heavily adapted"[8]. If stories are adapted cross-culturally to show that all cultures are similar on matters of human desire, then there must be an element of education in this; for how can the viewing audience decide if the foreign culture the adaptation is about, is similar to their culture or not, if the adaptation does not educate them on the culture it is representing? The translator's role becomes very important here, for they decide what can be edited out, what can be modified and what can be kept intact as the story moves across borders. Even within borders, how cultural diversities are depicted in books for children, are also determined by the author and editor who could either perpetuate traditional notions of racial difference, gender and class differences, or educate the reader or viewer to question.

Clare Bradford opens her book, *Unsettling Narratives*, with an example of the false constructions of Native American identity, that occurs in a book called *America: A Patriotic Primer*, where, Bradford notes, language and diction is used in ways which construct Native Americans as immigrants rather than the original inhabitants to the land. "*The Patriotic Primer'*s representation of Native Americans as merely another group of new arrivals constructs America as a nation of migrants rather than as a settler society".[9] As a primer, it is obviously meant for very small children, and what it teaches, therefore, is the incorrect account of Native American history, which wipes out the actual, horror-ridden truth of American history. That this book is by former Second Lady of the United States, Vice-President Dick Cheney's wife Lynne Cheney, gives this version of history a false credibility,

8 O'Sullivan, "Interntionalism", 18.

9 Clare Bradford, *Unsettling Narratives: Postcolonial Readings of Children's Literature*, (Canada: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 2007), 2.

which damages an entire people. As Toni Morrison asks, “How does one become a racist, a sexist? Since no one is born a racist, and there is no fatal predisposition to sexism, one learns Othering not by lecture or instruction but by example.”[10]

In all of this is present the abstract quality of silence – the what is not said – which is enforced and placed into a text by a variety of means. As both Pierre Macherey and Max Picard concur, the articulation of speech immediately indicates the space of silence it has sprung from and all the words which still remain in the silence,[11] [12]for speech is selective. But the silence is expanded by editing, mis-constructing, mis-representing, excising out of a narrative altogether, censorship, describing gender or class position, or the racial other in derogatory terms. Silence and the imposition of silence can be employed by the dominant group in multiple ways to keep the oppressed in a continued state of oppression, and more than what is said, what is not said becomes important - as Macheray says, “what the work cannot say is important, because there the elaboration of the utterance is acted out, in a sort of journey to silence.”[13] The silence present in one work regarding the group perceived as the “Other” is part of the greater collective of silence regarding the ‘Other’. Adaptations, depending in the dominant ideology of their time have the added responsibility of negotiating these spaces of silence in the narrative of the pre-text. The example of Lady Tremaine, given at the beginning, is an example of such un-silencing in an adaptation. With cross-cultural adaptations, where the country adapted the text does not share with the home country of the text a similar history out of which the text is borne, the possibilities of exploring these silences expand – how does a country without the history of racism as lived through by

10 Toni Morrison, *The Origin of Others*, (Cambridge, Massachusetts & London, England: Harvard University Press, 2017), 6.

11 Max Picard, *The World of Silence,* Regenary Gateway, 1952, 31. Pierre Macherey, *A Theory of Literary Production*, trans. by Geoffrey Wall, (London, Henley & Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978), 84 – 85.

12 . Pierre Macherey, *A Theory of Literary Production*, trans. by Geoffrey Wall, (London, Henley & Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978), 84 – 85.

13 Ibid, 87

America, depict racism in a production for children upon adapting an American classic whose entire plot pivots on race relations? What silences are uncovered and imposed in the process? What questions are raised?

When a book published a century ago, and very much a product of its time, is banned in the 21st century because of the usage of offensive, racialized or gendered terms, does the censorship have the desired effect? Is there any point to such a censorship which imposes a blanket silence on a part of history, instead of sensitizing the child reader to it and explaining the politics behind the term? Mark Twain, author of one of the most frequently banned and censored children's book in America, himself mentioned on multiple occasions that censorship and banning boosted sales and several readers of all ages would write to Twain that banning the book only made them want to read it more. The use of the derogatory word "nigger" is a frequent reason for banning the book but as Toni Morrison writes, " It struck me as a purist yet elementary kind of censorship designed to appease adults rather than educate children."[14] She is not incorrect. Censoring the word from some sources does not mean that children will not be exposed to it from other sources and rather than letting children learn inadequate or incorrect things, it is better to expose the children to such terms and their connotations through literature and discuss it with them.

This thesis proposes to examine the gaps in the narrative and how it has translated over in cinematic adaptations across different cultures, as no two cultures undergo the exact same historical experience, leaving open the scope for negotiation of the gaps which are present in

14 Toni Morrison, "Amazing, Troubling Book", in *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn,* ed. Thomas Cooley, (New York and London: A Norton Critical Edition, W.W. Norton & Company, 1999), 386.

the pre-text. For this purpose, the author and texts in focus here is Mark Twain and his children's fiction – *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer* (1876), *The Prince and the Pauper* (1882), and *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* (1884) – and their various adaptations within and without America.

Twain has been selected simply due to the influence he continues to wield over literature, with his novels being the few which straddle both canons – the children's literary canon and the mainstream, and even though *The Adventure of Huckleberry Finn* (1884) continues to face bans in various libraries it, along with *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer* (1876) and *The Prince and the Pauper* (1882) are still adapted in various parts of the world. Moreover, in the 21st century, with the collective resurgence of the Far-Right across the globe, Twain's novels continue to stay relevant, especially *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn,* the greater part of which involves crossing borders, if the Mississippi and the raft are considered as metaphors of the borders between nations. While most adaptations of *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer* and *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* are faithful to the time period and the location, *The Prince and the Pauper* has undergone several transformations in the course of its adaptations. The story of exchanged identities and doppelgangers seems to be viewed with a continued sense of fascination which has lead to innumerable adaptations around the world which are loosely based on Twain's novel. In India, Twain is still present in many middle school syllabi via the inclusion of the famous whitewashing scene from *Tom Sawyer*. As such, Twain's silences regarding race, gender and class relations becomes particularly significant, with his silence being defined here as the lack of the non-white, non-male, and non-privileged perspective. Twain can only base his depictions of the racial other, women and the lesser privileged based on what he has seen of them; he does not have their felt experience, and thus, his depiction is based on a second-hand understanding, as opposed to the writing on race or gender relations by one who has been on the other side, who has experienced the

oppression. Twain writes from his position of privilege, not just as an acclaimed and beloved writer in his time, but as a white man in a racially divided and strictly gendered world.

The primary question this thesis asks therefore is: how is Twain's silence negotiated with when scrutinized critically or in adaptation by the racial, gender and class Other? When translated and re-written in cross-cultural adaptations, by the cultural and racial Other who would view Twain, and America's immediate history, as depicted in the novels, from an experiential distance, how would these silences be expressed? Would they be expressed at all? How would these silences work in the education of children, for children learn by example from adults and what the adult provides them with - the adaptations which are more easily accessible than increasingly dense texts written in the linguistic style of over a century ago? To what extent do these silences which appear when single points of view are depicted regarding issues of race and/or gender, further the project of oppression and colonialism, not just with regard to the racial other or the sexual other, but also the "other in age", the Child, who is deprived of their freedom to judge both perspectives and both sides of the argument before coming to an opinion? Can silence regarding racial or sexual others be used as positive tool, by forcing readers to question the incongruities with everyday experience?

This thesis seeks the answers to these questions by doing a close reading of the pre-texts and some of their important adaptations, which are either cross-cultural or are British or American but have influenced other cross-cultural adaptations, since literary traffic with regards to children's literature is yet a one-way traffic with a greater influx and enduring popularity of Anglo-American children's fiction than of any other culture or nation. In the course of these close readings, I hope to locate the silences which populate the primary works and their presence or absence in the adaptations.

For this purpose, it was necessary to construct a concept of silence and silencing as applied and defined in this thesis. Texts dealing with silence as an abstraction, most of which were written in the immediate aftermath of the Second World War were easily available, but since they dealt mostly with the degenerating relationship between silence as an idea and language, I have not included them in my final analysis. Rather, I focused on constructing a theory of silence for the purposes of this thesis by referring to children's literary theory, race theory, gender theory, reader-response theory, and silence theory as and where applicable. Toni Morrison's non-fiction played a large role in constructing my understanding of silence, along with the works of various children's literature theorists, most importantly Peter Hunt and Clare Bradford. Peter Hunt, in the books referred to here, provides broad, but relevant, overviews of the various aspects and applications of children's literary studies, which infinitely helped my purposes, because most of the important books were unavailable to me. Moreover, beyond occasional mentions, silence as a concept was largely absent in the works of the children's literary theory I encountered. Bradford's study of indigenous fiction and representation in Australia was helpful in developing my understanding of representations of the Native American presence in Twain's fiction. There is a far greater volume of work exploring the Africanist presence in fiction, than there is exploring the Native American presence; in many ways, in the un-silencing of the black voice, the Native American voice gets re-silenced.

Most of the criticism that expounds on the abstract concept of silence, and purely that, like the works of Ihab Hassan, Maurice Blanchot and Max Picard, discuss silence as an entity in itself, and in relation to speech and language, as has been mentioned earlier. Of these Picard's *The World of Silence* best suited my requirements for this thesis. Alongside this, silence theory, as applied in this thesis, was derived from race, gender and class theory, within the scope of what is called social silence. Sarah Dauncey's "The Uses of Silence", her doctoral

dissertation that had been submitted at The University of Warwick in 2003 and available on the university website, was my starting point in this examination and exploration of silence. The purview of Dauncey's thesis is the uses of silence in fiction between 1900 – 1950. For this purpose, she analyses several representative novels, each through the lens of a specific theorist or philosopher. Though her topic is different from mine, she too examines how silence can reinforce racial and/or gender oppression, along with class-based oppression. While various critics have identified silences within specific frameworks like race or gender relations, silence can take many forms and it is too abstract and too vague to define in absolute terms or even build a relatively stable theory of, hence the relative lack of criticism dealing exclusively with silence, which necessitated the construction of a concept of silence, which I have done by examining the ways in which silence can manifest and be enforced, for this thesis.

The major amount of literature available was on Mark Twain and especially *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*. There have been multiple biographies of Twain, beginning from William Dean Howells' *My Mark Twain*. Everett Emerson (*Mark Twain: A Literary Life*, 2000), Justin Kaplan (*Mr. Clemens and Mark Twain: A Biography*), Albert Paine Bigelow (*Mark Twain: A Biography*, 1912), Ron Powers (*Dangerous Waters: A Biography of the Boy Who Became Mark Twain*, 1999) are all major biographies, and include among them Susy Clemens' *Papa: An Intimate Biography of Mark Twain* (1985). Other major works of criticism in the 20th century include James Cox's *Mark Twain: The Fate of Humor*, Camfield Gregg's *Sentimental Twain*, Tom Quirk's *Mark Twain and Human Nature*, and Peter Stoneley's *Mark Twain and the Feminine Aesthetic*, and Linda A. Morris' *Gender Play in Mark Twain.* Much work, a lot of which is repetitive in essence, has been published in *The Mark Twain Journal* by Alan Gribben from 1954 onwards. Of this, 52 volumes, till 2014, are available on JSTOR. The Mark Twain Papers, held at the Bancroft Library in The University

of California has started digitizing its collection under The Mark Twain Project to facilitate easier access of resources for researchers. Regarding the individual novels themselves, the maximum amount of work has been done on *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*, while comparatively little work has been done on *The Prince and the Pauper*, while *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer* is often seen as one with *Huckleberry Finn*. There have been multiple sustained studies and anthologies of criticism of *Huckleberry Finn* with an especial focus on the depiction of slavery in the antebellum South. There have, comparatively, been far fewer studies of the adaptations of the films, which is a gap this thesis tries to remedy. And so far, I have not encountered any critical work on Twain by an Indian critic, and neither did I find any adaptations of Twain's works in the vernacular. I did find a translation of *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* published in Bangladesh in 2014, which substitutes the dialects used by Twain with dialects native to Bangladesh and which translates the novel word-for-word. I have not studied this translation out of my own ignorance – for I am completely unfamiliar with Bangladeshi dialects. Tsuyoshi Ishihara's *Mark Twain in Japan*, proved very useful in understanding reception and perception of Twain outside Europe and America, for he provides an exhaustive analysis of the main, significant translations of Twain's fiction in Japan and discusses the anime – the only text I found which does so.

The adaptations proved more difficult to procure than the secondary reading and several adaptations I had wished to study were not available. This included a gender-swapped production of *Tom Sawyer* called *The Adventures of Con Sawyer and Hucklemary Finn* (1985); the two anime adaptations of *Huckleberry Finn – Huckleberry no Bōken* (1976) and *Huckleberry Finn Monogatari* (1994); the German production *Die Abenteuer des Huck Finn* (2012); *Hopelessly Lost* (1972) and *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer and Huckleberry Finn* (1981), both of which were productions in Soviet Russia; and *Back To Hannibal: The Return of Tom Sawyer and Huckleberry Finn* (1990). Adaptations of *The Prince and the Pauper*,

being a text that resonates anywhere with a monarchical history, was easier to find – the Hindi adaptation *Raja aur Runk* (1968) and the South Korean adaptation, *I Am The King* (2012) are studied here.

The contents are divided into four chapters – the first examines the issue of silence itself and the multiple, overlapping forms it can take; the second studies the issue of race and its representations in the adaptations of *Tom Sawyer* and *Huckleberry Finn*; the third chapter examines the representations and re-examinations of gender in the Tom, Sawyer, *Huckleberry Finn* and *The Prince and The Pauper*; and the fourth chapter examines the rendering of class difference in *Huckleberry Finn* and *The Prince and The Pauper* and its adaptations. Each of these adaptations are products of their time and the prevailing ideology they germinated in, as are the pre-texts and Twain himself and this thesis tries to keep that in mind in its examination. Dependence on theory in the analysis chapters – Chapters 2, 3 and 4 – is limited and readings are for the most part, my own readings of the text.

Chapter 1 Beneath the Umbrella called Silence

Silence "is a mobile construct whose import shifts depending upon the discourse utilizing it and the context conditioning it"[15] and as such it is a means to an end within the social contexts of race, gender, class, and education. It is what exists between two parties who are marked by their differences from each other and yet caught in the binary whereupon the existence of one defines the existence of the other[16] - the racial and/or gendered "us/them" and more significantly, adult/child. As Homi K. Bhabha observes "there is no given community or body of the people whose inherent radical historicity emits the right signs"[17] and as such silence becomes a tool in the power politics which marks the navigation of these differences and the effort to establish superiority and dominance over the Other. This chapter explores the multiple forms silence can potentially take to this end.

If forms of silence are used to construct the gendered and racial Other as both a fascinating mystery and a state of inadequacy which must be overcome, leaving them split between the two identities[18] and neither here nor there, this is more so evident in adult/child dynamics, where childhood is both a state of innocence and one that must be grown out of[19]. Unlike the racial and gendered Other, who as an adult can resist and resolve this splitting over time, children have to live with this trauma of splitting till they reach adulthood by social standards. This trauma is perhaps most visible in adolescents who are truly neither children nor adults and caught in a limbo of constructions.

---

15 Sarah Dauncey, "The Uses of Silence: A Twentieth-Century Preoccupation in The Light of Fictional Examples 1900 – 1950", PhD dissertation, (University of Warwick, 2003), 1

16 Homi K. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, (London and New York: Routledge Classics, 1994), 63 -64.

17 Ibid, 39

18 Ibid, 63

19 Peter Hunt, *Children's Literature,* (Blackwell Publishers, 2001), 5 – 6.

As children will inevitably move across the binary, they must be trained to be adequate adults and the texts they study, both written and visual, must be constructed accordingly along the lines of the ideology held by the dominant adult, whereupon silence is used to educate children in dealing with differences, be it to accept or reject prejudice.[20]

Nearly all the forms of silence spoken of trace themselves back to the Created/Constructed issue and most of them overlap with each other, which is a given, since they all eventually belong to greater abstraction of Silence itself, which like Time and Space is a Relative Dimension.

Literal Silence

Literal silence is the most obvious and common form of silence employed by authors. It exists when the character's presence is developed by their lack of active speech, without being mute. Or, as in the case of a novel like *Tristram Shandy*, which Sarah Dauncey uses as her first example in her thesis *Uses of Silence*, silence is depicted by typographical means – squiggles, dashes, lines - and incomplete sentences, as Sterne deliberately fails to express coherently, frustrates the reader's desire for closure and breaks down established forms of writing. This novel, however, is an exception, as here language itself is rendered silent, rather than a character; for example Beth March in Louisa May Alcott's *Little Women*. Or Jane Austen's heroines Anne Elliot, Fanny Price and Elinor Dashwood, each of whom are created as women who silently aid in the well-being of others around them, at the cost of expressing their own desires and speak less than nearly all other principal characters in their respective novels, their characters being illustrated not by dialogue but by authorial narrative. As this silence is seen a virtue, each of these women find their happy ending, even Beth March, who

20 Lynne Vallone, "Ideas of difference in children's literature", in *Cambridge Companion to Children's Literature*, eds. M.O. Grenby and Andrea Immel, (Cambridge University Press, 2009), 183.

dies peacefully, surrounded by her beloved family, and forever enshrined in their memory for her quiet strength and support for each of her sisters. In all these portrayals and overtly so with Beth March, is the manifestation of the Victorian idea of the Angel in the House – the ideal woman who is seen and not heard but who serves the household with grace and silence.

"Seen and not heard" is also a concept applied to children in much of Victorian and Edwardian literature. The child is not to question, the child is to only absorb like a sponge all that their adult superiors tell them and obey. This literal silencing of a child depends a great deal on financial and family situation however, and on gender, with girls expected to be quieter than boys.

The obverse of this idealized literal silence is that where this silence is the only choice. Like with children, the exercise of literal silence depends on social and financial situation, which inevitably pushes the marginalized and oppressed into being literally silenced. Paul D. in Toni Morrison's *Beloved* had to remain silent in the face of the oppression till he earned his freedom for fear of brutal punishment, and Beloved herself is literally silent and muted because she is dead and only communicates in Denver's imagination. Beloved's death has physically silenced her entirely but it has freed her to communicate beyond physical parameters. Literal Silence here, is taken to imply an introversion or a helplessness, depending on the context and the text studied; it is not an inability to communicate, or there would have been no sign language. For Austen's heroines, silence is an introversion; for Morrison's characters born of the memory of her ancestors, it is a helplessness; for the Angel in the House, it is a patriarchal requirement or otherwise they would be too hysterical and therefore mad and forced into silence; for children, it is an adult imposition.

Created/Constructed Silence

> "My early assumptions as a reader were that black people signified little or nothing in the imagination of white American writers. Other than as the objects of an occasional bout of jungle fever, other than to provide local color or to lend some touch of verisimilitude or to supply a needed model gesture, humor, or a bit of pathos, blacks made no appearance at all. This was a reflection, I thought, of the marginal impact that blacks had on the lives of characters in the work as well as the creative imagination of the author."[21]

This observation by Morrison could well be extended to include the presence, or lack thereof, of Native Americans in texts by white American authors. The original custodians of the land, who have suffered genocide and unimaginable persecution at the hands of white settlers, are, one could say, perhaps the most silenced group in the United States. That there has in the history of the US Congress been just 5 Native Americans members in the Senate and 18 in the House of Representatives, with just 4 members in the current 116th Congress says much about the state of representation of Native Americans in not only America but internationally by way of the image of either the brutal, war-like savage or the "noble savage" constructed in literature that has either vilified them or romanticised them; the most famous example being James Fenimoore Cooper's *The Last of the Mohicans,* which remains a "classic" text subjected to innumerable abridged editions, along with Mark Twain's *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*. Meant to be read by children, these abridged editions often become the first encounter they, especially non-American children, have with these peoples.

---

21 Toni Morrison, *Playing in the Dark: Whiteness and Literary Imagination,* (Harvard university Press, 1992), 15.

Therefore, for readers unfamiliar with the context, history and politics of colour and race relations in America, Morrison's reflection would hold true. The non-American casual reader would not be conversant with the extent to which Africanism and immigration has shaped and built American culture beyond the selected fiction consumed. For the child reader, depending on age, enquiry beyond the given text would be even more limited and mediated and filtered by adults – teachers, parents, librarians and the editors of abridged editions, translators, and producers of visual media adaptations. As for the black child in America, unable to find themselves in the text read, or finding the characters most relatable to them portrayed subserviently, they would internalize their own "marginality" – a concept Morrison explores in *The Bluest Eye*, through the child Pecola's silence, desires and tragedy.

As a reader, Morrison concludes that "No American text of the sort [she was] discussing was ever written *for* black people – no more than Uncle Tom's Cabin was written for Uncle Tom to read or be persuaded by."[22] Like the romanticised Native American, she asserts in *The Origin of Others*, by citing Beecher Stowe, is the romanticized Africanist persona, with whom "[c]ontrol, benign or rapacious, may ultimately not be necessary"[23] rendering slavery acceptable by "humanizing"[24] the slave, as in *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. She essentializes "Africanism" as the binary for "Americanness", created "[t]hrough significant and underscored omissions, startling contradictions, heavily nuanced conflicts, through the way writers peopled their work with signs and bodies of this presence...".[25] For her, Africanism signifies the spectrum of notions and assumptions that are borne of a lack of proper knowledge and inquiry about and prejudice-free engagement with people of colour, a "shared process of exclusion – of assigning designation and value"[26]. Out of this, and "under the

22 Ibid, 16

23 Morrison, *Origin*, 9 -10.

24 Ibid, 9

25 Morrison, *Playing in the Dark*, 6

26 ibid, 7

pressures of ideological and imperialistic rationales for subjugation"[27] the American-Africanist persona is created: a inferior and savage figure born to serve the white superior and justify the American hegemony by assuring white domination. In other words, the Africanist persona created by the white writer is a wholly muted and silenced puppet whose actions are controlled by the white master but who has a proclivity to ingratitude and rebellion, marking them the inferior, less than human creature.[28] By process of elimination, this invention of "blackness" results in civilized "whiteness". Whiteness exists in the silent presence of blackness. Conversely, one might argue, that without "blackness", there would be no "whiteness", as otherwise "whiteness" would crumble in itself without the binary to sustain it, since it exists only in white imagination and strives to create a silence about actual immigrant contribution in the construction of modern America. And it is a construction of the Other by white writers for a white audience, including white children; children who are themselves debated upon as beings of construction.

It is not just an Africanist presence which is created; Africa, too, is created as a continent: "As the original locus of the human race, Africa is ancient, yet, being under colonial control, it is also infantile...In novel after novel...Africa is simultaneously innocent and corrupt, savage and pure, irrational and wise."[29] Even for the American-African, it is this created image of Africa they are familiar with, especially as children, as Morrison recounts. The only relationship the American-African child has with Africa, in Morrison's memory is of distance and ignorance and a history of "traumatized Otherness" fostered by racism in literature, films and cartoons and inter-personal relationships[30] just like in Twain's *Tom Sawyer Abroad*, where the entire continent is defined by the silence of the Sahara – "accommodatingly mute,

27 Ibid, 8

28 See also Bhabha, *Location*, 118

29 Morrison, *Origins*, 104

30 Ibid, 100

conveniently blank, indisputably foreign"[31] - and Jim yearns to return to St. Petersburg with his white masters; or in Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness* where "[t]he landscape, and by extension the native, is represented as silent."[32]

This leads to a consideration of the hypocrisy of the proverb "when in Rome, do as Romans do." Historical applications of the statement, meant to advise a respectful adjustment to and acceptance of cultural differences, indicate that the proverb is only applicable for immigrants journeying to historically white countries, but not when the peoples of these countries travel to non-White countries, including North America before Columbus.[33] If they practiced what they preached, countries east of Europe – the Orient – would not be "a European [and later a colonial] invention"[34] fed to not just the reading public in Europe but the people of these lands themselves.

The "Orient", culturally far older than the Old World is infantalised as being silent and unable to represent itself, necessitating the white man's intervention[35] in unravelling its mysteries[36] without actually going knee-deep into the intricacies of any of the cultures and civilizations which constitute the east of Europe. The Orient is therefore Orientalized[37] under one single cultural umbrella which, in one stroke, erases the rich diversities, differences and histories which make each region unique – the Indian Subcontinent is unlike China which is unlike

---

31 Ibid, 102

32 Dauncey, "Uses of Silence", 51

33 Even as recently as 2019, one reads reports of random white persons going on racist spiels when they hear immigrants in America speaking in their inherited non-European (not including Spanish) languages and ranting like a broken record "This is America. Speak English." Have they themselves bothered to learn Najavo or Apache or any of the countless indigenous languages of the Americas or would they try to respect and speak in standard Nepalese or standard Japanese or Punjabi or Urdu if they went to Nepal or Japan or Pakistan?

34 Edward W. Said, *Orientalism*. (London: Penguin. 1977), 1

35 Ibid, 21

36 Ibid, 20 -21

37 Ibid, 3, 5-6, 67

Russia, which is unlike South East Asia which is unlike Persia and yet all are conflated into one uniform group.

> Orientalism can be discussed and analyzed as the corporate institution for dealing with the Orient—dealing with it by making statements about it, authorizing views of it, describing it, by teaching it, settling it, ruling over it: in short, Orientalism as a Western style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient.[38]

And just like "blackness" verifies "whiteness", the "Orient" establishes the "Occident"[39]: the Oriental heathen man with their heathen gods, standing in opposition to civilized white world, must be erased of their religions and traditions and rendered silent so they can be constructed anew to be of service to the Empire as hybrids mediating as interpreters.[40] "Orient" is hence nothing more than a linguistic tactic to highlight difference and justify the voluntary invasion and imposition no one asked for upon independent, civilized peoples who had lived on their own terms even given the history of invasion and conquering in the Indian subcontinent.

It could be argued that the creation of the Africanist/Orientalist presence and Africa/the Orient is a part of the larger construct of literature itself which has developed over time, making the child in a text of children's literature a construct within a construct within a construct within a construct. The concept of the Universal Child is hence a palimpsest, enclosed within the constructed layers of children's literature, childhood, and literature, marked by its difference from the Adult, which creates a need for a separate literature for children at all.[41] Even as children's literature theorists continue to debate upon the constructed/constructive nature of children and childhood – the children's literature version

38 Ibid, 3

39 Ibid, 1-2

40 Bhabha, *Location*, 48, 123 - 124

41 Vallone, "Ideas of difference", 174

of the Nature/Nurture debate – the idea of childhood continues to be constructed, along the lines of thematically demarcated sections for children where books and toys exist alongside, for commercial profit by publishers and bookstores and participating adults, "indirectly predicated upon the notion that childhood is a separate stage of life, a cultural construction that may not always have been in place."[42] This statement of Andrea Immel's is seconded by Phillipe Ariès who concludes at the end of his exhaustive study of childhood in Medieval and Early Modern Europe that with growing religious and moralist reform "it was recognized that the child was not ready for life, and that he had to be subjected to a special treatment, a sort of quarantine, before he was allowed to join the adults."[43] The Child therefore becomes the binary Other to the Adult, who is responsible for moulding and educating them, converting and leading them from vulnerability to maturity[44], in which literature becomes a tool, alongside other forms of study, even as constructions of childhood change and mutate from Locke's *tabula rasa* to the Romantic notions of childhood innocence. Both these concepts of childhood are problematic – Locke's assertion of the purely blank and formless state of the child's mind renders the child as a space of silence, a void without instinct, thought and understanding, not very different from a constructed automaton in whom commands must be fed; and the Romanticisng of childhood innocence is negated by the reality children faced in their day – as illustrated by Blake's "The Chimney Sweeper" poems. In any age, childhood innocence is a idealistic construction – the trauma of abuse, violence, bullying, dysfunctional families, war defeat the purpose of the "quarantine", as unflinchingly depicted in the *Harry Potter* books through the characters of Harry Potter and Ginny Weasley, both of whom have suffered significant trauma as pre-adolescent children.

---

42 Andrea Immel, "Children's books and constructions of childhood", in *Cambridge Companion to Children's Literature*, eds. M.O. Grenby and Andrea Immel, (Cambridge University Press, 2009), 20

43 Phillipe Ariès, *Centuries of Childhood: A Social History of Family Life*, trans. by Robert Baldick, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962), 412.

44 Vallone, "Ideas of difference", 175.

This brings us to Maria Nikolajeva's question regarding any literary character who are a part of a literary work which is created by anyone in the physical world: "are we to treat them as real people with psychologically credible traits, or merely as textual construction?"[45] Given that children characters are created by a whole host of adult participants – authors, publishers, illustrators – and approved and canonised by a whole other and overlapping group of adults – parents, librarians, teachers, academics – based on their concept of what they think children are; what they think children could be, both as children and future adults; and what they remember childhood to be, one could reply to the posed question, and Nikolajeva concurs, that they should be read as textual construction with "psychologically credible traits", which puts us somewhere in the middle of the Constructed/Constructive debate, or what David Rudd calls as "'hybrid', or border area."[46]

While critics have argued that children in literature, society and culture are oppressed and voiceless by the very construction of the idea of childhood as a separate state of existence[47], others have argued for the Child as a construct*ive* being, who while circumstantially influenced in their response to literature[48], is independent enough the navigate the world, and adult impositions, on their own terms. Both Jill P. May and Cedric Cullingford argue that children wield an independence of thought even though an assessment and ranking driven

---

45 Maria Nikolajeva, "Narrative theory and children's literature", *International Companion Encyclopaedia of Children's Literature*, ed. Peter Hunt, 2nd edition, Volume 1, (London and New York: Routledge, 2004), 172

46 David Rudd, "Theorising and theories: the conditions of possibility of children's literature", *International Companion Encyclopaedia of Children's Literature*, ed. Peter Hunt, 2nd edition, Volume 1, (London and New York: Routledge, 2004), 30

47 Ibid, 30 -31. Rudd refers to: Jacqueline Rose, "The Case of Peter Pan: The Impossibility of Children's Fiction", in *The Children's Culture Reader*, ed. by Henry Jenkins, (New York: New York Press, 1998), 65; Karin Lesnik-Oberstein, *Children's Literature: Criticism and the Fictional Child*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 26, 187; and Rex and Wendy Stainton Rogers, *Stories of Childhood: Shifting Agendas of Child Concern*, (London: Simon and Schuster, 1992), 84.

48 Cedric Cullingford, *Children's Literature and its Effects: The Formative Years*, (London and Washington: Cassell, 1998), 1.

educational system continues to try construct children into a socially desired, unquestioning adulthood that "closes rather than opens ideas".[49] Children know what they want to read and they may read a text entirely differently from how the author and publisher had hoped and intended for it to be read, they may discuss it with their peers and gain newer insights[5051] from that provided by the adult reader who provided the text to them.

There is an irony here; for the very groups who endeavour to construct a concept of childhood, out of pedagogical duty, were once children themselves.

> It is a truth still insufficiently acknowledged that our finest children's books are hybrid constructs that combine a child's perspective with the guarded perspective of the former child we call 'adult'.[52]

It seems therefore, that if the child is a constructive being, resisting the imposed constructs of voicelessness and helpnessness and ideal perceived childhood, once they transition on to adulthood, they participate in the same imposition of constructs. There are, in other words, forces of opposition and resistance present in the space of children's literature, with the "former child" employing various tactics to ensure the endurance of constructions of childhood which could silence out the constructive voice of the child – mostly through the creation of the child character in a work of fiction by the adult author and the rhetorical style involved. Hence, "Perry Nodelman...argues that children's books 'teach children how to be child-like'" and Rudd concludes that children's literature is "complicit" in the propaganda of the adult concept of "the child who will be an adult" which children "internalize". [53] By first-

---

49 Ibid, 194

50 May, *Critical Theory,* viii – ix, 40.

51 Cullingford, *Formative Years*, 13

52 U.C. Knoepflmacher, "Children's texts and the grown-up reader", in *Cambridge Companion to Children's Literature*, eds. M.O. Grenby and Andrea Immel, (Cambridge University Press, 2009), 159

53 Lesnik- Oberstein, *Children's Literature: New Approaches*, (Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), 12.

person narration or character focalisation in children's fiction, the author tries to get readers to "to align themselves with that focalising character's point of view"[54] or the child reader is led to sympathise with the child protagonist who has been created by the adult author and/or editor and/or publisher. As Nikolajeva argues "[e]ven when a child character is given a voice through direct speech or thought, there is often an adult voice accompanying it and adjusting it to guide the reader towards 'correct' understanding."[55] The child character could therefore be said to be a complete construction, a ploy, a lure, a bait to draw the real child[56] into the sphere of construction, silencing out the constructive part of the child. Hence, by Aidan Chambers' understanding, if the "real author" creates the "implied author" and "puts himself into the narrator", child or adult, at the same time creating an "implied reader" who the "real reader", child or adult, is meant to follow in navigating the book to its true meaning, the child reader is expected to unquestioningly accept all perspectives and prejudices embodied in the author and reader who exist within the textual construction and who the otherwise "unyielding" child reader is drawn in by.[57] If one accepts that all children's literature is aimed at a dual audience, given that it is adults who overwhelmingly create, approve, circulate, sell, and provide children's texts to adult buyers who introduce children to them[5859], then one recognises the ease with which the more mature adult reader can surrender their self to and judge the perspective in the book and approve and disprove its suitability for children accordingly and further the pedagogical function of children's literature. To quote Deborah

---

54 John Stephens, "Linguistics and stylistics", in *International Companion Encyclopaedia of Children's Literature*, ed. Peter Hunt, 2nd edition, Volume 1, (London and New York: Routledge, 2004), 106

55 Nikolajeva, "Narrative Theory", 173

56 Lesnik-Oberstein, *New Approaches*, 13

57 Aidan Chambers, "The Reader in the Book: Notes from Work in Progress", *Children's Literature Association Quarterly*, (1978 Proceedings), 3

58 Immel, "Constrcutions of childhood", 21.

59Deborah Stevenson, "Classics and canons", in *Cambridge Companion to Children's Literature*, eds. M.O. Grenby and Andrea Immel, (Cambridge University Press, 2009), 109

Stevenson then, "[u]ltimately the literatures most powerful children are ex-children"[60] who continue the tradition of constructing childhoods, a phenomenon that can be reductively compared to the tradition of doing chores for upperclassmen in English boarding schools. As Hilary Wentworth explains to Pat and Isabel O'Sullivan in *The Twins at St. Clare's* by Enid Blyton, "It's the custom of the school – and anyway, it doesn't hurt us. We can have our turn at sending messages and ordering the lower forms about when we're top formers ourselves."[61] The logic stands as: As we have been constructed as helpless, dependent, voiceless children; we will construct children ourselves when we're older and in a position of power and no longer silenced. The problem with this of course, is that adults, as one half of the Child/Adult binary, are also constructed by social norms and expected to comport themselves in socially accepted ways, beyond which lies deviancy.

To summarise, the child protagonist in a text is in itself a created character by the author and therefore not only a "constructed" child but also a doubly silenced child as their voice is manipulated by the adult author who is their creator. Reading about this created child is the actual child reader who, finding the character potentially relatable, might internalise this silenced voice. "The child therefore functions as a unique Other to the adult – each adult carries the memory of childhood within"[62], even as memory, distanced by time, can be a constructed abstraction.

Silence by Displacement/Replacement

While as a reader, Morrison encounters her people as a decorative tool in the white writer's arsenal, as a writer she discerns that the Africanist persona is rather like Basil Hallward's

60 Ibid, 109

61 Blyton, *The Twins at St. Clare's*, (Mammoth, 2004), 20.

62 Vallone, "Ideas of difference", 188

painting of Dorian Gray – "The fabrication of an Africanist persona is reflexive; an extraordinary meditation on the self; a powerful exploration of the fears and desires that reside in the writerly consciousness."[63] It becomes a way of ascribing to the Africanist persona the deviances whiteness would cast out from itself and thereafter policing the 'dross' through violence and repression, literal silencing and exercise of hegemonic control. As Morrison best explains it herself,

> "Through the simple expedient of demonizing and reifying the range of color on a palette, American Africanism makes it possible to say and not say, to inscribe and erase, to escape and engage, to act out and act on, to historicize and render timeless. It provides a way of contemplating chaos and civilization, desire and fear, and a mechanism for testing the problems and blessings of freedom."[64]

The Africanist and constructed Native American personae are used as pawns in whiteness' exploration of its own complexities and silencing and suppressing this created persona, exertion of control over this very creation, which in turn suppress, replace and silence the true African and Native American voice(s), serves to provide false assurances of honour and nobility to the 'Christian' and 'civilized' white ego. What therefore occurs is that by literal, created and enforced silencing of the created persona of the perceived Other, it is whiteness itself which gets silenced by displacement. The created Other replaces that part of whiteness which it rejects from itself, consequently reducing itself due to its inability to accept difference. Whiteness silences a part of itself by displacing it onto a creation which exists in its imagination and fear and which it tries to enforce in reality, the silence inadvertently exposing its own savagery.

---

63 Morrison, *Playing in the Dark*, 17

64 Ibid, 7

Examining slave narratives written by women before the Civil War, and marking the inhumane punishments that were meted out to them, Morrison writes,

> "How hard they work to define the slave as inhuman, savage, when in fact the definition of the inhuman describes overwhelmingly the punisher...such extreme pain seems to be designed for the pleasure of the one with the lash.
>
> The necessity of rendering the slave a foreign species appears to be a desperate attempt to confirm one's own self as normal. The urgency of distinguishing between those who belong to the human race and those who are decidedly non-human is so powerful the spotlight turns away and shines not on the object of degradation but on its creator...the danger of sympathizing with the stranger is the possibility of becoming the stranger. To lose one's racial-ized rank is to lose one's own valued and enshrined difference."[65]

Silencing by Displacement therefore, works doubly and ironically. Not only is the created persona the savagery is displaced on silenced out of fear, the white man's desire for superiority is so great it chooses to silence its own humanity.

A similar reading can be pursued in the case of children's reader, as Jacqueline Rose does in 'The Case of Peter Pan: The Impossibility of Children's Fiction' and though her argument has been subsequently dismantled, her point about the displacement of latent psychological desires from the adult author to the child character and reader remain pertinent. Here, however, there is a glorification of the child, rather than a vilification, as it is with the Africanist or Orientalist presence. For Rose, falling back on Freud, glorifying the child as innocent is not only "repressing" the child of its sexuality and denying its contradictions but

65 Morrison, *Origins*, 29 -30

denying any deviant sexuality in the adult psyche[66], so that the constructed child in literature becomes something of a means to the end of personal repression, a declaration that these aberrations were absent from the very formative years. Simply put, "displacement substitutes socially acceptable modes for desires that are forbidden."[67] For Hamida Bosmajian, displacement via the implied author – adult or child - becomes liberating for the real author as subtleties in the work escape the child reader, though she does not consider the adult reader of the same work who might be sensitive to these "strategies and gaps". In her reading, silencing by displacement is more an Un-silencing of the author's repressed psyche and similar to the employment of art and play therapy to facilitate expression of repressed trauma in a child, which puts her directly at odds with Rose's reading. Peter Hunt seems to find the middle path between the two stands, asserting that children's books, especially in the pre-World War I era, did perform a therapeutic function, in that childhood traumas were displaced onto it by way of fears in fantasy.[68]

Un-Silencing

What Toni Morrison engages in through her fiction and non-fiction, is the act of Un-Silencing, where she takes backs the created history of her ancestors and re-writes it by articulating the truth and giving them a posthumous voice. What she espouses is the very idea of the formerly colonized using the language of the coloniser to re-write the narrative. In the 21st century, with the internet and social media, this un-silencing has taken the shape of #MeToo and #BlackLivesMatter for example. It is facilitated by the mass movement of globalization that has happened over the last century, without the immigration controlled by

66 Rose, "Case of Peter Pan", 60, 63

67 Hamida Bosmajian, "Psychoanalytical criticism", in *International Companion Encyclopaedia of Children's Literature*, ed. Peter Hunt, 2nd edition, Volume 1, (London and New York: Routledge, 2004), 130

68 Hunt, *Children's Literature*, 16

colonialism, but it doesn't happen without facing the expected amount of obstacles and even as #BlackLivesMatter and Black History Month gains momentum, racist incidents against people of colour is alarmingly on the rise, #AllLivesMatter – a manifestation of the enforced "polite and liberal" stance on race – finds believers and the Ku Klux Klan and white supremacists get noisier. Un-silencing due to globalization has unleashed and exposed white insecurities in its entirety; while President Trump still holds onto the idea of a border wall with Mexico, migrant caravans make their way into the American South.

> The spectacle of mass movement draws attention inevitably to the borders, the porous places, the vulnerable points where the concept of home is seen as being menaced by foreigners. Much of the alarm hovering at the borders, the gates, is stoked...by 1) both the threat and promise of globalization; and 2) an uneasy relationship with our own foreignness, our own rapidly disintegrating sense of belonging.[69]

In the last five years, with a strengthening far-right internationally, the porosity of these borders, especially for those seeking refuge, is under threat as concepts of citizenship, nation belonging, race and culture is being questioned.[70] This is in opposition to un-silencing that is happening across the spheres of literature, music and visual media as diversity and representation is given increasingly greater value.

This un-silencing is supported by Federic Jameson's assertion that

> The cultural monuments and masterworks that have survived tend necessarily to perpetuate only a single voice in this class dialogue, the voice of a hegemonic class, they cannot be properly assigned their relational place in a dialogical system without the restoration or

69 Morrison, *Origin,* 94 – 95.

70 Morrison, *Origins*, 99

> artificial reconstruction of the voice to which they were initially opposed, a voice for the most part stifled and reduced to silence.[71]

When the voices unheard in recorded history is finally heard and preserved, that too is an act of Un-silencing, here of the "silent side of history" of the common man buried under "the loud facts of history".[72] Recording the lived memories of events like World War II and the Holocaust, and the freedom struggle and Partition as experienced by the common man beyond the official archives un-silences the forgotten and nearly lost stories as long as it is done without critical mediation, otherwise then the memory is tampered with.

The presence of social media, which puts readers in direct contact with the author, allows for questioning by the child reader who has become an adult, which exposes the absences present in the work, most notably seen in the interactions J. K. Rowling has with readers of her Wizarding World books and films, those who have grown alongside Harry Potter for over a decade, and have questioned her over issues ranging from the mischaracterization of Hermione in the heavily contested *Harry Potter and the Cursed Child*, to the complete erasure of Native Americans in Magic in North America even as she appropriates totem divinities from various Native American cultures to convert into the house structures of a school created along white British frameworks.[73]

In her discussion of feminism and children's literature, Lissa Paul identifies the following methods of what can be read as unsilencing: Re-Reading and its sub-categories Reinerpretation, Rehabilitation, Recreation; Reclaiming; and, Redirection.[74] Her categories can be applied beyond feminism to race, class and childhood itself.

---

71 Dauncey, "Uses of Silence", 36. Refers to Frederic Jameson, *The Political Unconsciousness,* 85.

72 Max Picard, *World of Silence*, 73

73 Loralee Sepsey, "Dear J. K. Rowling: We're Still Here", in blog *Natives in North America*, 1st July, 2016.

74 Lissa Paul, "Feminism revisited", in *International Companion Encyclopaedia of Children's Literature*, ed. Peter Hunt, 2nd edition, Volume 1, (London and New York: Routledge, 2004), 142 – 150.

As Roderick McGillis notes, "the opening of the canon to include forgotten writers (many of them women), ignored genres (such as fantasy and science fiction), books from former colonial countries and popular formula fiction (such as 'Goosebumps' or 'Animorphs' series)"[75] benefitted Children's literature, but it also benefitted the mainstream "adult" canon, resulting in a literature that must be Redirected to be more positively representative and inclusive of differences. Victoria Flanagan echoes this with respect to the inclusion of gender differences in children's literature[76] and Clare Bradford in saying, "children's texts have been a high priority for indigenous publishing houses, which seek to offer indigenous children experiences of narrative subjectivity while enabling non-indigenous children to engage with cultural difference...indigenous identities are multifarious...so no text can speak for all indigenous people" echoes Pauls' idea of reclaiming, though she does also clarify the limitations of the scope of the text. [77]

Therefore, when Angela Carter rewrites fairy tales from the feminist point-of-view in *The Bloody Chamber and Other Stories*, and when Enid Blyton, for all her classist, racist, xenophobic views, writes the *Malory Towers* and *St. Clare's* series, where the girls in boarding schools are the focus and the adult interference is nearly minimal, they engage in acts of reclaiming the fairy tale from the male hero saviour and the boy's school stories respectively.

Moreover, when Blyton shows the Famous Five or Five Find-Outers and dog embarking on their own to solve mysteries or road trips, while adult figures like parents are mostly absent, or ridiculed, like Mr. Goon, she reverses the "children should be seen and not heard" maxim,

---

75 Roderick McGillis, "'Criticism is the theory of literature': theory is the criticism of literature", in *The Routledge Companion to Children's Literature*, ed. David Rudd, (London and New York: Routledge, 2010), 15.

76 Victoria Flanagan, "Gender studies", in *The Routledge Companion to Children's Literature*, ed. David Rudd, (London and New York: Routledge, 2010), 26

77 Clare Bradford, "Race, Ethnicity and Colonialism", in *The Routledge Companion to Children's Literature*, ed. David Rudd, (London and New York: Routledge, 2010), 45

by focusing solely on the children and their judgements of the adults in their lives.[78] Even though Blyton's own narratorial voice is often heard and helpful adults usually surface near the end of the mystery stories – like Inspector Jenkins – her tone betrays more curiosity and excitement than patronage, which usually is a feature in adult author-child character relationships in children's texts.

The publishing of juvenilia too, would fall under Un-silencing as it allows for the voice of the child author to be heard, though even here, adults act as intermediaries – as editors, publishers, parents, and that is after these productions are approved by adult publishers for publishing.

Re-Silencing

The challenge to Un-silencing is Re-silencing, which occurs when the scope for Un-silencing is deliberately or inadvertently misused to impose a further silence on an already silenced group through the use of stereotypes or an assumption of their voice by a mediating third party[79]. An example of the former is the increasingly racist productions of Helen Bannerman's *Little Black Sambo* which had not been copyrighted in the United States.[80] The opportunity to undo and rewrite Bannerman's originally racist story was wasted by repeated racist illustrations in pre-Civil Rights era America. An example of the latter is provided by Clare Bradford – "Suzanne Fisher Staples' novels *Shabanu: Daughter of the Wind* (1989), *Haveli* (1993) and *Under the Persimmon Tree* (2005) accord with the tenets of neo-Orientalism in their representation of a homogenized Muslim culture characterized by

78 Cullingford, *Formative Years,* 112.

79 Bradford, *Unsettling Narratives*, 71

80 Brian, Alderson, "The making of children's books", in *Cambridge Companion to Children's Literature*, eds. M.O. Grenby and Andrea Immel, (Cambridge University Press, 2009), 51.

barbarism, the oppression of women and girls and socio-political systems based on tribalism rather than loyalty to the nation-state. The protagonists of these novels are exceptional Muslim girls whose aspirations and values are readily aligned with those of their implied Western readers."[81] This can be read as a Re-silencing because while it looks like there is an Un-silencing due to the representation and championing of Muslim girls breaking norms which silence them, they are re-silenced under Western models. Moreover, it is members of the immigrant population situated in the West who are represented; the people in the homeland continue to remain silenced in the Western market as one part of the asymmetrical power relations of them us/them, metropolis/colony, dominant/subaltern dynamics.

"'Subaltern' is a term used to identify those who are unable to represent themselves and remain outside of the discursive sphere - figures who are denied the possibility of speaking for themselves."[82] The subaltern are products of a hierarchical silencing – inferred from Ranajit Guha's stratification of the people in a colonial context[83] and which continues to exist even in the postcolonial world - determined by the convoluted equations of racial constructions and that of class, wealth, location, gender, age, access to Western models of education, caste; not necessarily in that order. The subaltern occupies the bottom tier in each of these categories with subcategories within them, namely man, woman, child in a three-tier pyramid in that order.

Gender, itself a construction historically used to oppress and subjugate women enclosing them in the domestic sphere and silencing their voices by patronising diagnosis of hysteria, reduces women to the category between the dominant patriarch and the dominated child. Hence, when Spivak offers a reading of Bhuvaneshwari Bhaduri's suicide in pre-

81 Bradford, "Race, Ethnicityand Colonialism", 45

82 Dauncey, "Uses of Silence", 56

83 Gayatri Chakrovorty Spivak, "Can the Subaltern Speak?", in *Colonial discourse and post-colonial theory: a reader*, eds. Laura Chrisman and Patrick Williams, (New York and Sydney: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1993), 79,

Independence India, she is trying to un-silence Bhaduri's muteness caused by first her position as an unmarried woman and then by her death. However, because Spivak is piecing together the abstract and unverified intentions of a person who has been silenced by death from scant clues, she runs the risk of a re-silencing instead of an un-silencing by assuming Bhaduri's reasoning and stamping her reading as the final word, because the subject will not return to refute or support her. Spivak therefore imposes a final silence on Bhuvaneshwari Bhadhuri, a subject who has been silenced once as a woman, then by her death, then by Spivak's mis-attributing to her a subalternity she does not possess by way of class, wealth and education, and finally by Spivak's re-silencing of her voice.

When the subaltern historian, or anyone representing the subaltern speak for and of the subaltern, they engage in a re-silencing unless they speak with the subaltern or with the subaltern experience – there is no un-silencing when a third party controls and directs the terms of that "un-silencing". Children, therefore, never achieve a state of Un-silencing as even their own productions face third party mediation and approval and they continue to be controlled by adults in every sphere; they only ever get Re-Silenced.

Assumed Silence

Silence can be assumed when the subject being looked at is not directly engaged into interaction but nevertheless judged to be silent and without opinion – for example the Austen heroines Fanny Price and Anne Elliot, who are automatically assumed to be inferior and unworthy of respect not just because of their social position but because they do not voice their opinion loudly; if Elizabeth Bennett did not always have a witty retort on hand, one doubts if Mr. Darcy would have been captivated by her 'fine eyes'.

It can also be assumed in the case of the dual audience in the children's literature. When the adult author displaces their repressed, forbidden feelings onto the implied narrator or the glorified child to feel a sense of relief because the child reader cannot understand the nuances, they are assuming the child's mental capacity as incapable and by making this assumption they are imposing a silence. This can be read in Barbara Wall's statement too, that the "narrators will address child naratees overtly and self consciously, and will also address adults, either overtly, as the implied author's attention shifts away from the implied child reader to a different older audience, or covertly, as the narrator deliberately exploits the ignorance of the implied child reader by making jokes that are funny primarily because children will not understand them..." It not only assumes a silence on the part of the children, but is also extremely patronising in that it finds humour in laughing at the very audience the writer purports to write for, for no fault or folly their own; for example in various cartoons children in the 1990s viewed on Cartoon Network and Nickelodeon, are peppered with adult jokes, as uncovered in various articles by the online news outlet Buzzfeed and consequently available for the perusal of readers of all ages in the digital world.

False Silences

As implied in the section Literal Silences, silence can be the result of introversion and therefore a false silence because in this case there is no outside party, or circumstance which is hindering communication, but rather a personal inability or trepidation to communicate or a choice to simply remain silent with the freedom to speak at any given point.

But false silences can also be used as weapons of rebellion and rewriting, through the employment of subliminal messages, subversion and reversal of the child's gaze on adult[84], black gaze on white, feminist gaze on patriarchy, all the while maintaining a cover of silence.

According to Jill P. May, false silences – though she does not use that exact term – are put in place by children's authors to avoid censorship and controversy at the stage of evaluation, through the use of messages understandable to the child but critical of mainstream structures, within the framework of those very structures.[85] Later in the book, May cites African-American critic Valerie Smith's reading that African-Americans have, since slavery, "displayed a profound consciousness of language, created a space for the expression of his or her will or identity, and seized the opportunity to escape."[86] Smith therefore speaks of the false silences present in the underground movement to freedom as lived by her ancestors.

This concept is evoked by Homi K. Bhabha in his reading of Frantz Fanon's "Algeria Unveiled", when he reads the veil as a symbol of resistance against the coloniser, without overnight overturning the existing colonial system[87] but rather as an underground movement, which false silence is characteristic of.

Selective Silencing

In 1791, when Richard Johnson published the *Arabian Nights* as *The Oriental Moralist*, he "assured purchasers that he had 'carefully expunged everything that could give the least offence to the most delicate reader.'"[88]

84 Cullingford, *Formative Years*, 136

85 May, *Critical Theory*, 56. See also Hunt, *Children's Literature*, 17.

86 Ibid, 143. From Valerie Smith, *Self-discovery and Authority in Afro-American Narrative,* (Cambridge, Massachusetts & London, England: Harvard University Press, 1987), 4 –5.

87 Bhabha, *Location*, 89 – 90

88 Alderson, "Making of children's books", 38

In doing so, Johnson inevitably erased much of the richness of the stories and the culture they are borne out of – a fate shared by translations of Rumi's verse[89] - to appeal to a white reader who will engage with the exotic Orient on their own terms and to their taste, without being made cognizant of its differences. This is not reading a cross-cultural text for holistic learning, but to follow fashions. Johnson, therefore, selective silences parts of the stories, as do translators of Rumi, to render them palatable to vaguely cultivated interests.

Similarly, the German translations of Alice in Wonderland suffer from a selective silencing within the text because the original proves to be a linguistic and contextual challenge. So all that is "grotesque" or untranslatable or inexplicable is removed from the translation– a selective silencing by exclusion. Emer O'Sullivan also notes that the Enzensberger translation of Alice, where British cultural references are replaced by European references – also observable in translations of Harry Potter in various languages – mutates the book from one aimed at children to one understood only by adults. [90]

A similar trend is observed by Toni Morrison:

> "It is interesting, not surprising, that the arbiters of critical power in American literature seem to take pleasure in, indeed relish, their ignorance of African-American texts. What is surprising is that their refusal to read black texts – a refusal that makes no disturbance in their intellectual life – repeats itself when they reread the traditional, established works of literature worthy of their attention."[91]

89 Ali Rozina, "The Erasure of Islam from the Poetry of Rumi", *The New Yorker*, 5th January 2017.
90 Emer O'Sullivan, "Comparative children's literature", in *International Companion Encyclopaedia of Children's Literature*, ed. Peter Hunt, 2nd edition, Volume 1, (London and New York: Routledge, 2004), 199.
91 Morrison, *Playing in the Dark*, 13.

To support her statement, Morrison provides examples from criticisms of texts by Henry James, Gertrude Stein and Willa Cather, where the Africanist presence and issue of race have been unstudied by critics, ending with the dismissal of William Faulkner's later works which focus on race and class. She goes on to liken the "willed scholarly indifference" or a personal choice to maintain silence on a subject to the "centuries-long, hysterical blindness to feminist discourse and the way in which women and women's issues were read (or unread).[92] As Clare Bradford observes, "when books by minority authors [or about minorities] find white audiences, this is generally because they are not *too* different'.[9394]

This act of selecting aspects of a literary product, and by extension, the circumstances or influences which have birthed it for study, while overlooking or deliberately ignoring other, equally powerful forces in the text, becomes a way of maintaining and perpetuating pre-existing biases. This enforcing of silence on self regarding selective issues can be applied to the existence of children's literature as "a parallel universe to the world of canonical literature"[95], which, while forming the first texts any person encounters in their developmental processes, remains a "parallel canon". The silencing enforced on the entire body of children's literature is therefore similar to the silencing Morrison notes has traditionally been enforced on feminist discourses. However, an aspect of selection is to be found here too. Specific texts of children's literature have been gauged important enough that they find place in both universes, with or without controversy.[96] – one of which is one of the primary texts examined in this thesis – with Lewis Carroll's *Alice's Adventures in*

92 ibid, 14

93 Bradford, "Race, Ethnicity", 46

94 Michael Awkward, *Negotiating Difference: Race, Gender and the Politics of Positionality*, (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1995), 66 -67.

95 Hunt, *Children's Literature*, 2.

96 Deborah Cogan Thacker, "Criticism and the critical mainstream", in *International Companion Encyclopaedia of Children's Literature*, ed. Peter Hunt, 2nd edition, Volume 1, (London and New York: Routledge, 2004), 46.

Wonderland, Markus Zusak's *The Book Thief*, and J.K. Rowling's *Harry Potter* series a few scant examples. Moreover, within the construction of the unofficial canons of children's literature – itself testament to the silencing of literature aimed at children in the construction of mainstream canons[97] - the Newberry, Caldecott and Touchstones lists have historically included ""safe" tiles depicting wholesome white children struggling to secure a self- identity for themselves".[98] There are no differences in these selections – with both authors and created characters uniformly white and heteronormative. Only recently have these lists begun to embrace diverse representation in greater numbers.

Selective silencing also occurs in the books which are provided to children within the spaces of education that they occupy, especially the school, including textbooks which can embrace xenophobic, racist, sexist, classist, castiest views behind the protection of an approved school text. Writing on the value of providing elementary school children with "transcultural" and "multicultural" children's fiction, Linda Pratt and Janice J. Beaty in *Transcultural Children's Literature* configure a set of guidelines and paradigms by which to select the children's fiction from "other" cultures which children in the United States ought to be exposed to, though they assert that a "transcultural book" is "relative to the reader's own home culture and geographic region".[99] Following this logic, this thesis proposes to study Mark Twain's *Adventures of Tom Sawyer*, *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*, and *The Prince and The Pauper* as transcultural texts when examined by way of its various adaptations in Japan, India and South Korea. Many of these texts, deemed as canonical "classics" and out of copyright, are read by children in abridged editions, as has been mentioned before, and each edition, depending on the publisher and editor excise out parts of the text based on their own

97 ibid, 44.

98 May, *Critical Theory*, 139

99 Linda Pratt and Janice J. Beaty, *Transcultural Children's Literature*, (Columbus, Ohio: Prentice Hall, 1999), 2.

discretion and determined length of the edition, in the process removing the greater part of the politics of the text as they simplify it by reduction. As a child growing up in urban India at the turn of the millennium, these abridged editions of novels - many of which not originally written for children – formed as much a part of our literary diet as Enid Blyton and Roald Dahl.

While Pratt and Beaty justly say that the purpose of transcultural children's literature is to "help children acquire an awareness of a more inclusive world"[100] and by implication not develop prejudices about a certain or various culture(s), the paradigms and guidelines inadvertently expose their limitations and betray a similar kind of selective silencing spoken of earlier in this segment.[101] The guidelines are shallow and generalized, fitting all cultures under umbrella paradigms of political system, geography, economic system and social system, with no space for the individual histories which shape individuals cultures and without solid framework to authenticate the portrayal of the culture depicted in the text provided. It holds the teachers (and parents) responsible for judging authenticity and provision of the texts, without taking into concern pre-existing biases these mediating figures might have. This, in itself, is an act of control over the content consumed by children, and puts the adult educator in a position to silence aspects of a culture which they deem unsuitable for the children, which defeats the purpose of exposing children to transcultural children's literature. One of the points on the checklist is "The author's depiction of peoples social roles and activities express a transcultural quality if...4. they provide positive role models"[102]. While Pratt and Beaty do not say *only* "positive role models", the very inclusion of this criteria implies an exclusion of a multiplicity of characters, of which some might be

100 ibid, 4

101 An example of a deliberate application of selective silencing can be seen in the education of the colonized subject as noted by Bhabha, *Location*, 124.

102 Pratt and Beaty, *Transcultural Children's Literature*, 14.

negative and might provide instruction to the child by way of negative example. This erasure, a silencing, of the negative aspects of a culture, which co-exist with the positive, renders an incomplete and unreal portrayal of the subject culture which potentially leads to incomplete and unrealistic understanding in the child reader. Moreover, who decides what is "positive" and what is "negative'? One peoples' positive may be another's negative and by empowering educators to mediate in the selection of texts, certain positive aspects of the transcultural text might be excised before consumption because it is deemed negative by the adult reader who engages with the text before it is passed on to the child reader. This "selective silencing" becomes an assertion and continuation of dominance over the culture it comes into contact with and deems the inferior "Other", aspects of which are negotiated with selectively on the basis of yardsticks pertinent to the dominant culture[103] – in the case of this text by Pratt and Beaty, America. Moreover, before the provision of transcultural texts to children in Western educational systems, is the issue of translation, which, as already mentioned earlier, can be severely problematic, but faced with the diverse texts from diverse countries, those from predominantly white countries tend to garner a greater amount of preference, hence explaining the wild popularity of texts like the Swiss *Heidi* or the Swedish *Pippi Longstocking* or the German *Inkheart* trilogy. And in former colonies, it explains the still enduring popularity of Enid Blyton and Roald Dahl and European fairy tales as opposed to literature for children produced in India in English and native languages – in popular bookstores like Starmark, or the erstwhile Oxford Bookstore Junior, or Story in Kolkata, India, for every single shelf of Indian children's literature in English, translation or original, there is an entire bookshelf stocked with Blyton on the average. Inclusion of writing in vernacular depends on the space available.

103 Bradford, *Unsetling Narratives*, 72

This also renders the idea of the Universal Child suspect, as by creating a Universal Child at all, all racial, cultural, experiential differences are overlooked and the concept of the Universal Child is constructed broadly in Euro-American paradigms. It leaves no scope and space for children from diverse cultures where childhood could be and is constructed differently historically.[104]

Silencing/Speaking by Action

As mentioned earlier, Pratt and Beaty formulate generalized guidelines to measure the value and authenticity of transcultural children's texts, with the end goal of the student being able to "make generalizations about the country and culture"[105] which reveals attitude of the authors towards the subject itself. Though they do say that multiple texts from one culture ought to be studied to gain a holistic understanding and the child reader might wish to independently explore a specific culture in the depth, the checklist provided for determining the introductory texts in the subject display a polite indifference towards an exhaustive understanding of a culture different from one's own. Even within an exhaustive checklist, which insists that the author of the text selected be native to the culture there is no provision for evaluating the authors' own biases towards their own culture. Apart from this, how else is one to verify the authenticity of the portrayal in the text, beyond trusting the author? Is it to be verified against personal experience or further secondary sources? Neither do they provide space for the social and political histories which make cultures nuanced, different, dynamic and unique from each other. Limiting them within the sphere of generalized guidelines only serves to silence the dynamism of various cultures and reinforce and perpetuate stereotypes among the child reader.

104 Rose, "Case of Peter Pan", 62.

105 Pratt and Beaty, *Transcultural Children's Literature*, 15.

A similar sense of shallowness and patronage is spoken of by Toni Morrison in *Playing in the Dark: Whiteness and the Literary Imagination*. She calls it "silence and evasion" which is "complicated by the fact that the habit of ignoring race is understood to be a graceful, even generous, liberal gesture...To enforce its invisibility through silence is to allow the black body a shadowless participation in the dominant cultural body. According to this logic, every well-bred instinct argues against noticing..."[106]

What Morrison articulates is a Silencing by the very action of not acknowledging and appreciating difference in the guise of condescending, patronising, superficial and hypocritical well-bred politeness. By shoving under the carpet discussions on issues of not just race relations but also gender relations, there is an erasure and silencing of these crucial matters from immediate consciousness and consequently a continuation of oppression in subtler forms. This also results in dominant oppressor identifying as liberal and politically correct in their navigation of race and gender relations:

- I have a friend who is a person of colour, therefore I am not racist and racism doesn't exist.
- I have a friend who is a girl, therefore I am not misogynistic.

The instances of everyday violent racism and crimes against women that plagues the world – especially the increased number of attacks against people of colour in the United States of America since the 2016 presidential elections – is silenced out in the face of this logic by people who do not actively condemn racism and sexism and choose to enforce a silence on themselves. This act of self-silencing therefore facilitates the larger silencing that occurs as a result of this "liberal gesture". This evasion and patronage carries with a subjective sense of superiority and privilege, making even what might have been kind intentions unkind.

106 Morrison, *Playing in the Dark*, 9-10

This notion of patronage in silencing by the act of speaking is further discussed in her reading of the slave narratives which boomed in the 19th century, in support of the "discourse of slavery and freedom"[107].

> " How could one speak of ...almost anything a country concerns itself with – without having as a referent, at the heart of the discourse, at the heart of definition, the presence of Africans and their descendents?
>
> It was not possible...What did happen frequently was an effort to talk about these matters with a vocabulary designed to disguise the subject...the consequence was a master narrative that spoke *for* Africans and their descendents, or *of* them. The legislator's narrative could not coexist with a response from the Africanist persona...the slave's own narrative, while freeing the narrator in many ways, did not destroy the master narrative."[108]

The slave narrative, mediated and edited by the dominant, white, pro-abolitionist editor, would inevitably be silenced even as the slave finds a voice to speak out, by omission of detail, or trivializing the important or reconstructing the original language to present the slave narrator as inferior and therefore pitiable, and to reinforce white privilege[109] even as they "magnanimously" give voice to a slave. Perhaps the most apt example in this context is the narrative trajectory of Jim in Twain's *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*, *Tom Sawyer Abroad*, *Tom Sawyer Detective*, and *Huck Finn and Tom Sawyer Among the Indians*.

Clare Bradford observes a similar attitude of patronage and a re-silencing when she notes

---

107 ibid, 50

108 ibid, 50

109 Ibid, 51

> across colonial settings, ethnographers and folklorists collected the narratives of indigenous peoples, altering them to accord with European narrative practices and publishing them as children's stories; often they were styled as the last remnants of traditional stories saved from extinction by their assiduous collectors. Detached from the cultures in which they originated, such stories were incorporated into Western frames of reference. Indeed, such stories continue to appear as 'West Indian', 'Native American' or 'African' stories in anthologies, where readers can have little or no understanding of how these stories are woven into the values and beliefs of the cultures from which they derive.'[110]

There are multiple kids of silences at work here. Firstly, it is the third party acting in the interest of the reader to edit, modify, manipulate, and silence into reproductions in print or visual media rather than portraying the original and teaching otherwise by way of other influences, thereby creating a silence of the original narrative. Secondly, there is a Re-silencing, since the white ethnographer purports to speak for the voiceless minority, only to disrespectfully represent the indigenous folklores on a universal scale. Thirdly, both these silences contribute to the development of a silence created by speaking and acting for the already silenced, for though the tales and narratives have been voiced, there has been a reduction in value and a misuse and misappropriation of them[111] to the point that when an Indigenous voice speaks without mediation, they are deemed not representative enough as against that created by the Non-Indigenous author[112]. A counter-argument to this would be that as reduced and simplified stories appearing in anthologies, they can serve as inadequate

110 Bradford, "Race, Ethnicity", 44

111 See also, Bhabha, *Location*, 20. And Bradford, *Narratives*, discussion of Paul Goble's collection of Native American tales, 80 - 81

112 Bradford, *Narratives*, 91

introduction to the curious reader who would be willing to explore the provenance and historical richness of these stories further. But that is the condition the counter-argument stands on – the reader would have to be a very specific kind of reader to give the tales their due respect and therefore a miniscule percentage of the majority who would read the anthologies, as school texts or otherwise.

When Disney increased Pocahontas' age to position her as the love interest to the white "sympathetic" settler, John Smith in *Pocahontas (1995)*, while promoting her as a feminist heroine for wanting to be free of her social shackles and eventually exercising her choice to refuse the man she fell in love with, and then investing her as the first (and only) official Native American Disney Princess, they were Silencing by Speaking for Native American peoples in the name of inclusion and representation. Not only were the crew working on animation, music and casting definitely mostly not Native American, Pocahontas' features were deliberately redrawn to look Mongoloid and make her more beautiful and sexualized with the rest of the movie constructed around stereotypes.[113] Moreover, by defining her yearning for individuality as feminist, they draw her away from her Powhatan identity, as noted by Clare Bradford.[114] She is certainly an example of inclusivity, representation and feminism, but only within the paradigms of Euro-American constructions of feminism and she is included on their terms, as a Pocahontas created by Disney, not as she was, thus making her a token, and silenced by those who offered to speak for her. Disney does place Pocahontas in the realm of universal knowledge, but they also reduce her by mis-representing her. Even as Judy Kuhn and Vanessa Williams sing "You think the only people who are people,/ Are the

113 A decade later, Canadian-Japanese actress Mizuo Peck would be cast as Shoshone icon Sacagawea in the highly popular *Night at the Museum* trilogy where she would be romantically paired with the late Robin Williams' Teddy Roosevelt.

114 Bradford, *Narratives*, 74 - 77

people who look and think like you?" from the main single from the movie, the iconic "Colors of The Wind", they accentuate Disney's act of nomalizing silencing.

Enforced Silence

The "willed scholarly indifference"[115] with regards to the study of issues of race and feminism by white, male critics, and the "silence and evasion" tactic in discussions of race as a "generous" gesture[116] are both aspects of enforcing a silence on the self. In the case of the former, this enforced silence is a personal choice that only serves to limit them as critics, and while the latter might be different from the former in the nature of it, they share the same principle. Those choosing to ignore race in literary discourse or daily parlance, endeavour to enforce a silence on the issue of race in a text or current affairs, but as Morrison says, "The world does not become raceless or will not become unracialized by assertion. The act of enforcing racelessness in literary discourse is itself a racial act."[117] By attempting to enforce silence about race and/or class and/or gender politics in the guise of liberal politeness, it only emphasizes and highlights the issues further as an elephant in a crowded room. And by doing so they become complicit in the act perpetuating racism and/or sexism and/or class hierarchies, and what is silenced deliberately is their own capacity to overcome prejudice and bias.

Working in tandem with silencing by displacement is silencing by repression, which is an enforcement and suppression of instinct in oneself. This repression happens mainly by a determination of the 'taboo', which are "communal prohibitions put in place to control instinctual desires - desires threatening to destroy the community... However, instead of

115 Morrison, *Playing in the Dark*, 14

116 ibid, 11

117 Ibid, 46

removing the desire altogether, the introduction of a prohibition invites its repression."[118][119] Race relations in American and colonial history is littered with the wielding of taboo. What would be determined as taboo, primarily sexual desire and mixed-race relations, by the slaveholder or the colonizer would be displaced onto the colonized Other as a deviancy to exert control over. Therefore, when Mayella Ewell surrenders to her own 'taboo' desire for the black man Tom Robinson in the deeply racialized American South, the punishment for 'rape' is meted out to Tom. This application and determination of taboo carries its own element of hypocrisy in that, rape of women of colour and birth of mixed race children was not only not considered taboo, but also routine and justified as women of colour were less than inferior and whose bodies were not their own – "those days it was called *droit du seignuer*, right of the lord."[120] While a white woman's desire for a black or brown man is taboo and would scandalise her community, a white man's rape of a woman of colour would be his right, with or without the element of desire.

Using the benign example of alcohol smuggling in during the Prohibition, prohibition invites not just repression or enforced silencing, but also incites rebellion, which in the case of race, gender and class relations can be dangerous. When a child is faced with 'taboos' about inter-personal race or gender relations, there is an awakening of curiosity which leads to examination, followed by punishment which results in internalizing the taboo and the prejudice it fosters – a girl child punished by orthodox parents for indulging in the taboo act of talking to a boy would grow up believing it as a deviancy in herself and thereby repressing her own instincts and internalizing that taboo by trying to propagate it amongst others. History, literature and film are littered with examples of psychopaths whose perversions can be traced back to the repression enforced by taboo.

---

118 Dauncey, "Uses of Silence", 70

119 Sigmund Freud, *Totem and Taboo: Some points of Agreement between the Mental Lives of Savages and Neurotics*, trans. by James Strachey, (London and New York: Routledge, 2011), 34.

120 Morrison, *Origins*, 9

Hierarchical Silencing

The assertion of racial, and/or gender, and/or class dominance by manipulating and mediating language to maintain established hierarchies is not specific to era, cultures, places. Shakespeare demarcated class distinctions through speech and diction patterns; Japanese women in the Heian Period were barred from knowing Chinese which was the language of the court and learned men; and as mentioned in the preceding segment, slave narrative was often reconstructed or the language of Africanist characters was created by white authors to this end. Morrison proposes a penetrative explication into how "the dialogue of black characters is construed as an alien, estranging dialect made deliberately unintelligible by spellings contrived to defamiliarize it; how Africanist language practices are employed to evoke the tension between speech and speechlessness; how it is used to establish a cognitive word split between speech and text, to reinforce class distinctions and otherness as well as to assert privilege and power..."[121] For the American and non-white reader, this manipulation of language is a silencing and humiliation of their voice and inherited histories by mockery. For non-white readers from countries without a history of slavery or colonialism[122], however, in the absence of further research and understanding, the language portrayed would be assumed as authentic and accurate, and hidden under the layers of the manipulated language is the silenced voice of the perceived Other.

This hierarchical silence based on race is not confined to the white/black binary. As Morrison examines in *The Origin of Others*, black towns which boomed after the Civil War, in "free" land wrested from Native American tribes, came with certain hierarchal conditions – the lighter the better, and the more skilled the more preferable. Therefore, within their own race, certain sections were rejected by color-coding and not only were Native Americans silenced

121 Morrison, *Playing in the Dark*, 52

122 Morrison notes "South America, England, France, Germany and Spain" as participants in the idea of "invented Africa". 7.

with the loss of their home, but also those who did not fulfil requirements of colour and skill.[123] It is much like the Muggleborn Registration Committee seen in *Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows*, where to remain in Wizarding society, one must produce at least one magical ancestor, failure of which would lead to a complete silencing by death or "imprisonment", a lateral application of the One – Drop Rule where even a single drop of non-white blood makes one non-white, by which logic America's first First Lady (of Colour) is not Michelle Obama, but Edith Wilson, who descended from Pocahontas.

Beyond race, as implied by class demarcations in Shakespearean plays, is the kind of silencing which supports the established hierarchy by differentiating by speech patterns and diction.[124] A prime example of this is Eliza Doolittle from Bernard Shaw's *Pygmalion,* who is asked to be quiet by Henry Higgins because her class and lack of formal education has not taught her to speak like a posh Londoner. Gradually, as her slang and colloquialisms and broad Cockney accent is "corrected" by Higgins, the flower girl who was once rudely silenced by polite society for daring to try earn a living, is taken for a European princess. Eliza Doolittle is an exception however, seeing as she forces and learns her way into genteel society. For those who do not undergo this language transformation, they continue to be judged and dominated and eventually silenced when around those who determine class and hierarchy by language usage and accent. Eliza, before her transformation, is a representative of the "doubly-silenced" woman – "subordinated by patriarchy and capitalism".[125]

The *Harry Potter* canon, as established in the 7 original original books, displays several instances of this hierarchical silencing.

123 Morrison, *Origins*, 56 -57, 64.

124 Dauncey, "Uses of Silence", 37.

125 Dauncey, "Uses of Silence", 42

× House-elves, as slaves, and therefore lowest in the hierarchy, are literally silenced, to the point that they are conditioned to punish themselves for even thinking ill of the family they serve.
× Hermione, as an articulate human witch, attempts to "speak" for the house-elves, assuming they all want freedom from servitude based on her one example of Dobby. While her crusade is justified in that she tries to end slavery, she does so without actually communicating with the house-elves herself but rather via subterfuge. Her assumptions are opposed by Winky who seems to represent house-elves more than Dobby does, and while house-elves are constructed by Rowling as a parallel of the ideal slave who loves their master, and Dobby as a merged representation of writers of slave narratives or slaves who would run away from the oppression, Hermione's dismissal of their opinion in her efforts can be read as an exercising of her hegemonic right. She inadvertently silences the house-elves as much as their social condition does.
× As an educated person who depends on reason and logic and the proven, Hermione also attempts to silence those who do not speak the same language of known fact as her – namely, Luna, who, though by no means inarticulate, displays a mind more open to the unknown than Hermione.
× It is not just blood purity which forms the hierarchical scheme of the Wizarding World but also magical ability, and as a pureblood who does not show great magical potential at the beginning, Neville Longbottom is often silenced by both family and peers who dismiss him as awkward and stupid, something which he internalizes and is evident by his stutter and reticence.

Silence as Power and Control

Toni Morrison explains this rather succinctly in *The Origin of Others*: "...for humans as an advanced species, our tendency to separate and judge those not in our clan as the enemy, as the vulnerable and the deficient needing control, has a long history...Race has been the constant arbiter of difference, as have wealth, class and gender – each of which is about power and the necessity of control."[126] As has been discussed earlier, the created Africanist persona fulfils the desire to control and exert power over the Other by whiteness, as well as regulate the fears and desires which plague white people themselves and most importantly, sustain the blackness/whiteness binary. "It was this Africanism, deployed as rawness and savagery, which provided the staging ground and arena for the elaboration of the quintessential American identity."[127] By silencing indigenous populations through violence and genocide, and the American-African by inhumane subjugation or slavery and both peoples through created images in literature, Silence becomes a weapon in the wielding of power and control to maintain not just the ideal of being the ideal civilized man, but also that they stand unopposed and therefore free from the Old World hegemony in the New World. Hence, silence here, becomes an illusion to satisfy, and justify, the white man's ego.

Morrison echoes this when, having given an account of "scientifically proven" diseases slaves were vulnerable to, she asks, "...why, if these slaves were such a burden and threat, they were so eagerly bought, sold."[128] But who then, would do all the hard labour, within and

---

126 Morrison, *Origins*, 3

127 Morrison, *Playing in the Dark*, 44.

128 Morrison, *Origin*, 5. She writes of Dr. Samuel Cartwright's diagnosis of two illnesses specific to slaves :

> 'Dr. Cartwright pointed to two illnesses, one of which he labelled 'drapetomania, or the disease causing slaves to run away.' The other illness he diagnosed as 'dysaesthesia aethiopica' – a kind of mental lethargy that caused the negro 'to be like a person half asleep' (what slaveholders more commonly identified as 'rascality')...the forced exercise, so beneficial to the negro, is expended in cultivating...cotton, rice and tobacco, which, but for his labor...go uncultivated, and their products lost to the world. Both parties are benefitted – the negro as well as his master.

without the house that the white masters were too superior to do? And how else would they maintain their own idea of 'civilization' if there were no whipping-boys in the form of the Africanist presence? As Dauncey notes, "By stripping indigenous groups of any discursive capacity and rendering them bestial and uncivilized, the West aspires to legitimize its imperial project". [129]

Race, gender and class are constructs for the sole purpose of maintaining an assumed power over another, sustained by the dismissal of and silencing the voice of the constructed other. When this silence is broken by way of slave narratives, or the Civil Rights Movement, or Feminism – when the Other talks back, this control and power is consequently threatened. Only within the sphere of the adult/child binary, does this power equation seem relatively unthreatened. Even with a child questioning what they encounter, it is the adult who provides the answers. It is the choice of the adult, the one with the power and control, to choose the nature of the answer. As David Rudd notes, "there will always be *attempts* to privilege certain texts, to see them as superior, canonical, or whatever, while marginalizing others..."[130] and given that it is adults who mass produce, approve, canonise, purchase and provide the literature produced for children, to children, as children have neither financial nor legal independence, it becomes a relatively unhindered task to preserve and conserve the canonical status of authors like Blyton and Dahl.[131] Even as they may be critiqued within academic circles, the non-academic paying consumer, who is unaffected by debates ranging within academia, becomes a participant in the preservation of the established canon by actively

---

These observations were not casual opinions. They were printed in the *New Orleans Medical and Surgical Journal*. The point being that blacks are useful, not quite like cattle, yet not recognizably human.' Cartwright phrases his 'inference' in a way that suggests that slavery is a mutually agreed upon deal and the slave gets due credit for all the work they do rather than being considered property.

129 Dauncey, "Uses of Silence", 50

130 David Rudd, "Introduction", *The Routledge Companion to Children's Literature*, ed. David Rudd, (London and New York: Routledge, 2010), 5

131 Hunt, *Children's Literature*, 9

purchasing the fiction produced by these authors, perhaps driven by their self-assurance that they read them as children and still turned out right. Children, therefore, read what the powerful and controlling adult in their life provide them and younger children, who are just beginning to gain some literary skill and thus dependent wholly on the adult have an even lesser say older children.[132]

> As children's books are an expression of a power – relationship, are mediated through adults, and are unprotected by any supposed literary status, adults commonly feel free to put their judgements into practice and control the books just as they control their children.[133]

This exercise of control is extended to even the spaces designated for children, for example in bookstores, where not only do the adults wield buying power (unless the child is handing over their pocket money) but are the ones with access to most of the shelves (unless the child is very tall for their age).[134] Adults, or ex-children, therefore control all the positions of power mentioned earlier, along with the critical sphere, where children, already secondary recipients of the literature written in their name, are entirely absent.[135] The children in studies including children's response are not very different from the indigenous peoples to the adult academics anthropologist it could be said: even the responses provided by children for studies purporting to value their opinion involve a degree a mediation in the final presentation of that response. This thesis is victim to this same folly: no children were consulted in the writing of it.

Exercise of power and control for the purpose of silencing is most evident in critical controversies and censorship, in which librarians, parents and religious leaders play a large role. As recently as April 2019, saw the burning of *Harry Potter* novels, along with Buddhist

132 ibid, 9. See also, May, *Critical Theory*, 4; Immel, "Constructions of childhood", 24.

133 Hunt, *Children's Literature*, 255.

134 Immel, "Constructions of Childhood", 21.

135 Stevenson, "Classics and canons", 113

figurines and other "negative" items like Hello Kitty by a priests in Poland based on the baseless accusations of sorcery[136] simply because they found their own position in the community threatened by the presence of what they deemed as Other. This is not the first time the *Harry Potter* books have been controversially accused of promoting witchcraft, which leads one to assume that it is the series enormous popularity which make it a target for books about witchcraft and vampire mythologies are produced regularly and then often adapted for television, though topics for censorship and controversy usually revolve around depictions of race relations and sexuality.

A infamous example of this is the controversy surrounding and banning of Maurice Sendak's *In The Night Kitchen* (1970), which, though a Caldecott winner, proved unpopular with librarians and parents because Sendak depicted toddler nudity – something anyone with a toddler in the house is likely to face multiple times every day and toddlers themselves are likely to encounter via a mirror. In some cases, white pants were famously drawn over the child in the controversial panels.

Similar baseless allegations lead to the repeated banning of books like *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* (1884) and *To Kill A Mockingbird* (1960) by school boards and librarians on grounds that they use racial slurs[137][138]. These acts of censorship by banning do not seem to indicate an investigation into why or an understanding of how and to what purpose these racially charged terms are used – just banning a book, which is a product of its time in an effort to be politically correct and teach students political correctness is hardly sensible; it

136 Shaun Walker, "Harry Potter among books burned by priests in Poland", in *The Gaurdian*, 1st April 2019.

137 Kristine Phillips, "A school district drops 'To Kill a Mockingbird' and 'Huckleberry Finn' over use of the n-word", in *The Washington Post*, 7th February 2018.

138 Anapol Avery, "New Jersey lawmakers propose resolution asking schools not to teach 'Huckleberry Finn', in *The Hill*, 23rd March 2019.

only leads to an incomplete understanding of racial or gender politics which would presumably not be the case if students and children and teachers and parents not only engaged with the text but made a concentrated effort to understand the text as a product of its time and the politics of the text – especially in a novel like *To Kill A Mockingbird* – to understand why racial slurs are offensive. No political correctness is less dangerous than enforced and unexplained political correctness. As Peter Hunt points out "is hard to find a 'classic' of a hundred years ago which is not blatantly sexist or racist"[139], so one asks: is every book of the last 150 years to be banned because they are products of their time?

The expunging of offensive terms in revising and reprinting texts a century old is also ineffective for, "colonial and racist ideologies are commonly encoded in structural, semantic and narrative features which are not ameliorated merely through the removal of words or phrases."[140]

The principle on which censorship functions: "[141]what children don't know about can't hurt them" only eventually backfires because the knowledge adults hope to protect children from is found out by children from less reliable and more dubious sources, namely their peer group, which automatically implies a incomplete understanding of the issue. Moreover by banning books and forcing other "politically correct" books upon children, instead of letting them explore on their own and partaking in dialogue with them to formulate a holistic understanding of the book and the social issue it is representative off, only "reinforces the distinction between pleasure and learning".[142] However, for the adult in a position of power, the child is too immature to have an opinion on such issues and so the child continues to be immature till they cross the age in which society deems them to be an adult.

---

139 Hunt, *Children's Literature*, 257.

140 Bradford, "Race, Ethnicity", 43.

141 Hunt*, Children's Literature*, 256.

142 Cullingford, *Formative Years*, 193.

Censorship and silencing by power and control becomes a means to maintain the ego of the adult in charge by letting them control the education and development of a child. One cannot help but ask: exactly how is a child a threat, unless it is to overturn social structures and prejudices in the future, and how insecure is the adult that it must engage in power politics with the child to maintain its own ego?

Silence by Stereotype

Bhabha writes, "...the stereotype...is a form of knowledge and identification that vacillates between what is already 'in place', already known, and something that must be anxiously repeated...the stereotype, must always be in *excess* of what can be empirically proved or logically constructed."[143] Its purpose is therefore to "construe the colonized as a population of degenerate types on the basis of racial origin, in order to justify conquest..."[144] and this informs the literature produced by the colonizer.

In the Preface to *Playing in the Dark: Whiteness and Literary Imagination*, Toni Morrison observes, "regardless of the race of the author, the readers of virtually all American fiction have been positioned as white...What happens to the writerly imagination of a black author who is at some level *always* conscious of representing one's own race to, or in spite of, a race of readers that understands itself to be 'universal' or race-free?"[145] Since she also says that "American literature has clearly been the preserve of white male views, genius, and power, those views, genius, and power are without relationship to and removed from the overwhelming presence of black people in the United States"[146] the question arises that if

143 Bhabha, *Location*, 94 – 95.

144 Ibid, 101.

145 Morrison, *Playing in the Dark*, xii

146 ibid, 5

both author and reader are positioned as white, what happens when a white writer creates a black or South Asian or East Asian character for a universal audience who are assumed to be white, but are overwhelmingly black and Asian? The criticism surrounding the characterisation of the token South Asian representation Raj Koothrapali in the American sitcom *The Big Bang Theory* or the recent controversy regarding the character Apu[147] – who is voiced is a white actor - in the long running animated series *The Simpsons* are only the result of the greater acceptance of concepts of diversity and inclusion and difference in the 21st century. Conversely, what happens when an Asian-American writer, whose inherited historical experience in America is different from an African-American writer, represents their culture in a text which is marketed towards a white audience? The critical and commercial success of the recent film *Crazy Rich Asians* (2018) in American and European cinemas and its failure in the Eastern Hemisphere is part of the answer. The movie provided a shallow understanding of the nuances of (South-East) Asian culture while pandering to a predominantly white Hollywood audience and promoting itself as the flag-bearer of Asian representation. In doing so, the film promoted Asian culture with a gloss, while silencing out the diverse ethnic communities who form Singapore, including brown Asians.[148] Asian-Americans, in this particular context, accepted this as accurate representation, having been distanced by nurture and generation from their inherited culture. One might say therefore, that this is an example of Asian- Americans muting or silencing their inherited culture from their lives, becoming more American than Asian.

In both cases, there is a dependence on stereotypes, which, as has been emphasised so far, results in a silencing of the true voice, narrative, history and culture.

---

147 Katie Kilkenny, "'Simpsons' Creator: "No Nuance" Around Apu Debate, Decries "Outrage of the Week" Culture", in *The Hollywood Reporter*, 18th July 2018.

148 Hannah Ellis-Petersen and Lily Kuo, "Where are the brown people? Crazy Rich Asians Draws Tepid Response in Singapore", in *The Gaurdian*, 21st August 2018.

In the case of the former, "the absence of real knowledge or open-minded enquiry", and the 'liberal' "habit of ignoring race",[149] regarding all non-white peoples – the Other – naturally encourages a dependence upon and fostering of stereotypes in depictions of the Other. In the case of series like *Harry Potter*, such depictions are often token, for the sake of a show of diversity and verisimilitude, with an incomplete idea of the history and mythology of the culture being appropriated, as in the case of the character of Nagini in the extended *Harry Potter* universe, who was played by a South Korean actress and was explained as being a creature of Indonesian mythology. With the flaw in her arguments being pointed out, Rowling took to blocking critics on social media. The creators and producers of The Simpsons have repeatedly taken the same path of dismissal of criticism from South Asian actors and critics of the stereotypes Apu's characterisation reinforces, including the "Indian Accent", which is to be found in the portrayal of most South Asian characters in American sitcoms. With the white creators dismissing criticism and reluctant to educate themselves on correct representation, the complex Asian voices that could have enriched the text – be it in print or visual media – is silenced by the preference of stereotype. This stereotyping is extended to passing depictions of Native Americans in texts by white authors, especially in novels aimed at the child audience, like Louisa May Alcott's *Little Women*, where the only substantial reference to Native Americans depicts an image of a savage menace to white women and polite white society[150][151] – a stereotype which becomes the fulcrum of Twain's *Adventures of*

149 Morrison, *Playing in the Dark*, 7-8

150 Louisa May Alcott, *Little Women*, Chapter 27, Project Gutenberg

151 Regarding stereotypical representation of Native Americans, Jill P. May makes an extended note, p. 67:

> Although there were some earlier attempts to discuss European attitudes about Native Americans, Roy Harvey Pearce's *The Savages of Africa*, first published in 1953, presented an in-depth description of American history's stereotypes of Native Americans and their place in history. As a literary scholar with an interest in how cultural images cause people to view history, Pearce researched early Native American images in narratives and discovered that the Indian become a "symbol" in literature. Because the European settlers wished to place their invasion in a positive light, they represented the Native American as a primitive subgroup of

Tom Sawyer and the incomplete *Tom Sawyer and Huckleberry Finn among the Indians*. Coupled with the idea of "playing Indians" as boys in nineteenth-century American texts are shown to engage in and the oblique references to the silenced and yet colonized Native Americans in the recurrent "Indian war whoops" – found in too many texts of the period to list, the construction of Native Americans seem to make them as fictitious and alien as Martians. Stereotypes which construct the heathens of the Orient and Africa as races to be conquered by the civilizing white man, as seen in the boy's adventure novels of Hebert Strang and Percy Westerman and Captain Maryyat; or the samurai as a dying but glorified way of life after the Meiji Restoration in films such as *The Last Samurai* (2003), a Hollywood production with a white man saviour, function similarly.

Part of silencing by stereotype, which also falls under "Selective Silencing" is what Morrison calls *fetishization*[152]. Morrison determines this as "establishing fixed and major difference where difference does not exist or is minimal" and reads Ernest Hemingway's *To Have and Have Not* and *The Garden of Eden* using this as one of the lenses, especially in the later where the character Catherine wishes to appropriate blackness and androgyny for both herself and husband in an effort to be "othered" by white and heteronormative people and therefore be unified with the husband "within the estrangement"[153]. In the context of the appropriation

---

heathens. Thus, the idea of savagism was introduced in their narratives. Writers played down the idea that Indians fought to survive the invasion of foreign peoples. And they continually linked Native American attitudes to a more primitive time, thus stripping Indians of their own cultural history. As a result, "American history" in literature began with the settlement of the Europeans. The earlier societies were "written out" of literature, and the only role given to the Indian as precultural. Even when writers tried to view the Indian in a favourable light, he is shown as a person devoid of the "cultural mannerisms" held in common by the invading Europeans. In the end, the "noble savage" in literature became a stereotype of a man who refused to be civilized and who could not survive within white man's higher, more sophisticated and "civilized" culture.

152Morrison, *Playing in the Dark*. 68

153 Ibid, 87

of blackness, one might include the act of "blackface"[154][155], or a white person styling their hair in cornrows, as fetishization, especially in these cases there is a loss of cultural sensitivity with history being silenced.

This fetishization of stereotype can also be extended to include the Western preoccupation with 'Asian poverty'. Like *Crazy Rich Asians* after it, *Slumdog Millionaire*, as a movie, was as derided in India as it was feted in Hollywood, as its white director treated poverty almost like a separate character in the film. *Slumdog Millionaire*, of course is one of many examples which depict India as a poverty-stricken, undereducated, noisy, dirty country, depicting only that which its target audience in the West wants to see, while silencing out the diversity of cultures and capitalist wealth India has to offer. Similarly, blackness is susceptible to be equated with poverty and intellectual lack, though innumerable examples to the contrary exist, as seen in Harold Fromm's insistence that African-American academic Henry Louis Gates Jr. is "white" because of his financial success and education.[156]

Conversely, in a reversal of position, but within existing binaries of "us" and "them", or "me" and "other", the Anglo-American-European white population can to be put in a position of the Other when viewed from the locus of the non-white and/or non-Anglo-American-European reader, audience and consumer, enabling the former to be as stereotyped in the understanding of the latter as they stereotype the African or Asian "Other". Following from

154 Awkward, *Negotiating Difference*, 11 -13

> John Howard Griffith's *Black Like Me* (1961) records his lauded but misguided attempt to understand the African-American experience in the Deep South by dying his skin black. He works under the impression that just assuming the surface will also acquaint him with the full measure of black psyche though he betrays his own fallacy when he describes his reaction to seeing his dyed skin for the first time in terms of the stereotypical savagery attributed to black men; he uses terms like "fierce", "dark", "unsympathetic" and feels he himself has been wiped out of existence, though his very acknowledgement of his own self would testify otherwise.

155 Bhabha notes that the "skin, as the key signifier of cultural and racial difference in the stereotype, is the most visible of fetishes...", *Location*, 112

156 Awkward, *Negotiating Difference*, 82

this, it can be inferred that the white Anglo-American collective can too suffer from the same kinds of silencing they inflict on those they perceive as the Other, including white women, especially when faced with a child audience unaware of the subtleties of racial or gender or class politics which form the framework of these societies; an idea which this thesis attempts to explore.

Silencing Madness

The one instance when difference is not determined and silenced by race and/or class and or gender is when it is gauged by "madness", or a perception of "reality" that deviates from what is viewed as the norm. But then who determines what is "normal", what is "reality" and therefore, what is "mad"? Both William Blake and Vincent van Gogh, considered "mad" in their time and outcast and unappreciated for their re-visioning of art, have left enduring and influential legacies. An example from children's fiction of a "loony" would be Luna Lovegood and her father Xenophilius. Rowling, as she does with the naming of characters, has Luna affiliated to the moon, which is traditionally associated with inspiring madness; and her father's name literally means " an individual who is attracted to foreign peoples, manners, and cultures."[157] The Lovegoods, believers of conspiracy theories and as yet unidentified or unseen or unestablished magical creatures, are ostracised for their "madness". But they are also believers of justice, equality and humanity, without prejudice and bias and refuse to be silenced, even when mocked and bullied by the Wizarding World. And eventually, they are proven right in their belief when the existence of the Deathly Hallows is established by Harry, though they probably never know.

157 Oxford English Dictionary, https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/us/xenophile

Deviancy from prevalent normalities – in itself a social construct - in any form, has scope to be considered "madness", which, as a threat to the stability to established society must be punished and silenced by constructing asylums or psychiatric hospitals - spaces of imprisonment; where interaction happens as an exercise of power by the "normal" or "reason" over the "mad" and the language of "madness" is dismissed or pitied instead of being explored and understood –

> "...dialogue itself was now disengaged; silence was absolute; there was no longer any common language between madness and reason; the language of delirium can be answered only by an absence of language, for delirium is not a fragment of dialogue with reason, it is not language at all; it refers, in an ultimately silent awareness, only to transgression."[158]

What occurs here then, is the silencing of the language of madness, for madness need not be mute, and even the mute have an unspoken language. The onus of deciphering that language is on the one with "reason", with formalized language patterns, by engaging with the patterns and nuances of the language of the "mad". Madness and reason are as much binaries as light and dark, and one cannot come into existence until the other is defined; who therefore, is to say which is superior and which must be othered? Every individual, by way of nature and nurture carries within them some form of psychopathology, so who decides what is "mad" and therefore must be silenced?

There are organisations like the American Psychiatric Association [APA] which publishes the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders [DSM] - considered the definitive source list of psychopathologies and even in the 21st century the notion that one must be

158 Michel Foucault, *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*, trans. Richard Howard, (London and New York: Routedge, 2001), 248 – 249.

"mad" if they are visiting a counsellor still exists in pockets. Definitions and constructions of madness depend largely on the existing prejudices and biases of the day; however prejudices do not dissolve overnight and therefore, certain traits, characteristics, orientations and choices continue to be determined as "mad" by sections of people:

- Homosexuality, removed from the DSM in 1974 after protests by gay rights activists, still finds itself in a limbo when it comes to unbiased social, legal and religious acceptance.
- Gender dysphoria in children is still a part of the DSM-V, which is the present upgradation of the work, having assumed that children have too little insight into their own desires and choices.

Silence as Absence

In August 2017, a supermarket in Hamburg removed all foreign goods from the shelves to make a point about and critique xenophobic policies of the Far-Right.[159] The gaping gaps and the silence of the usually busy shelves made their point loud and clear. The silence of absence was used here as a critique of the oppressive forms of silencing.

"As Sontag suggests, the adoption of silence provides a method of critiquing language, consciousness, and civilization. The art of absence is resonant."[160]

Silence as Absence can mean a void, a loss, a gap, an echo, a speechlessness, a hollow, an emptiness, the source and aftermath of and fraternal twin to noise and language, and death,

159 Richard Hartley-Parkinson, "Supermarket removes all foreign groceries from shelves to make point about racism", in Metro UK, 23rd August 2017.

160 Dauncey, "Uses of Silence", 61

depending on context and application. As light is to dark, language and noise is to silence. "The absence of language simply makes the presence of Silence more apparent."[161]

Literature produced in the immediate aftermath of the noise of the Second World War – like Beckett's *Waiting For Godot* – is, according to Ihab Hassan, a literature of silence, because that is what language has been traumatised into being and the Silence is of the loss of that language. [162] This silence is also like a gaping wound, a hollow, an endless blank and hopelessness lived over and over again with the loss of loved ones. The silence of trauma that death leaves behind resonates loudly.

Silence of absence carries the potential of becoming almost physical and tangible in its weight, in other words a presence, if unbalanced by language which need not be noise – "Speech came out of silence, out of the fullness of silence"[163] but it need not be sound, otherwise the deaf and the mute would be continually oppressed by silence. Body language functions as effectively as the spoken word in keeping silence as absence from becoming too claustrophobic.

Silence of absence is essentially that which is not said and to keep it from combusting and collapsing into itself, like a "dream deferred", it must be voiced.

In whichever way Silence works, and in whatever form it takes, it serves an agenda and is perhaps the only sphere in which the dominant group practice and preach – they practice silencing and train children to silence. But as "that which is not" said, silence can also either

161 Picard, *World of Silence*, Introduction.

162 Hassan, "The Literature of Silence: From Henry Miller to Beckett and Burroughs", *Encounter* (January 1967), 80

163 Picard, *World of Silence*, 8.

be identified and reclaimed through retelling or be left to continue undisturbed depending on the individual delving into it, though they might be uncovered as modes of retelling the pre-text range from just translations to translations and adaptations[164], though the final choice to interrogate or reinforce the tradition assisted by silence depends on the person adapting or translating or abridging. It is precisely this that this thesis proposes to investigate.

164 Stephens, “Retelling stories”, 94.

Chapter 2 Silence and Reinterpreting Race

In an interview titled "Mark Twain Interviewed: First Impressions of India," in the Calcutta edition of *Englishman* on 8th February 1896, on being asked for his thoughts on the benefits of British rule in India, Twain said, "It is my belief that in the development of the world the strongest race will by and by become paramount— the strongest physically and intellectually." Twain was by this time 61 years old, famous everywhere, widely travelled and had already been noted for his anti- racial stance and his vitriol against violence inflicted upon African Americans, who he says, in the same interview, are "merely freed slaves, [since] you can't get rid of the effects of slavery in one or even two generations. But things will right themselves. We have given the negro the vote, and he must keep it." [165]

The contradictions in the statements makes Twain's stance on race look like that of a spectator to a fight to a blood sport like dogfighting - a survival of the fittest though the parties have unequal chances. Why is the responsibility of fighting to maintain the right to vote on the African-American? Are the magnanimous white masters who have given "the negro the vote", hoping that they will decide it is folly and return to the old system? This paradox effects all depictions of race relations in the *Huckleberry Finn* and *Tom Sawyer* novels, even when he is openly racist in his portrayals, like that of the Native-Americans in *Huck Finn and Tom Sawyer among the Indians*.

In the interview quoted, Twain agrees that Native Americans are treated too harshly in the legal spectrum and that their lands, including the reservations they have been shoved into is constantly encroached upon, in the same breath blaming them for their troubles – "The red

165 Scharnhorst, *Interviews*, 287. The rest of this interview is contradictory, since Twain expresses admiration for the different races (ethnicities) who coexist in India, condemns the harsh treatment of Native Americans in reservations and expresses his literary familiarity with the "Bengali Babu".

men killed settlers, and of course the Government had to order out troops and put them down", as though they were rabid animals. This part of the interview, with the white man displacing his responsibility onto the victim who has been pushed into a corner is played out in miniature in *Huck Finn and Tom Sawyer among the Indians* with the five Native American men who Tom, Huck, Jim and the Mills family encounter and get friendly with. For a laugh, Huck tells these three men that seven more white men are due to join their party, when in truth it was to be just one, and these five men – whose names, like Man-afraid-of-his-Mother-in-law, are burlesqued from that of real Native American people, like the Ogala Sioux chief Man-afraid-of-Horses [166]– panic and proceed to kill (and scalp) the men in the party and kidnap the women and Jim, leaving Tom and Huck to rescue them. Huck is witness to the murders and apparently the full details " was horrible, but it would not do to put it in a book"[167]. There are two and a half points here: firstly, the Native American is constructed as being so inhumanely savage that details must be silenced out in narration, the white man takes no cognizance of his actions precipitating this and is constructed as the heroic rescuer, and lastly, Jim, freed over a year before this story begins, is still with Tom and Huck. *Huck Finn and Tom Sawyer among the Indians* encapsulates Twain's entire understanding of race relations in eight unfinished chapters and being written after both *Tom Sawyer* and *Huck Finn*, it clarifies race depiction in both novels.

The notes accompanying the Mark Twain Project edition of *Huck Finn and Tom Sawyer among the Indians* trace Twain's primary source to *Our Wild Indians* (1883), by army officer Richard Irving Dodge, along with other books on Native Americans by white writers of the time, all lauded for their accuracy, especially Dodge's. Having observed these peoples from a

166 Mark Twain, *Huck Finn and Tom Sawyer among the Indians and Other Unfinished Stories,* eds. Dahlia Armon and Walter Blair, (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: The Mark Twain Project of Bancroft Library and University of California Press, 1989), 46

167 Ibid, 49

distance en route to Nevada Territory, this was Twain's effort to counter the stereotype of Fenimore Cooper's "noble savage"; by turning to the other spectrum of the stereotype and this text and *Tom Sawyer* are built along those lines – the romanticised notion of the "noble savage" as held by Tom is countered and defeated by the Native Americans they face in both these texts. Here, it is these five men, with their war-paint and tomahawks and feathers, and there it is Injun Joe. Twain goes so far as to create a character – Brace Johnson – who was raised by Native Americans but has grown to despise them for their inhumanity, as a way of "authorising" his perspective in the reader's eyes.

The references to "Indians" in *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer* (1876), excluding the character and construction of Injun Joe, are a part of the sepia-tinted nostalgia of *Tom Sawyer*, of an antebellum Southern village, famously based on Twain's own hometown of Hannibal and it is widely accepted and corroborated that many of Tom's exploits – like "showing off" in front of Becky, or hunting for treasure – were drawn from his own life. The reflexive oath "Honest Injun" is just testimony to the popularity and acceptance of the "noble savage" stereotype amongst children. So after his engagement dissolves with Becky, Tom runs away to Cardiff Hill to consider future options. His second thought is of "join[ing] the Indians

> and hunt buffaloes and go on the war-path in the mountain ranges and the trackless great plains of the Far West, and away in the future come back a great chief, bristling with feathers, hideous with paint, and prance into Sunday-school, some drowsy summer morning, with a blood-curdling war-whoop, and sear the eye-balls of all his companions with unappeasable envy[168]

168 Mark Twain, *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer*, ed by R. Kent Rasmussen, (New York: Penguin Books, 2014), 61

before that is abandoned for the idea of being a pirate. Eight chapters later, after he Huck and Joe Harper have run off to Jackson's Island and played pirates, they decide to be "Indians for a while" and they act in every way they assume Native Americans do – they paint their faces, whoop, and "kill[ed] and scalp[ed] each other by the thousands". The important, traumatic experience of watching Injun Joe murder Doctor Robinson has already happened between these two instances, but Tom is as yet unshaken in his conception of Native Americans as taught by his adventure – for now, the white constructed book holds greater authority over the actual member of the group, hence a kind of silencing by speaking. Of course, Tom has sworn in blood, along with Huck, that he will remain silent – a literal one – about what he witnessed, but that should not mean that the incident has been forcefully silenced in his psyche, or he wouldn't have been plagued enough to divulge his story to Muff Potter's lawyer. Therefore, it can safely be said that his disillusionment does not happen till *Huck Finn and Tom Sawyer among the Indians,* which incidentally has a long passage at the beginning where Tom waxes poetic about Native Americans. [169] For the reader outside the

169 Twain, *Among the Indians*, 36 – 38.

> *Injuns* ornery! It's the most ignorant idea that ever—why, Jim, they're the noblest human beings that's ever been in the world. If a white man tells you a thing, do you know it's true? No, you don't; because generally it's a lie. But if an Injun tells you a thing, you can bet on it every time for the petrified fact; because you can't get an Injun to lie, he would cut his tongue out first. If you trust to a white man's honor, you better look out; but you trust to an Injun's honor, and nothing in the world can make him betray you—he would die first, and be glad to. An Injun is *all* honor. It's what they're *made* of. You ask a white man to divide his property with you—will he do it? I think I *see* him at it; but you go to an Injun, and he'll give you everything he's got in the world. It's just the difference between an [page 36] Injun and a white man. They're just all generousness and unstingeableness. And brave? Why, they ain't afraid of anything. If there was just one Injun, and a whole regiment of white men against him, they wouldn't stand the least show in the world,—not the least. You'd see that splendid gigantic Injun come war-whooping down on his wild charger all over paint and feathers waving his tomahawk and letting drive with his bow faster than anybody could count the arrows and hitting a soldier in any part of his body he wanted to, every time, any distance, and in two minutes you'd see him santering off with a wheelbarrow-load of scalps and the rest of them stampeding for the United States the same as if the menagerie was after them. Death?—an Injun don't care shucks for death. They prefer it. They *sing* when they're dying

text, Injun Joe is the representative of Native Americans, as constructed by Twain, for he is the only one physically present in the text and the minute Huck identifies him as "that murdering half-breed"[170], which is immediately reinforced by Doctor Robinson's murder, Huck's description of him colours the rest of the novel. Even if the readers opt to maintain alongside Tom, the concept of the "noble savage", they are still exposed to the constructions of Native Americans as the author forces upon them further threats of violence against white women and children by Injun Joe – first with the threat to bodily mutilate Widow Douglas as revenge for her husband's actions against him in – "tain't robbery altogether – its *revenge*"[171]

> —sing their death-song. You take an Injun and stick him full of arrows and splinters, and hack him up with a hatchet, and skin him, and start a slow fire under him, and do you reckon he minds it? No sir; he will just set there in the hot ashes, perfectly comfortable, and *sing*, same as if he was on salary. Would a white man? *You* know he wouldn't. And they're the most gigantic magnificent creatures in the whole world, and can knock a man down with a barrel of flour as far as they can see him. They're awful strong, and fiery, and eloquent, and wear beautiful blankets, and war paint, and moccasins, and buckskin clothes, all over beads, and go fighting and scalping every day in the year but Sundays, and have a noble good time, and they love friendly white men, and just dote on them, and can't do too much for them, and would ruther die than let any harm come to them, and they think just as much of niggers as they do of anybody, and the young squaws are the most beautiful be-utiful maidens that was ever in the whole world, and they love a white hunter the minute their eye falls on him, and from that minute nothing can ever shake their love loose again, and they're always on the watch-out to protect him from danger and get themselves killed in the place of him—look at Pocahontas!—and an Injun can see as far as a telescope with the naked eye, and an enemy can't slip around anywhere, even in the dark, but he knows it; and if he sees one single blade of grass bent down, it's all he wants, he knows which way to go [page 37] to find the enemy that done it, and he can read all kinds of trifling little signs just the same way with his eagle eye which *you* wouldn't ever see at all, and if he sees a little whiff of smoke going up in the air thirty-five miles off, he knows in a second if it's a friend's camp fire or an enemy's, just by the smell of the smoke, because they're the most giftedest people in the whole world, and the hospitablest and the happiest, and don't ever have anything to do from year's end to year's end but have a perfectly supernatural good time and piles and piles of adventures! Amongst the Injuns, life is just simply a circus, that's what it is. Anybody that knows, will tell you you can't praise it too high and you can't put it too strong."

170 Twain, *Tom Sawyer*, 68

171 Twain, *Tom Sawyer*, 163. In *Huck Finn and Tom Sawyer among the Indians*, Brace Johnson, who was purportedly raised by Native Americans offers a short lesson on Native American concepts of revenge, where

– and then with the very close calls Tom has with him, first in the haunted house at Cardiff Hill, and then at McDougal's Cave. Moreover it is a child, Huck, who describes him as he does, and that is an open invitation to the dual audience – "the growing boy and the nostalgic adult"[172] – to identify with Huck's point-of-view. That Huck uses the language that he does is testimony to the pervasiveness of the racial prejudice. Injun Joe's own story is never told; whenever he speaks, he is plotting robbery and revenge or actually committing a crime; he is called a "half-breed" repeatedly in the novel but the reader is not made aware why. He is part-white but what is his association with the town of St. Petersburg? Why is he an outcast from his or his mother's tribe, since it was commoner for a white man to take, often forcefully, a Native American wife? Injun Joe's history suffers in silence; we judge him on his present and the contextual history that he speaks out loud when he explains his motives for revenge but that is it.

In the 2011 German production Injun Joe combines Judge Douglas' horsewhipping him and Dr. Robinson's father's turning him out hungry into one justification for his refusing Robinson's money after the gravedigging and then murdering him. Later on in the film, at around the 57 minute mark, when a young Aunt Polly invites him to dinner and asks him why he is in town, he replies, "My father is buried here." This at least un-silences some part of Injun Joe's history: his father was white, and he was fond of his father or he would not have come to St. Petersberg and faced racism on a daily basis. Earlier in the film, he asks Doctor Robinson what is the point of earning any money if nobody wants it – there being a scene near the beginning of the film where he offers to pay to play a game of Shoot the Indian in the village square and is rejected because his "skin is red"[173] causing him to get angry and overturn the stall. In a way, for this Joe here, it is like a self-fulfilling prophecy – the

---

they are honour bound to kill a white man to avenge a kin who had been killed by a white man.

172 Peter Hunt, *Children's Literature*, 232

173 *Tom Sawyer*, dir. Hermine Huntgeburth, Germany, 2011, 12:33 min

townspeople discriminate against him based on their prejudices against Native Americans – leading him to react violently in public out of frustration and reinforce those prejudices. That he is not a completely negative character is well-established in this film, though there are plotholes. Aunt Polly asks him why he came to town, but his exchange with Doctor Robinson before the murders indicates that he has lived in the town for several years at least and he knows Horst Williams, who corpse he is hired to dig, well enough to pay his respects to the departed soul in a moment of silence and express trepidation and faint alarm at being asked to dig his grave. He helps Aunt Polly with her overturned cart of jam and is touched by her kindness when first, she gives him a bottle in thanks, and second, invites him to dinner. The film even hints at a romantic angle between them, and Tom has a nightmare that he finds the two of them sensually waltzing and threatening him. Yet he is shown looting a steamboat's storeroom with malevolent eyes at in the first scene, firmly establishing him as the villain and he threatens Tom on two separate occasions. Even so, for a movie produced in a country with its own ghastly history of racism and xenophobia, Injun Joe's portrayal is far more sensitively done, offering the audience, especially the children who would view this adaptation of an American classic, a chance to form their own judgements and sympathies regarding the character, instead of enforcing the stereotype as seen in the original. Perhaps the distance that Germany has from the immediate experience and conflicts that mar Native-American existence in America, enables them to look at and depict the situation objectively enough. The biggest problem this depiction has, one it shares with most of the other adaptations, is the whitewashing of the character – the actor Benno Fürmann is white German and the whitewashing of Injun Joe occurs in multiple faithful adaptations of the novel, including the 2014 American production, the very term also putting in mind the most famous scene from the novel – the whitewashing scene, which can be found in middle school textbooks in India even in 2019.

This whitewashing of the fence seems can be seen as the manifestation of the whitewashing in the casting, but more importantly, both can be read as whitewashing society itself[174] - by displacing their own cruelty and violence onto Injun Joe, a silencing by Displacement, the white community is absolved of their own such tendencies and can instead vilify the racial other. Moreover, if one accepts Peter Messent's reading that Injun Joe and Tom are twinned[175], then it must also be accepted that Tom undergoes multiple instances of silencing by displacement. Tom's fantasies of sugar-coated violence as a part of Tom Sawyer's Gang is mirrored in the actual violence threatened and executed by Injun Joe and Tom only survives with his romanticism intact because realization of that violence happens in Injun Joe. But he is also silenced in that he is created from memory as the bridge to a nostalgic Utopia of childhood with the adult reader writer and readers' own desire for that childhood is displaced onto him. Tom, therefore, is constructed as the ideal child – constructive and resisting construction within the boundaries of the text, as the cumulative manifestation of nostalgic childhoods, whose desire for adventure is enshrined in the glow of a romantic childhood as the possibilities of emerging darkness are displaced onto the construction by stereotype of a racial other who will be overcome and silenced absolutely so that the child can remain in perfect childhood. And to enter into that perfect childhood, one must be whitewashed, as is the little slave boy Jim in *Tom Sawyer (1973)*, who sings along with all the boys in the whitewashing scene only after his face has been covered with whitewash. Whitewashing reduces identity to a mask that can be worn on and off, like the redface assumed by the white actors who play Injun Joe and Tom himself who plays "Indians", making the identity of the non-white Other a triviality that can be assumed. That application of the whitewash to his face makes little Jim's appearance grotesque in the scene is only reflective of the hypocritical

174 Peter Messent, *The Cambridge Introduction to Mark Twain*, (United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 72.

175 Ibid, 70

white ego which cherishes its own identity at the cost of others especially by reducing different cultures to distinctive markers open to appropriation.

Apart from the 1973 Reader's Digest production *Tom Sawyer*, and interestingly the 1930 production where Injun Joe was played by Charles Stevens, Geronimo's grandson, most adaptations have had white actors applying either redface and/or incorporating in their appearance braids and/or feathers and short ponytails which have stereotypically become synonymous with Native American culture. Therefore in the 1979 – 1980 television production *Huckleberry Finn and His Friends*, Canadian actor Alex Diakun, a Polish surname indicating white ancestry, played Injun Joe in a hilariously ill-fitting wig with pigtails; and alarmingly enough, in *Tom Sawyer (2000)* with anthromorphic characters, Injun Joe was depicted as a vicious black bear who tied his hair back in a short ponytail and wore a pendent with feathers and dreamcatchers, though the character is credited as Injurin' Joe. In the first example, the very fact that the wig becomes a cause of hilarity, intentionally or unintentionally, is reflective of how casually Native American culture is treated. For the second example: that a viewer in India immediately looks upon that as appropriation of Native American culture, when there are otherwise no racial markers throughout the film, goes to show how deeply pervasive the stereotype is. Even in an animated with clear influences of Disney productions in the song sequences especially, the racial connotation cannot be done away with, apparently, for while the credits say Injurin' Joe, the characters repeatedly refer to him as Injun Joe[176]. It is not just anthromorphic animals engaging in man-made institutions like school, and church, with houses and cemeteries and picnics that populate this production; race must be transposed here too. If the villain in the film is racialized, one can go as far as to say that the priest at Church is drawn on African-American preachers, even if only for the sake of facilitating the musical aspect of the film. In either

176 It is entirely possible that I repeatedly heard the name incorrectly, but no matter how much I slowed down play speed, the character was referred to as Injun Joe.

case, both examples are reductive and unnecessary in a film like this, and that they were included at all implies the adult effort to instil in children these racial motifs, which may immediately escape the child viewer but will be understood by the adult viewer who is not just viewing it with the child, but also playing it on a media platform for the child's consumption.

As mentioned, the Readers Digest *Tom Sawyer* has Ho-Chunk member Kunu Hank playing Joe and his portrayal incorporates no other racial symbols, though he is shown to have a box of trophies implying that he has killed before. But like the various other portrayals of Injun Joe, beginning from the 1938 Production faithfully done by David O. Selznick (within the purview of this thesis) he goes through the other actions attributed to Injun Joe in the adaptations only: he throws a knife at Tom during Tom's testimony in court before Tom can even say his name and escapes through the window and runs away by stealing a wagon; and he falls to his death in McDougal's Cave, the second of which seems to have been added solely to dramatise and highlight the tension in films and to reinforce depictions of Native Americans as savages who do not spare even children as he chases Tom and Becky through the caves. Reportedly this scene was so traumatic for the children at the previews of the 1938 production that it had to be toned down before the final release. Even then, the screams and visible trauma of red-haired, plump and rosy cheeked Ann Gillis' Becky Thatcher in this production echo. However, this particular scene could have been re-enacted with any other character who has a grudge against Tom – it is not just that Injun Joe is horrifying, any character, regardless of race, chasing the pair through dark caverns saying he'll kill them would incite terror. What these productions do therefore is just add to the silencing Joe already suffers from, by way of Hierarchical silencing and that by Stereotype.

One suspects Twain himself would not approve of the chase – his preferred source for Native American information, Richard Dodge states that children would not be killed but adopted

and affectionately raised by the tribe, meaning, if Injun Joe was to follow this particular notion too, he would not kill or chase Tom and Becky, explaining why Twain's own Injun Joe does not chase Tom in the novel after Tom chances upon him in the cave, and why in the 2014 production, where Twain is a character and narrator, Injun Joe dies as he does in the novel and in the anime *Tom Sawyer no Bōken* (1980), Injun Joe very clearly tells Tom and Becky, "What kind of monster do you think I am? I have never hurt a woman or a child in my life", which results in Tom's meditation later in the English dub of 1988 that maybe no one gave him enough of a chance to prove himself otherwise. This Injun Joe is heard falling to his death off-screen in the American dub of the anime, but in the Japanese original the implication is that he got shot by the sheriff.

The 2014 production, one of the most recent to be a faithful adaptation of the novel, still takes considerable liberties with it by coalescing into one narrative the stories of both *Tom Sawyer* and *Huckleberry Finn*. The scene on the wreckage of the Walter Scott, which forms one of the early dramatic moments after Huck and Jim leave Jackson's Island is incorporated within another instance of commonality within the various adaptation: after Tom speaks out at court, Huck confronts Tom for betraying him and scared that Injun Joe will catch them decides to leave, and Tom, wanting smooth things over between them, leaves with him, without informing anyone, and head to Jackson's Island, making the end of this arc the infamous funeral scene from the novel. So it is in nearly all the adaptations discussed here, barring the one from 1938. In the 2014 adaptation, before the pair go to Jackson's Island, they head to the wreckage where they find Injun Joe plotting and escape on a raft in a storm. The other moment is that of the contested "evasion" scene from Huck Finn, where Tom swoops into the narrative to usurp authority from Huck and proceeds to use Jim as a means to an end to the fulfilment of his need for adventure. The humiliations Jim faces this time are not rendered necessary because the prisoner foils their plans inadvertently, but Tom decides to

help Muff Potter escape from prison in the same way as he helps Jim and he and Huck dig a tunnel big enough to get their plan started. Before Tom can put the rest of his plan into action, Muff escapes, but is caught and brought back into town after being tarred and feathered. The indignities forced on the black man, despite his protests, are not enforced on the white man, though their situations are the same. Also disturbing is the complete whiteness of the film: for a story set in the antebellum South, where are the people of colour? The plot contrives it so, or perhaps the memory of the Mark Twain within the film does.

In the film, an elderly Twain is asked by two young children to tell them a story of his youth when steamboats ruled the Mississippi and he proceeds to tell them about Tom Sawyer and Huck Finn. The last scene where he opens a box with a slingshot, the same one Huck gave Tom when they saw each other last, seems to imply that he was Tom Sawyer or he took the name for the story. This complicates the narrative problem, creating parallel narrators. The real Mark Twain, the assumed identity of Samuel Langhorne Clemens, therefore Aidan Chambers' "second self"[177], constructs the focalising character of Tom Sawyer, whom he has drawn out from his own memory of childhood, inviting the child reader to a typical boy's adventure story. The story is therefore a mixture of fact and fiction, as memory can be un-silenced, re-silenced and constructed with time and distance. Taking this as the main source material, the writers adapt it for the screen and create a virtual clone of the real Mark Twain, who has his own set of memories. There are therefore double narrators – the real Twain and the false one, who has no existence outside the text, even though it explains why Jim appears in only the penultimate scene and why apart from him running away with Huck, presumably to slavery again because the false Twain says that due to carelessness, they missed Cairo, there is a complete erasure of slavery from the production. While it makes sense that the narrator Twain would not have first-hand knowledge of the events of *Huck Finn*, and

177 Chambers, "Reader in the Book", 2

therefore can only provide what he has heard, there is no logic in suddenly introducing the slavery issue as a token mention after the entire film has been silent about it with even all-white background actors. Erasing and silencing a part of history does not erase history itself; the film may avoid it as extraneous to the narrative, but that does not change history, and while this is historical fiction, all history cannot be made fictive by erasure in depiction. The sudden presence of Jim in the last few minutes, after African-Americans have been absent throughout, can only complicate the child viewer's response, especially since a historical fiction often becomes a way of introducing history to the child learner.

This issue of distortion of history in adaptation and translation is evident in the curious case of *Tom Sawyer no Bōken* (1980) which was produced after nearly half a century of translations of Twain's works had been ongoing in Japan. Tsuyoshi Ishihara in *Mark Twain in Japan: The Cultural Reception of an American Icon*, provides a detailed study of how interpretations and translations of Mark Twain's entire corpus developed over the decades post the First World War and the changing attitudes to the "bad boy" trope and the racial issues of the novels led to Tom Sawyer and Huckleberry Finn's immense popularity and their inclusion within Nippon Animation's World Masterpiece Theatre series which aired for the family, anime versions of children's literary classics. As Ishihara notes throughout, Japan did not have an equivalent racial experience and consequently the brutality of slavery or the moral dilemma it generated was often either mistranslated or excised out of the translation altogether. This would construct a false image of America for the reader in Japan, a sanitised image. The anime *Tom Sawyer no Bōken* does exactly that by only partially presenting the savagery of slavery and depicting an Injun Joe who bears no racial markers apart from his name and his anger at his mistreatment, though it does not go so far as to reducing him to comic relief, which *Huckleberry Finn Monogatari* (1994) does. There, Injun Joe is strictly one dimensional, as he is in most adaptations, but for his fear of rats which Huck exploits to

save Tom and Becky from him in the cave. This anime, like those of the 90s like *Ranma 1/2*, is "fast-paced, carnivalesque, comical, fantastic, action-oriented"[178] and avoids anything that could potentially cause controversies; so Jim, who triggers a young white boy's moral re-examination in the pre-text, is transformed into a little boy of colour who plays with the other boys as part of the group and who journeys down the river with Huck and Tom because he wants to go and see his mother in hospital. By removing the equation of slavery entirely however, *Huckleberry Finn Monogatari* renders itself pointless. The characters have no purpose and development, it exists as testimony to Twain's immense and enduring popularity in Japan, and the international reach of anime. *Huckleberry Finn Monogatari* would be edited down to a 90 minute movie – *Huck and Tom's Mississippi Adventure* in 1995 – and released in America, like *Tom Sawyer no Bōken*, which had been dubbed as *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer* and released in the America market in 1988. While *Huckleberry Finn Monogatari* avoids controversy by drawing most of its material from *Tom Sawyer*, *Tom Sawyer no Bōken* draws from other stories featuring Tom too and barely touches upon the issue of slavery. The only episode dealing with the brutality of slavery is Episode 33, when Jim and Tom help a runaway slave escape to freedom. The scars on Maurice's back are an eye-opener for this Tom, who seems to have been insulated from the truth of slavery by being situated in a St. Petersberg where slaves not only live like family members with their white owners, but are also seemingly content with it. From Episode 1, a familiarity is depicted between master and slave and especially between Tom and Jim, who calls the former Tommu-chan, which is an incredibly intimate term for their particular situation. In Episode 23, Tom evens goes to the well to get water *for* Jim. Episode 33 marks a crucial point of division between the original and the English dub.

178 Tsuyoshi Ishihara, *Mark Twain in Japan: The Cultural Reception of an American Icon,* (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 2005), 110

Tom: Sure takin' a big chance but I reckon it's worth the freedom...Oh, I reckon you wishing you was going with him, huh?

Jim: Yes.

Tom: That's right Jim. Don't you lose hope 'cause your time's gonna come.

Jim: One day, we all gonna know what it is to be free.

Here, in the English dub, Jim is still scared enough of authority that he cannot run away – this episode is the only time he expresses that, even as he directs Tom around in their endeavour to help Maurice. In the original, to Tom's question, Jim says, "No." making him as the ideal slave, representative of the slave constructed by white literature and law, but also a product of the Japanese concept of respect towards the father, the elder, the senior. So Tom listens to Jim obediently, because Jim is senior to him and Jim must serve his family before himself. The child audience in Japan would understand that part, but the subtleties of racism would be missed by them.

The transfer from Japan to America of an American novel in a new form raises all kinds of political issues. Japan, itself a colonial power once, had never experienced slavery and had only barely been free of the American Occupation after the Second World War. Therefore it constructed the narrative and the characters on its own terms, picking and choosing segments and sections and selectively silencing those aspects of the novel which could detract from the family anime feel and/or prove impossible to suitably translate and explore. With the English dub, it underwent reconstruction. While the display of Tom and Huck's nudity was not uncommon and innocent among the sexually uninhabited anime productions from the 90s onwards, it was unacceptable in America so these minor scenes underwent censor edits, as did Tom's nightmare in Episode 33 of Jim being whipped and lynched. It almost reads as

though the child audience was not to be exposed to the truth of their own country's history. Or perhaps it was taken as a critique of white American history and therefore silenced. It would certainly explain the narration in the first scene of the anime, where a young slave boy is shown going to the well to get water. In the original, this happens in silence; there is no dialogue till he reaches the well and begins conversing with Jim. In the dub, however, there is a bit of narration where the boy is identified as getting water for his mother's cooking and drinking. The exact wording and tone makes it seem like the water is for their own household, which it might be, but the very fact that it is a relatively intact family with at least mother and son in it is what is important. Given the time and place, it would be uncommon to see an intact family in reality, and in media especially if they are not the principal characters. So when we are given an extended glimpse into Jim's family life in the Reader's Digest *Huckleberry Finn* (1974), it serves a purpose by aligning our sympathies with Jim from the beginning. Here, however, the only purpose this narratorial explanation seems to serve is to distort the truth of the inhumanity of slavery where the slaveowner had more rights to the child than its own mother. By adding this in a Japanese, therefore foreign, production, the American dub, which would be watched by millions in the English-speaking world, would be absolved of any accusations of distorting and distancing its own history since the lay audience, unfamiliar with the politics of translation, would attribute this to Japanese ignorance of slavery or imbibe a distorted image of slavery. That Jim is not freed in either version of this production is in keeping with Toni Morrison's statement that "[n]either Huck nor Mark Twain can tolerate, in imaginative terms, Jim freed."[179]

> Thus the fatal ending becomes the elaborate deferment of a necessary and necessarily unfree Africanist character's escape, because freedom has no meaning to Huck or to the text without the spectre of enslavement, the

179 Toni Morrison, *Playing in the Dark: Whiteness and Literary Imagination*, (Harvard university Press, 1992), 56

> anodyne to individualism; the yardstick of absolute power over the life of another; the signed, marked, informing, and mutating presence of a black slave.
>
> ...Two things strike us in this novel: the apparently limitless store of love and compassion, the black man has for his white friend and white masters; and his assumption that the whites are indeed what they say they are, superior and adult. This representation of Jim as the visible other can be read as the yearning of whites for forgiveness and love, but the yearning is made possible only when it is understood that Jim has recognized his inferiority (not as slave, but as black) and despises it...Jim's slave status makes play and deferment possible – but it also dramatises, in style and mode of narration, the connection between slavery and the achievement (in actual and imaginary terms) of freedom.[180]

Jim is the "black man [who] slips to reveal the white skin"[181], and the resolution of Huck's, and Twain's, moral dilemma that plagues him throughout the novel is contingent on exactly this: " he was white inside".[182]

Critics attribute the moment of resolution to Huck's decision in Chapter 31: "All right, then, I'll go to hell" when he tears up the letter to Miss Watson and decides instead to save Jim from being sold into slavery again. I would however argue that it is when Jim offers to stay with an injured Tom, risking his own freedom that he has regained again after being subjected to Tom's elaborate and humiliating escape plan, because if Tom were in his place he would never leave a member of the group behind, that the tension between Huck's constructed

180 ibid, 56 – 57.

181 Homi K. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, (London and New York: Routledge Classics, 1994), [Indian Reprint: 2010], 89

182 Mark Twain, *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*, Edited by Peter Coveney, (Penguin Books, 2003), 349

morality and his sympathy towards Jim is eased completely and the gap between Huck's resolution and his perspective of Jim is filled in. The existence of this gap would explain why it is so easy for Tom to just enter the narrative and take charge; Huck willingly lets him for then someone else can take responsibility and his dilemma can be held at bay. With Jim's declaration, Huck's internal conflict is nullified because he can now judge Jim within white parameters with white yardsticks. As long as he views Jim as the Other, the conflict would exist, but with Jim assuming the image of the ideal, sacrificing, subservient black man, he, and Twain, can breathe easy. After this moment, Jim is no longer referred to or described as "nigger". Other Africanist presences in the novel continue to be referred to in these terms, only proving that Jim is the exception to the norm. Jim is not representative of his people and kin, because he grows into the ideal racial hybrid, "the black man with a white soul". Huck's socially constructed notions about slavery and black people run so deeply in his worldview that it is beyond him to fathom that selflessness is not an exclusively white trait, even after experiencing firsthand the corruptions of King and Duke. He wonders at the cruelty of human beings towards one another[183] when he sees King and Duke tarred and feathered, but Tom's machinations and orchestration of Jim's escape is not seen as cruelty towards another human being and neither is King and Duke's dressing Jim up as an "Arab" to which Jim's own reaction is of satisfaction[184]; and throughout the novel, till Jim's revelation of his "white soul" Huck oscillates between referring to him as Jim and "nigger", even in the Chapter 31 when he debates writing to Miss Watson. Huck's conflict is solved not by acceptance of racial difference but by rewriting the difference in white terms. Jim's offering to sacrifice his freedom for Tom's sake does what even the image of Jim as a family man could not do.

The reconsideration of Jim that happens just before he tears up the letter shows how fond Huck is of Jim personally but this barrage of memories happens without factoring in racial

183 Twain, *Huckleberry Finn,* 302

184 Twain, *Huckleberry Finn*, 220

difference as he recalls the times Jim cared for him like a loving father figure and deferred to him gratefully. Huck's search for a father figure in his life ends with Jim, as someone who will always love him without challenging him. Huck's desire for a father who is adviser and trustworthy is universal, but he also needs something more: a father who, unlike his own, he can control. For Huck, Jim is a father-for-free. [185]

That no mention is made of Jim's wife and children and his desire to buy their freedom in the last chapter, and in all the sequels Twain would write, after Jim has been revealed as a free man is indicative of Jim's future status. Even if there was no *Tom Sawyer Abroad* or *Tom Sawyer Detective* or *Huckleberry Finn and Tom Sawyer among the Indians*, where Jim has been reduced to a whining, patronised, dumbed down source and unknowing provider of comic relief , one can understand that even with his freedom, Jim is not going to leave Huck and Tom; Twain's narrative through Huck's eyes had been heading that way since Duke and King joined the party, which sapped out of Jim all the intelligence and fire he had displayed early on in the novel and slowly silenced him.

When he vehemently argues with Huck over the wisdom of King Solomon and the language French in Chapter 14[186], Jim displays a mixture of common sense and lateral thinking against Huck's acceptance of social constructs. It is a moment of humour and lightheartedness before things take a serious and because the authorial perspective is Huck's, the reader is invited to laugh at the illiterate black runaway slave. And when he chastises Huck for pranking him after the fog, leading to the humbling of Huck before Jim, white boy before black man, Huck learns the important lesson that feelings are not the monopoly of white people. But the entry of King and Duke begins the process of Jim's silencing, and by the time Tom has arrives to seize control, Jim is so dutifully slavish and silenced that beyond a few initial protests, he complies

185 Morrison, Toni. 'This Amazing, Troubling Book', in *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*., ed. Thomas Cooley, (New York and London: A Norton Critical Edition, W.W. Norton & Company, 1999), 390

186 Twain, *Huckleberry Finn,* 134 - 135

entirely with Tom's harebrained scheme. Huck as Twain's second self in the novel, channels Twain into the novel, even if they are set up as two separate people and the first person narration and direct address to the reader offer some level of verisimilitude. Therefore, as the narrator's identity stands, it is Huckleberry Finn, who is created from memory and contested historical models from Hannibal, by Mark Twain, and who narrates the novel from a distance in time – indicated by the past tense and the address to the reader – leaving the events and people of the novel open to manipulation by memory which may or may not be reliable. Therefore, Jim is a construction of Huck's memory and all that both he and Huck say ought to be taken with a pinch of salt, because Huck Finn is an unreliable narrator – given how much we see him lying impromptu in the novel to adapt and survive – and also because his learnt racism would colour Jim's re-presentation, which it indeed does in the sequels when Jim's only identity is "our old nigger Jim that which we freed".

By the end of the novel, Jim's running away has no meaning therefore. It is only there to initiate contemplation on the nature of freedom in post- Civil War America and appease the reading public by its anti-slavery stance. Just freeing Jim on paper is enough for Twain. Anything more would mean dealing with the nature of racism and examining his own Self in the process, while alienating his target readership of older children – boys and girls - who flocked to the book the more it got banned in various libraries across America. For example, a 12 year old girl, Gertrude Swain, wrote to Twain in 1902, after the Omaha library had banned *Huckleberry Finn* saying: "I have read Huck Finn, about fifty times. Papa calls it my Bible, I think it is the best book ever written, and I don't think it would hurt any little boy or girl to read it. I think it would do lots of them a lot of good." [187]

187 R. Kent. Rasmussen, *Dear Mark Twain: Letters From His Readers,* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press, 2013), Letter 142

The film adaptations could not alienate them either so they too would have to tread carefully but even then, the amount of violence depicted on screen would increase with each American adaptation, each of which would also be much acclaimed in their time.

The Canadian-West German production *Huckleberry Finn and His Friends* (1979) would be the most faithful to the pre-text, seconding the implication of leaving Jim imaginatively enslaved even when he is technically and legally free.

> "That was the first time I sat down with regular white folks and ate supper at their own table; it don't seem proper nohow."

The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn, starring Mickey Rooney released in the same year as *Gone with the Wind*. As against the tragedy of the latter, this production of *Huck Finn* was relatively lacking in depth, with Huck providing sweeping statements on equality at the end, a realisation he came to only when Jim risked his own freedom for Huck's sake by taking him to the Wilks' house after Huck received a snakebite. The scene just before that is one of un-silencing one of the most silenced moments in the novel – Huck's reaction to the news of Pap's death. Huck here, does not react positively. He accuses Jim of betraying him and not being his friend – words which would be echoed nearly word for word in the 1993 Disney production – and it takes Jim getting caught and put on trial for Huck to run to his rescue, with help from a steamboat captain on the way. This adaptation is comparatively much tamer and sanitised than the 1993 version, where Jim is would have been hanged without trial if it has not been for Mary Jane Wilks.

The 1993 Disney adaptation does not hold back on violence perpetrated on the weak. That Elijah Wood is a much younger Huck than usual only magnifies the horror of Pap's violence. Huck's own terror is palpable – he falls asleep with a loaded rifle notched next to him at night

after Pap has a violent, drink-fuelled episode. Huck's faking his own death is also enacted in detail whereas in other adaptations this usually takes place of-screen.

It is in its depiction of the Huck and Jim relationship that the film finds its stand. Jim does not have to mutate into a black man with a white soul for Huck to make up his mind between right and wrong. Huck's naturally good heart and fierce sense of doing the right thing solves his conflict early on when he sees Jim with fresh whiplashes on his back at the Grangerfords mansion and he fully sees the brutality of slavery for the first time. Coupled with his own affection for Jim, this pushes him to declare he will go to hell if he must. In the same breath he "humbles" himself and apologises to Jim for accusing him of selfishness earlier that morning. The Huck and Jim relationship is constantly positioned to be that of equals with Jim as a kind mentor and Huck accepting his teachings, perfectly encapsulated in the scene where they fence on the raft, and Jim, with perfect posture, handily defeats Huck even as their conversation is that of the Frenchman not speaking like a man. The juxtaposition of this absurd conversation and refined swordplay adds to the humour of the movie but more importantly it establishes Huck and Jim as equals, which Huck too accepts in a few short scenes. And therefore even when Huck accuses Jim of betrayal when he learns of Pap's death, he is unable to be angry with him for long and returns to rescue him from jail while the whole town is exhuming Peter Wilks' body and Duke and King are being declared frauds.

Duke and King bring Jim into town in the caricatured guise of a Swahili warrior and teach him some Swahili, or what they think is Swahili. Jim's frustration with this and with King and Duke is evident in the reactions he does not bother to hide from Huck. Therefore, even as he goes along with it, because the frauds threaten to expose Jim as a runaway slave, Jim does not let himself be re-silenced by them, much like his predecessor in the 1974 Reader's Digest production.

The 1974 production provides the most radical take on the novel while staying faithful to it. Opening with a shot of slaves going to work at the fields and a glimpse into Jim's home life with a newborn baby, it moves onto juxtaposed images of the harshness of slavery and the luxury of class living as the song "Freedom" plays out and Huckleberry Finn moves from wealth, through the fields and his old fishing haunts. From the very start therefore, it establishes its ideology clearly enough, as it aligns the audience sympathy with Jim by un-silencing his family life and provokes consideration of white hypocrisy, which reaches peak realisation when Huck asks Colonel Grangerford during a shootout what started the feud. Grangerford doesn't know, he's accepted it as a constant and has unquestioningly maintained a feud which results in the mass slaughter of his family. Buck's death, pathetic in the novel, is avoided here by turning Buck into a little black, slave boy who escapes from there with Huck.

Huck returns to Jim and thereafter they run into King and Duke and Jim displays his intelligence when he proposes to pretend to be the slave of King and Duke, rather than the "freeborn manservant" Huck introduces him as, so that he is not sold into slavery. This works till they head to the Wilks to dupe the sisters of their money and Jim is confined to the raft as a mad Arab till he is sold to slave traders. That Huck refers to him here as the "freeborn manservant" instead of "our old nigger Jim" as he does in the pre-text is Huck's way of establishing that Jim is a free man and though he may not necessarily understand the Jim's reason or logic for running away, he accepts it and supports Jim.

The turning point for Huck, like in 1993, comes when he sees Jim's blood from the wounds inflicted by slave traders.

Huck : Jim! Your blood is red!

Jim: You didn't know that before Huck?

This is what pushes Huck into convincing Jim to take the raft and head to Cairo while he writes to Judge Thatcher to inform him that Jim is innocent of his murder and that he Huck will forward the money to buy the freedom of Jim's wife and child who are to join him in Cairo. Huck even offers to give Jim the capital to start his dry goods store in Cairo before they go their separate ways. At the end, Jim is still a runaway slave but he is free imaginatively and Huck moves beyond the understanding of freedom by binaries. Cognizant of his privileges, this Huck, through his actions, instead of overarching moral comments, becomes an example of unlearning prejudice and fighting for right and equality.

Alongside constructions of Injun Joe and Jim, is the forming of a piece of the earth – Jackson's Island. It can be read as the Americas in miniature, the Americas as they started with the pilgrims. Jackson's Island is the most ideal place for the boys to run off; it is literally silenced by the lack of language and history. All it has is its virgin woodland and a present which is written as the boys dictate, very similar to the utterly silent New World that J. K. Rowling imagines in her Magic in North America series. Tom, Huck and Joe Harper run away to the he island for some time and they play pirates and "Indians"– the absolute silence of the land allowing them to be uninhabited in their appropriations. They can run away to the island, colonising it as colonisers and be as they like in it, without guilt because there are no indigenous people in their way, and even if they are, because Twain writes "almost wholly unpeopled"[188], they are not significant enough to be noticed. The German production of 2011 gives the Island a prehistory by making it the hiding spot of Murrell's treasure, which is just enough to indicate the presence of people once upon a time and reason enough for the adventurous to venture there in the present. In *Tom Sawyer and Huckleberry Finn* (2014), there is a look into the wildlife of the Island before Huck and Tom proceed to kill an unnecessary number of that wildlife for their meals. In *Huckleberry Finn*, when Jim enters the

188 Twain, *Tom Sawyer*, 89

island, the movement is symbolic of the journey his ancestors had undertaken. Jim crosses over water and immigrates from St. Petersberg to Jackson's Island in search of freedom, only to get colonized by the white man (boy). For him to be free, he must leave the island, though Huck must leave with him, since the colonizer or the colonial past cannot be left behind, but can be met with halfway, as Jim tries his utmost to do till King and Duke arrive.

The Jim and Huck of the later adaptations become symbols of resistance, even as *Tom Sawyer* adaptations continue to whitewash Native American presence. That there is an abundance of material on portrayals of Jim but there is nearly nothing on Injun Joe only indicates the continued silencing of the Native Americans in discussions and portrayals of race relations in America. The controversies surrounding *Huckleberry Finn* no doubt helped. Adaptations of these two novels continue to negotiate the central issues depending on the ideology of their period of time – a 2018 short animation production of *Huckleberry Finn* ended with Huck running to freedom and Jim giving up his own to stay with a wounded Tom. If looked upon as a critique of the Far-Right, this short speaks volumes in its silence by absence of constant language. The silences might not be immediately discernible to the child, but the adult accompanying it can be a mentor – point the child in the right direction and then let them figure it out.

Chapter 3 Gender Constructs and Silence

In Japan, manga aimed at children is first serialized in magazines before they are collected in a volume – shōjo manga like *Cardcaptor Sakura: Clear Card-hen* (2016 – ongoing) in shōjo magazines like *Nakayoshi* which are aimed at young girls; shōnen manga like the *Dragon Ball* (1984 – 1995) in shōnen magazine *Weekly Shōnen Jump* which meant for young boys. This gendering of manga and magazines continue into those for adult; for men and women there is seinan and josei manga and magazines respectively. There is no rule which says boys cannot read shōjo manga or girls cannot read shōnen manga, but the very fact that the gendering of manga happens at all is symptomatic of Japan's deeply ingrained notions of gender norms and heternormativity. To simplify and severely generalize, shōjo manga is primarily floral and pastel in hue, while shōnen manga is darker, grittier and more violent, corresponding to feminine grace and masculine aggression respectively.

This is also reflective of the more universal concepts of women as the weaker sex and men as the protector, with women being reduced to the harridan, or the Angel in the House, or the helpless girl. As these traits are ascribed onto women, it must by process of elimination mean that men do not have these traits, and as it constructs femininity, it constructs masculinity alongside it. When Tom Sawyer in the 1973 production says, "Heck, girls ain't no fun. Always gigglin' or weepin'" he subscribes to a stereotyping of girls and moreover he does so based on one girl Amy Lawrence, so he also generalizes. At the same time, what remains silently deducible in his speech is that boys are neither giggling, nor weeping. "Boys don't cry" is one of the biggest assertions of constructed masculinity, because tears are weak and feminine. Enforcement of a stereotype like this silences the scope for sensitivity in men and when frontier or colonial literature or war literature portray the heroism of men in combating harsh terrains and unforgiving climates and savage natives and enemy frontlines, they

automatically exclude and silence out all scope of different masculinities. Walter Blythe, Anne Shirley's second son, who has inherited his mother's poetic and romantic temperament, spends a long time in *Rilla of Ingleside* debating over enlisting in the Great War, the doubts sprouting in his mind because of all the bullying and name-calling he was facing at college on a regular basis, for not having enlisted in the war. Walter's fault is that he does not like the futility of war; he would much rather help the war effort from home than in the frontlines. Giving in to social pressure to prove his masculinity, when he finally does go to the frontlines he dies a heroic death after saving another soldier. Walter Blythe's masculinity is made to be inferior and effeminate because he does not believe in the honour of warfare. That there is at all the idea of a different masculinity asserts the existence of a "normalized", dominant form of masculinity, cultivated by a tradition of warfare and gender boundaries.

Tom Sawyer's romantic, exaggerated imagination, not very different from Anne Shirley's in the sheer excess of it, could not be more different from it in content. Anne draws her romanticism and stories from the nature which surrounds her in Prince Edward Island; Tom draws his inspiration from James Fenimore Cooper's *Leatherstocking* novels, pirate stories, and Robin Hood, all of which, along with being "exotic", also subscribe to the physically powerful, intellectually superior man which millions of boys like Tom read and internalize, especially if they are the only books adults pass on to them. However, the several girls who had written to Twain about the joy they found in *Tom Sawyer* and *Huckleberry Finn*, are proof that girls too read boy's adventure tales. In the late 20th and early 21st centuries, this division can best be summed up as "boys are given Hot Wheels, girls are given Barbies." A girl may choose to reject her Barbie entirely and play with Hot Wheels and be termed a tomboy, but if the boy rejects his Hot Wheels to chose a Barbie, he is subjected to far crueller names,[189] which leads to a silencing of his choice by repression, resulting in the enforcement

189 Judy Simons, "Gender roles in children's fiction", in *The Cambridge Companion Children's Literature*, eds. M. O. Grenby and Andrea Immel, (Cambridge University Press: 2009), 152

of a hypermasculinity, unless the child with support from a parental figure, can assert his choice.

Sixteen years before Huckleberry Finn, Louisa May Alcott had given her readers Jo March, who wanted to fight in the Civil War with her father and looked for a career beyond the home, like Alcott herself had done. Jo was "tomboy" figure, realised in the cutting of her hair to pay for her father's medical care, and even if she had a conventional happy ending, it happened after she left home, went out on her own, provided for her family, cared for her dying younger sister by providing emotional and financial support. She may do so by expressing her dissatisfaction with her "assigned gender roles" [190] but as a product of her time, her feminism is both nascent and radical and it will be interesting to see Greta Gerwig's take on Jo March when the eighth film adaptation of Little Women releases in 2019, relatively soon after the 2017 television adaptation.

In *Tom Sawyer*, Tom's boyhood is not so much defined by his love for adventure, as it is by the women around him – Aunt Polly is harried, aged and looking after 3 children, Amy Lawrence is in love with him, and Becky Thatcher's meanness and ability to hold a grudge – as seen when she does not tell Mr. Dobbins the truth behind Tom's ruined homework - is set off against Tom's taking the whipping for her and later in the courage and promise of protection he gives her when they get lost in McDougal's cave. Because Tom does not hold a grudge and is selfless, he is a noble boy.

The horror of "sitting with the girls" in the classroom, which is mirrored by Anne's horror at being made to sit next to Gilbert Blythe in *Anne of Green Gables*, is treated as a moment of false silence by Twain, recreated over and over again, and especially faithfully in *The*

190 Ibid, 147

Adventures of Tom Sawyer (1937). The Reader's Digest production eliminates this scene altogether because there seem to be no gender divisions in the classroom anyway, reflecting the norms of the time the movie was made in rather than the one it was set in. In *Tom Sawyer and Huckleberry Finn* (2014), Tom puts the idea into Mr. Dobbins' head by saying, "Don't make me sit with the girls", handily ensuring that he does sit next to Becky. In *Tom Sawyer* (2011), Tom tells Mr. Dobbins as soon as he enters class that he was talking to Huck Finn, which he deemed more important than being in class. This cheek earns him his punishment of sitting with the girls, and it is not till Tom actually heads to his seat that he sees he is sharing with Becky, which makes him happy but it's a subtle change of expression. Here, in fact, it is Becky who makes the first move, by placing an apple on his side. In *Tom Sawyer* (2000), the animated anthromorphic version, Tom loudly protests that there are several awful things he would prefer doing over having to sit with girls – like getting his ears cleaned – while his body language betrays his words and he continues to sit there even when he does not have to. The use of "sit with the girls" as a punishment here is a lapse in either the plot or the animation because there do not seem to be any pre-existing gender divisions in the classroom. Nevertheless, Tom makes his way to Becky and stands by her, flirting, for several minutes before he sits between Becky and Amy Lawrence, who has fast realized that she is losing his attention. That Tom wants to "sit with the girls", despite the sniggering titters or appalled gasps, so he can attract Becky's attention, and survives the experience unscathed, therefore rendering the punishment pointless and laughable is Twain exposing the fallacy of imposing gender divisions in the one-room classroom by subverting the punishment. This is clearly meant to be a humiliating punishment and enforce gendered spaces at the same time –by making the idea of crossing the gender line a humiliating one by forcing the crossing, any threat to the established gendered space that could stem from the student body is kept at bay. That the punishment fails with Tom is the text's quiet rebellion against the norm.

In *Tom Sawyer no Bōken*, the concept of "sit with the girls" as punishment is changed completely. Here, instead, Tom is made to sit with Becky because he has been an errant pupil and Becky a model one who could be a good influence on him. This is surprising given how deeply held patriarchal values are in Japan, but this is a matter of nation over gender. From "sit with girls", it translates and mutates to "sit with the model pupil (who can be of useful service to the nation), irrespective of gender, so the deviant pupil can be moulded into a model pupil under the influence of the model pupil."

As Tom Sawyer's attentions shift to Becky Thatcher, Amy Lawrence becomes the casualty. In the pre-text, the longest she is seen for at any given time is in Chapter 18, after Joe Harper, Tom (and Huck) crash their own funeral, but by this time Tom has already shifted his attentions to Becky and his engagement to Becky has already been confirmed and broken. This engagement with Becky happened while Tom was still technically engaged to Amy – at no point did he tell her that he was no in love with her anymore, though she had her suspicions from the church scene onwards, when Becky made her first appearance. It could be said that this is puppy love and these "engagements" are not serious, but they are serious to the children themselves, and Tom's ill-treatment of Amy, especially when he uses her affection for him to make Becky envious in Chapter 18, do not paint Tom in a good light and could potentially normalize such behaviour among the child readers and audience.

In the 1937 production, Amy, whenever she appears, is painted as annoying and petty, as though that justifies Tom's betraying her trust: Tom even confirms that they are still engaged just before he spots Becky, against whom Amy is the foil. It makes sense therefore that the only thing she tells Tom in the German production is, "Cheater. You will burn in Hell."

In *Tom Sawyer* (2000), Amy is given as large a role as Becky and the silence that is placed on her by action – by Tom when she speaks but he does not afford her the courtesy of listening,

when he uses her for her feelings for him and treats them as trivial – is un-silenced here. Tom remains the same, but Amy here is very different from the scorned little girl in the pre-text or the simpering one of 1937. This Amy is a "tomboy", or rather, she defies the restrictions that social norms place on female fashion and deportment, quite like Blyton's George Kirrin in that regard. But unlike George, she does not do so by rejecting her femininity. She wears overalls, goes fishing with the boys, and presents Tom with a large can of worms she caught herself when Tom sit between her and Becky as punishment. But the producers seemingly balk at depicting a character who embraces her femininity without succumbing to stereotypes – here those of female jealousy – reducing her to someone akin to the scheming villainesses of soap operas. She follows Tom and Becky around, snitches on Becky when the latter spills ink on and ruins test papers, and when Tom crashes his own funeral, she kisses him publicly after she is certain Becky will see it – which is not only scandalous for the time period the film is set in according to costume but also sets up a contest between two modes of female behaviour. She does all she can to sabotage Tom and Becky's romance, but she does so out of envy and anger and redeems herself by the end; it is she who tells everyone that Tom and Becky are in McDougal's Cave, and by the end of the film, she begins dating Huck Finn, after his display of bravery in the caves. She and Becky also have a duet together – "One Dream" – where they sing about how much they individually love Tom. In this animated film meant for children, Amy is one possibility of girlhood any child who identifies as a girl can aspire to.

Compared to Amy, Becky in 2000 is constructed as a coquette, not just by the difference in their sartorial choices but also by body language. Becky is attributed with all the stereotypical traits that are associated with coquetry – the coy glances, the voice modulations, the delicate movements – as she plays hard to get. But that she has a playful nature beyond this is also displayed when she tricks Tom into kissing his pet frog instead of her, implying that she

consciously behaves according to gender roles imposed on her. The same cannot be determined for Becky Thatcher in the 2014 production, who, though written similarly to the Becky in 2000, is a far more one-dimensional character, limited to simply being Tom's romantic interest and the damsel to his hero just like 1937, Becky who is demure, coy and for the first few scenes she appears in – mute. Her early muteness in the film is contrasted with Amy's ceaseless chatter, the production blatantly favouring her, though both characters are, for the lack of a better word, "nyaka". Ann Gillis is given three emotions to work with in this film – primarily coyness; terror in two scenes, which Gillis embodies astonishingly well; and anger after Tom's slip. This limited range of feelings, which boxes in Becky's character clearly predict her future as the Angel of the House.

The whipping Tom takes on her behalf redeems him in her eyes after he accidentally confesses to having been engaged to Amy Lawrence in most of the productions, but in the Reader's Digest production, the whipping takes place before and is used as a tool to establish Tom's nobility within the narrative. Played by a very young Jodie Foster, this Becky is very stolid, balancing out Tom's energy. Even when she looks for excuses to not enter the caves, because she is scared but does not want to say it, her voice only slightly wavers and hints at her fear till she finally gives in and follows Tom in with trepidation because he does not understand "no", the second time he displays this lack of sensitivity in the movie – the first time being when he badgers her into getting engaged with him.

Six years later, Becky in *Tom Sawyer no Bōken* would let Tom know that she's scared when entering the cave but she would rather go with him and explore than wait at the entrance for his return, even though Huck puts no pressure on her to go. She is far more outgoing and fearless than her counterparts[191] and earlier incarnations within the scope of translations that had happened in Japan. Produced in Post- Occupation Japan, this Becky spends unsupervised

191 Ishihara, *Twain in Japan*, 108

time alone with Tom and is not bashful about kissing him on the cheek.[192] In Episode 23, she even goes catfishing with Tom and Huck, eventually running into the river herself and using her hat to secure the catfish Tom had hooked. She voluntarily cancels a party she had been planning so she can go, and says that she does not mind her ruined dress and hat and would like to go fishing again. She is the result of restrained liberal values that took root in Japan during the Occupation; clever, smart and kind and with a greater capacity for guilt than the original Becky of the pre-text is shown to have. The anime also does not make any effort to enforce pre-conceived notions of femininity on its audience, unlike the English dub. When Tom is made to sit next to Becky in Episode 5, he tries his hardest to jog her memory as she is unable to identify him. She fails at placing him the first few times and gets irritated after a while. All this happens without any narration, but when this scene plays out in the American dub, Tom keeps up a steady commentary which could simply be read as a small boy repeating the sexist remarks he must have heard from adults, if one ignores the adult construction of the scene – "just shy, being as how most girls are" and "she's too pretty to be dumb" are two of the statements exclusive to the English dub. Firstly, Becky just wanted to focus in class, and secondly the addition of these statements reflects deeply on the sexism present in America even now. On the one hand, a girl/woman is too pretty to be dumb, but on the other hand blondes are always equated with being dumb.

In *Tom Sawyer* (2011), the German production, Becky is a feminist. One of her first lines in the movie establishes her as a supporter of universal suffrage. When Mr. Dobbins asks what the difference is between men and women, to which a few euphemistic jokes made by the boys, Becky says, "Women are not allowed to vote." Mr. Dobbins is clearly angry by her answer and begins to lecture her but is interrupted by a tardy Tom who is made to sit next to Becky. It is she who takes the lead in her relationship with Tom here. She invites him to meet

192 Ibid, 107

her outside and after school; instead of following Tom's lead, as all versions of Becky have done so far, she takes the lead in an adventure, when she invites Tom to explore McDougal's cave with her by saying that she'll allow him to pretend he's a pirate and kidnap her for an afternoon; she invites him to tea after he has testified at court and shows no hesitance in intimately embracing, to which Tom himself looks visibly uncomfortable. Once they get lost in the cave however, despite everything so far, Becky has to shrink back into her socially constructed role as the damsel, while Tom protects from the horrors of the cave and Injun Joe. For the sake of facilitating Tom as the hero, Becky has to make the sacrifice. Alternatively, Becky's construction as a far more liberal and progressive character who is reduced to the damsel could be read as postulating a woman as helpless in times of crisis. However, in light of Aunt Polly's characterisation in the same production and the fact that the director is a woman Hermine Huntgeburth, the first reading, that of Becky's sacrifice, is more likely.

As with the portrayal of Injun Joe, this adaptation reconstructs the character of Aunt Polly by testing boundaries as much as possible given the restrictions of the time the story is set in. It explores the gap in Twain's narrative regarding the source of Aunt Polly's income, and by de-aging Aunt Polly to a young woman in her early thirties at most, enables her to work for her living. Therefore she takes care of Tom and Sid, runs the house and farm on her own, and makes jam to sell at the market and earn an income. This Aunt Polly also has a strong sense of equality, as shown in her treatment of Injun Joe and a strong sense of right and wrong, as she is one of the first people to protest Muff Potter's arrest and subsequent attempt at hanging without trial. Moreover Aunt Polly here is not party to prevalent racial prejudices. As discussed in the last chapter, she displays no bias in her treatment of Injun Joe; she offers him food and invites him into her home, but her reaction after she learns that the man she was so kind to, murdered someone and framed another and could threaten her nephew's life is eliminated in the film. We see her accepting the security around her house that Judge

Thatcher and the Sheriff arrange, but other than that, the audience is never told how she deals with this. This Aunt Polly is self-sufficient, independent, no-sense and capable, reflecting 21st century ideas of womanhood in a 19th century setting and to maintain her character as a strong woman, where strength is defined in masculinist terms, the potentially emotion-driven reactions she could have are silenced. Along with Becky Thatcher, the portrayal of women in this film is by far the most progressive out of all the productions discussed here, though it is inherently restricted by its pre-text from breaking the boundaries completely.

The institution and enforcement of this gender binary in literature and art, automatically exclude and silence and silence the Other to the binary, the threat to its stability and hegemonic dominance. Therefore, when Twain makes the protagonists in *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* (1884) cross-dress, he questions the gender binary itself[193][194], and by doing just that, un-silences the gap between that exist within the binary itself, and the space of transgression which exists within and can be realized without, reifying into the Other, the third gender. Twain however, as a product of and limited by his time, can only explore this issue of "appropriate gendered behaviors and mannerisms, [as] social constructions, not immutable laws"[195] as much as he already does and through cross-dressing and its parodic connotations, as he would have been familiar with from minstrel shows. That the scenes where Huck and then Jim, cross-dress devolve into moments of humour within the narrative is indicates a similar dilemma within Twain that race relations cause for him.

Unlike Tom, who is not only constructed by Twain, but also controlled by him, having become manifest from a very specific and limited part of Twain's memory, Huckleberry Finn,

---

193 Victoria Flanagan, "Gender Studies", in *The Routledge Companion to Children's Literature*, ed. David Rudd, (London and New York: Routledge, 2010), 32 - 33

194 Linda A. Morris, *Gender Play in Mark Twain: Cross-Dressing and Transgression*, (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 2007), 20

195 Ibid, 4

as Twain's second self, has greater access to the personal confusions which plague the author and which he tries to resolve through his constructed identity by trying to gain objectivity by looking at the problem from a distance. Therefore, it is onto Huck, rather than Tom, that Twain ascribes these questions regarding gender roles and norms. Moreover, as a child enmeshed in the social hegemony structure, Tom is more constructed by his nurture and less flexible than Huck, who as the outsider to social normativities, is greater able to cross borders.

At the end of Chapter 10, Huck and Jim decide that Huck should make his way to the shore and find out the current news. Given that he is supposed to be dead, Jim suggests that Huck dress up in the women's clothing they recovered from the frame house, and help Huck with the ensemble and the actions of the act Huck will have to perform. In Chapter 11, Huck ends up in Mrs. Judith Loftus' house, dressed as a girl. There he learns, among assorted Loftus family gossip, that both Pap Finn and Jim are suspected of his murder and there is a $200 and $300 reward for their capture respectively. Does this mean that a father's murder of his son is considered less heinous than a black man killing a white man? The information that Mr. Loftus plans to row over to Jackson's Island to search for the "runaway slave" makes Huck anxious enough that his performance starts to slip and Mrs. Loftus cottons on, concluding that he is a runaway apprentice, which adds multiple identities upon Huck who first becomes Sarah, then Mary, then Sarah Mary Williams, then runaway apprentice George Peters[196]. Near the end of the novel, in the "evasion" scene, Huck cross-dresses again, this time as a servant girl to deliver a letter.

The second time he dons a gown is to appease Tom's asinine whims, but the first occasion, when he has to pretend to be a girl in front of a stranger, Huck must perform his part as a girl. While the text may be constructed so as to generate humour from all the mistakes Huck

196 Morris, *Gender Play,* 39

makes, within-the-text Huck starts fumbling and slipping only after he learns that Jim might be hunted out in the island. The cracks in Huck's performance appear only once he gets anxious about Jim's fate and the humour in the scene is derived at the cost of Huck.

If Huck is thirteen or fourteen years old, as he presumes he is in the novel, then his voice ought to be cracking, necessitating the adoption of a different range of voice as women presumably speak in. It is not mentioned if he does so in the novel, but the adaptations have various attempts at falsetto with varying rates of success. Huck must therefore speak and walk the way he and Jim assume girls do, based on what they have seen of girls in St. Petersberg, and in performing the gender he assumes by cross-dressing, he becomes an example of what Judith Butler calls "gender performativity"

> ... the various acts of gender create the idea of gender, and without those acts, there would be no gender at all. Gender is, thus, a construction that regularly conceals its genesis; the tacit collective agreement to perform, produce, and sustain discrete and polar genders as cultural fictions is obscured by the credibility of those productions...
>
> As in other ritual social dramas, the action of gender requires a performance that is repeated. This repetition is at once a reenactment and reexperiencing of a set of meanings already socially established; and it is the mundane and ritualized form of their legitimation.[197]

The performance as imitation[198], which can be practised, revised and tested, as happens here, which is also one the learning techniques of early childhood, therefore, reveals gender to be a

197 Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity,* (New York and London: Routledge, 2002), 178

198 Ibid, 175

matter of Nurture over Nature and a learned skill. If gender is simply the delivery of certain expected actions, then the gap in the binary is closed as the binary collapses.

Following on from Judith Butler, Linda A. Morris examines the scene of Huck's cross-dressing as an exercise in gender performance, which can be traced back to not just the minstrels in Twain's time who did blackface in early theatre and would also play women in blackface, in her book *Gender Play in Mark Twain: Cross-Dressing and Transgression.* For her, there is a reversal of roles when Huck puts on a gown and Jim helps dress him – "In masquerading as a girl, Huck moves momentarily from the subject position to the object position. He becomes the object of Jim's gaze, thereby taking on a female stance with his female disguise."[199] It temporarily puts Huck in the position of helplessness that Jim is permanently in but that does not automatically imply that he can now identify and sympathise with Jim.

Morris also notes the irony "arising from the fact that Huck's cross-dressing in itself calls into question culturally constructed notions of gender while, at the same time, Judith Loftus's tests and ensuing instructions reinscribe gendered behaviors as though they were absolute and universal."[200] Judith Loftus does not censure Huck for cross-dressing, she instead offers instruction on how to do a better job the next time he is in a situation like this. Nevertheless, as a member of the existing and established binary, she subscribes to the male and female particularities of actions which underline the tests she puts Huck through. One of the suggestions she gives Huck is regarding the technique of throwing something at something – "fetch your hand up over your head as awkard as you can, and miss your rat about six or seven foot."[201] On one level, this is a woman teaching and thereby perpetuating constructs and stereotypes of "female helplessness". On another level, this is written by a man who has

199 Morris, *Gender Play,* 36

200 Ibid, 35

201 Twain, *Huckleberry Finn*, 116

created the female character who speaks these lines. Hence, is this Judith Loftus advising Huck for the sake of his survival, for everyone might not be as kind as she has been; or Twain, whose experience of femininity is entirely second-hand, using the character of Judith Loftus to show that socially constructed gender is contingent on conditioning? As this entire episode is underpinned by humour, Twain falls just short of conveying to his readers (and audience) that gender is conditioned, which though exposed here, is cloaked under that humour. Hence, cross-dressing here becomes similar to the blackface appropriated by the minstrel men Twain was familiar with; or the redface applied by the white actors who played Injun Joe; or like the experiment undertaken by John Howard Griffiths, which he writes about in *Black Like Me* (1961), where he dyes his skin black to experience the American South, but essentially remains white inside. It can be removed like a mask, as an identity to be temporarily appropriated; a minor breach in the borders which is fixed once the subject returns to their original position. That Huck wears his own clothes under the dress only reinforces that and re-silences the possibility of the emergence of the Other from the existing gap and silence.

Morris also notes the gender and racialized boundaries that are crossed when Jim wears Aunt Sally's calico dress to escape[202], as per Tom's plan. The black man is positioned as a threat to the identity and space of the white woman for unlike Huck, who wears clothes with no history and baggage, Jim wears the clothes of an identifiable owner, thereby taking on their identity in his disguise. This is checked within the next few lines when Aunt Sally rushes to get things ready for Tom's convalescence after she has seen the returning party, "scattering orders right and left at the niggers."[203] Her dominance and position in the hierarchy is restored and Jim's transgression is erased when his own clothes are put back on him.[204]

---

202 Morrris, *Gender Play*, 56

203 Twain, *Huckleberry Finn*, 359

204 Ibid, 360

In the adaptations, Huck's episode of cross-dressing is faithfully depicted in every version, but because the "evasion" section is written out of most of the adaptations, Jim's cross-dressing is not rendered on screen. Even in *Huckleberry Finn and His Friends* (1979), which dedicates an episode to this segment from the novel, though Jim escapes wearing Aunt Sally's calico dress, he returns without it.

Most of the adaptations examined in this thesis eliminate exchange between Huck and Jim where racial boundaries are transgressed by a reversal of gaze when Jim helps Huck dress and practice being a girl altogether. The Reader's Digest adaptation of 1974 in fact, makes this entirely Huck's ideas that he has when he runs by a house with some laundry hanging out to dry. In the 1939 adaptation, Huck is shown to be already dressed and in the 1993 adaptations, the scene cuts to Huck knocking on Mrs. Judith Loftus' door. While in the first adaptation here, Huck is shown walking the street with his hands primly head in front of him, the only aspect of physical gender performance in the other two adaptations is the voice modulation. The young age of the 1993 Huck makes him better suited to this endeavour than the others, where the audience has to suspend disbelief to accept their acts. Huck bases his performance on what he has observed of women presumably, since we do not know if Jim instructs him in the films, but his observation is inadequate, and when he is caught by Judith Loftus for a boy, in the films, he leaves quickly enough, as soon as Mr. Loftus appears, gives the news regarding the manhunt for Jim, and leaves. Huck's cross-dressing is silenced of its possibilities of gender fluidity and dissolution of gender roles as it is reduced to situational comedy in the adaptations. Even when Huck cross-dresses again in the 1939 production, this time to play Juliet in the King and Duke's performance of Romeo and Juliet, it merely acts as a reference to the beginnings of theatre, when Juliet truly would have been played by a young boy in cross-dress. In the adaptations, it is only ever the young boy, caught between childhood and adulthood, who still carries the ability to cross gender boundaries.

Huckleberry Finn and His Friends however depicts Jim's role in this in exact detail. In Episode 16, he helps Huck fit into the dress, ties and adjusts his bonnet for him over his protests, and teaches him how to hold himself and walk delicately, to the best of his knowledge and ability. Huck follows his lead faithfully and when they agree that his walk is much improved, Huck actually twirls and skips down the path. That is not to say that he embraces the role; he is visibly anxious as soon as he knocks on the door and his falsetto slips several times to his normal voice. Here however, Huck is not interested in the advice Mrs. Loftus passes onto him – he is impatient to get to Jim and warn him. The 1974 adaptation eliminates even this for immediately after this scene is shown the Grangerford/Shepherdson feud, meaning that it is some time before Huck returns to Jim, who is apparently in no immediate threat of capture because that is not information Mrs. Judith Loftus conveys to Huck. By leaving Jim, unexplained, for a relatively long duration, does Huck not recognize the worry Jim must be feeling for him? Moreover, does Huck not consider the grief that Widow Douglas would experience upon news of his death? According to Aunt Polly in the 1979 television series, he does not consider the grief and harassment he caused for everyone. While Huck's actions are less thoughtless than Tom's, the reader shall never know of the women's side of the happenings after Pap kidnaps Huck in the other adaptations. Unlike in the book, where Pap kidnaps Huck on his way back from school, which would cause tremendous worry, in most of the film adaptations, Pap kidnaps Huck in front of Widow Douglas and Ms. Watson, after demanding a large sum of money from them, which he plans to continue extorting. Mickey Rooney's Huck would be the most thoughtless among this group, for he was prepared and planning to leave on his own, before Pap showed up, but at the end, the Widow still forgives him and takes him back in her care. Huck's reunion with the Widow is far more emotional in the 1993 Disney film as when Pap had kidnapped him, he had also injured Ms. Watson.

The women in the adaptations are reinterpreted depending on situation. In the 2014 adaptation *Tom Sawyer and Huckleberry Finn*, it is Widow Douglas who fires a blank shot and insists on the trial of Muff Potter, which transforms her from the helpless woman threatened with mutilation by Injun Joe in the novel to someone entirely capable of self-defence and with a deciding voice in the community. In the 1993 adaptation of Huck, this role is given to Mary Jane Wilks who saves Jim from hanging in a similar way and just in the nick of time. In the 1974 production, Mary Jane colludes with Huck to out King and Duke as frauds during the auction. Both Marys are still the compassionate and kind-hearted girl from the pre-text but much more decisive. The women are vested with limited scope and power and Mary Jane Wilks can only exert the authority she does because she carries her Uncle's name. She draws her authority from his memory and not as an individual herself. Nevertheless, for the young girl watching these the 1993 adaptation, Mary Jane's display of authority is a powerful moment in a narrative dominated by men, especially given the construction of femininity that was imposed on Mary would leave her duped and betrayed.

The biggest problems with these adaptations is the erasure of Joanna's cleft lip – either she as a character is written out or she is a blemish free non-speaking character and the films miss out on the opportunity to represent physical deformity sensitively. In the novel, Joanna is made to eat in the kitchen, with Huck, when there is company, presumably on account of her cleft-lip which could cause discomfort among the guests, and when she cross-questions Huck about England she is lectured by Mary Jane to be kind to him, though her first description is "that's the one that fives herself to good works and has a hare-lip."[205] Hare-lip, which is derogatory, identifies her throughout her entire stint in the text – Huck even very nearly calls her that to her face[206] - which, given that we see the narrative from Huck's point of view, reduces her to a comic character whose relentless inquisition of him and his bumbling

205 Twain, *Huckleberry Finn*, 223

206 Ibid, 238

answers are moments of comic relief. The complete erasure of it entirely works as a selective silencing and only perpetuates idealistic constructs of beauty; just presenting her onscreen would have undone a lot of the silencing imposed upon her in the novel.

Since, most of the adaptations exclude the "evasion" scene entirely, silence is also imposed to the loving, yet stern Aunt Sally, whom Tom and Huck trick very waking minute. She is not afraid to use her hickory switch on the boys but she is also perennially anxious and the pranks Huck and Tom play on her do confuse and scare her terribly; another instance where neither of them consider the effect their actions can have on those who love them. Apparently, Tom's experience in the funeral episode in *Tom Sawyer* did not mellow his search for adventure, and to create adventure if there is none readily available. Aunt Polly's grief then, did not teach him to treat Aunt Sally with a modicum of respect. Only in the television series, does she have a role where she exerts her authority over the men in the neighbourhood and in her own household.

Twain's approach, and consequently and subsequently, that of the adaptations, to gender changes with texts. Tom, more so than Huck, is therefore defined by the women he is around – as Becky takes initiative in the 2011 production, Tom must necessarily lose his hyperactivity. Huck's masculinity is constructed differently however. By illustrating his failure to pass off for a girl, he is established as firmly male. Even when sharing a table with a girl who is of a higher social standing than him, the gaze remains with Huck, for her deformity automatically places her below Huck in the hierarchy, because he is an undeformed boy, who has successfully survived the crucible of cross-dressing by asserting his masculinity.

In 2004, Mattel Entertainment released *Barbie as The Princess and The Pauper*, the sixth Barbie movie, which loosely adapted Twain's *The Prince and the Pauper* (1882), by changing

the gender of the titular characters. Edward, Prince of Wales, became Princess Annaliese and the pauper Tom Canty became pauper seamstress Erica. The plot is fairly simple – to save her bankrupt kingdom, Annaliese must marry a rich young prince, choosing duty over love, but before she can do that, she is kidnapped by the Prime Minister Preminger, who wants to be King himself. Annaliese's tutor Julian, who also loves her, convinces her doppelganger Erica to pretend to be the Princess till the real one is found. Erica gets exposed as an imposter but eventually the two couples – Princess Anneliese/Julian and Erica/Prince Dominic – reveal Preminger's plot and save the kingdom. But before the couple can have their conventional happy ending, the two leads, both played by Barbie, the centre of so much controversy regarding unhealthy standards of beauty, is shown choosing to delaying the happy ending. Annaliese first brings the kingdom into prosperity again before she marries Julian, and Erica leaves to chase her dreams as a singer, before she decides to return to marry Dominic.

The body of the Barbie doll is of unrealistic proportions and not an example of body positivity; moreover the original Barbie is expensive enough that the majority of children, especially in developing countries, are unable to buy it. But the movies are available to everyone and as such do have an influence on the consumer. This particular movie does not just change the gender of the protagonists in the translation from pre-text to adaptation; it has two young women who choose to live their own life and live their dreams before choosing to marry, two women who do not wait to be rescued and rescue themselves by their wits and intelligence, two women who successfully balance both duty and desire responsibly and judiciously, two women who are their own heroes and who are defined by themselves.

Chapter 4 Silence and Re-writing Class

In *Second Form at Malory Towers* (1947), Gwendolyn Lacy befriends new girl Daphne Turner who is rich and pretty, till it is revealed by Daphne herself that she was lying about her wealth all along and stealing from the girls because she had no money, and though Gwen is looked at unkindly for abandoning her friendship with Daphne because she is poor, the other girls – all well-to-do themselves – accept Daphne and resolve to treat her kindly because Daphne saved Mary-Lou's life. Enid Blyton's didactic intention – of teaching acceptance, not just of other's mistakes but also one's own before judging someone else – would have been much more effective if Daphne was not associated with "thief" hereafter, and relegated to the background as a quiet, passive character in the rest of the books.

Daphne is not alone in the ranks wealthy-new-girl-who-gets-revealed-as-a-fraud within the scope of Blytons's books. A similar fate is shared by Pauline Jones in *Claudine at St. Clare's* (1944). Here too, Pauline, who lied about her wealth is assumed to be a thief till proven otherwise and though Ms. Theobald explains why Pauline lied – "because she longs to be thought better than she is"[207] - and the girls all defend her against Angela's spiteful comments, at the same time calling Angela out on her own snobbery, Pauline is reduced to a background figure while Angela continues to be prominent. Miss Theobald's construction of the sentence also carries a hint of derision and condescension. "She longs to be thought better than she is" reads as the opinion that she ought not aspire beyond her class.

Are these therefore examples of Blyton's classism? The Hon. Angela Favorleigh and her mother are both held in a low opinion by the girls because they are so arrogant about their wealth and titled relations, and Gladys Knight, who just has her mother who works hard to provide for her daughter is popular and loved in the set because she is unassuming, kind and

207 Enid Blyton ,Claudine at St. Clare's, Chapter 21

wise. If Miss Theobald is seen as the adult author's mouthpiece, then her statement, "We should never judge people by the amount of money or possessions they have, but by what they *are*"[208] would indicate that Blyton is not being classist but the number of girls from single-parent families, or those who live with relatives, or are from poorer families, who lie and steal and play spiteful tricks on others is too great to be explained away. Alongside this are the accounts of half-term visits which clearly establish which girls have parents with cars and which do not; and the birthday treats and feasts which are again linked to the financial status of the parents. When nearly everyone in a group belongs to the same social class, as defined by occupation, wealth and provenance of that wealth, it is easy to not seem classist. The girls who lie and steal, as though wealthy children are biologically incapable of stealing, are always either impoverished or foreigners, and they do so because they are acutely aware of their own class difference from the majority of the girls. Miss Theobald certainly says that one should not judge by money but that these girls get inevitably literally silenced in the course of the series is a class-based judgement.

I would disagree with Cedric Cullingford's observation that, "there is nothing obviously sociological in [popular] books: riches and poverty do not come into them. Money and designer clothes definitely do..."[209] Firstly, not all children's books are popular books, secondly, are money and designer clothes not symbols of wealth, which automatically make "riches and poverty" a part of the equation? Money, whenever it enters the picture, however implicitly, by its very presence brings in the have/have not binary into the framework. Even as description as seemingly innocuous as "shabby clothes" factors in the question of money, and by money, or lack thereof, class. The possession of a real Barbie doll, and not the fakes, is enough to establish the class difference with someone who does not possess one. One of the reasons the girls all found Pauline's claim to greater wealth than Angela absurd was

208 Ibid, Chapter 23

209 Cullingford, *Effects*, 17

because Pauline's clothes were simply not as nicely tailored as Angela. Even if neither girl had mentioned money at all, the very description of their persons would have set them apart from each other on the social/class spectrum.

Cullingford continues, "Not all can go to private schools, but the readers can enter into that world. Not all can afford the most expensive of clothes, but all readers are happy to imagine the possibility."[210] That is, till the readers see the representative's of their own class are routinely constructed as frauds and thieves and then no longer an interesting character in the story. Cullingford himself, seems to be speaking from a position of privilege, by assuming reader reaction. He makes children's books with class markers like these in them equivalent to the fairy tale or fantasy fiction: all readers are happy to imagine the possibility of getting an owl on their 11th birthday and attending Hogwarts. But even there, all it takes is for Draco Malfoy to tell Ron Weasley, "No need to ask who you are. My father told me all the Weasleys have red hair, freckles and more children than they can afford"[211], which becomes the famous and more effective "Red hair, and a hand-me-down robe? You must be a Weasley" in the movie, for the class distinctions to be firmly established.

Class difference, as a social construct like race and gender, is the result of feudal and capitalistic oppression, distinguishing between the lord and the serf, the capitalist and the worker, the rich and the not so rich – "the formation of a class is artificial and economic, and the economic agency or interest is impersonal because it is systematic and heterogeneous."[212] In a single image, it is the development of an expensive, luxury residential skyscraper, while surrounded by slums whose residents work night and day to make ends meet – it is a familiar sight in any Indian metropolis. Unlike race and gender differences however, class position

---

210 Ibid, 17

211 J.K. Rowling, *Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone*, Bloomsbury, 1997, 81

212 Spivak, "Subaltern", 70

can be changed, but only on an individual level – it very much remains the same in the broader sphere of things.

For both Huckleberry Finn and Tom Canty, there is a change, an upward movement in class position, but while one was "happy to imagine the possibility", the other was not.

> ...the juvenile pariah of the village, Huckleberry Finn, son of the town drunkard. Huckleberry was cordially hated and dreaded by all the mothers of the town, because he was idle, and lawless, and vulgar and bad— and because all their children admired him so, and delighted in his forbidden society, and wished they dared to be like him. Tom was like the rest of the respectable boys, in that he envied Huckleberry his gaudy outcast condition, and was under strict orders not to play with him. So he played with him every time he got a chance.[213]

Supposedly based on Twain's friend Tom Blankenship,[214][215]Huck's introduction into the stories establishes him as the outsider to primary social structure comprising individuals who have some financial power and belong to the social institutions of the church and school. Both Huck and Muff Potter, the town drunkard, belong to the outliers of civil society, not members of the structural institutions of religion and education, but subject to the same laws and as such, both of them are subject to some degree of censorship by those who form the respectable classes.

Naturally, this exoticizes them and makes them and makes their company irresistible for the boys of the town and even more so for Tom Sawyer who has a natural proclivity for flouting

---

213 Twain, *Tom Sawyer*, 46

214 Ibid, note 1, 224

215 Scarnhorst, *Interviews*, Interview 191. The residents of Hannibal debated over the actual inspiration for Huck Finn amongst themselves.

rules. It is not till Huck comes into money by finding Murrell's Treasure with Tom that he is brought into the folds of civil society. What could have stopped anyone in the village from adopting Huck before this otherwise? It could not have been that Huck had a parent living, so the adults of the community turned a blind eye to the abuse and abandonment the child endured; Pap was alive even after Huck became rich and Widow Douglas adopted him. Rather, they continued to censor Huck's company and ostracise a child for no fault of his own. It is because Tom tells Mr. Dobbins that he stopped to talk to Huckleberry Finn that he is punished and made to sit with the girls; Mr. Dobbins is so outraged by this that Tom has to repeat it twice before Mr. Dobbins can digest it. When Joe Harper and Tom look for a third member to join their band of pirates on Jackson's Island, they recruit Huck Finn, mainly because no adult authority will forbid him or tie him down. And there is a moment of pathos when Huck candidly says, "I don't want nothing better'n this. I don't ever get enough to eat, gen'ally— and here they can't come and pick at a feller and bullyrag him so."[216] In the 2011 German production, Huck gets especially angry with Tom's not leaving with him to Jackson's Island as they had planned because the spot by the river stank and he had to live on mice and rats.

In Chapter 29, after Huck overhears Injun Joe's plan for exacting revenge on Widow Douglas he runs to the nearest house, the Welchman's, where he is greeted with, ""Huckleberry Finn, indeed! It ain't a name to open many doors, I judge!"[217] Huck's reputation precedes him, but it is not a reputation he has earned, it one that has been forced on him because he does not go to school or church, instead swears and smokes and does precisely what he likes. But nowhere in the text is Huck ever said to have been deliberately malicious to anyone, and if he steals food, it is out of hunger. In the next chapter, Huck's saying, "I'm a kind of a hard lot,—

216 Twain, *Tom Sawyer*, 92

217 Ibid, 178

least everybody says so, and I don't see nothing agin it..."[218] only implies how deeply he has internalized this prevalent opinion of himself maintained by the adults in town.

In *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer* (1938), we hear of Huck before we see him.

> Mr Dobbins: I trust you have an excellent excuse?
>
> Tom (seeing empty seat next to Becky): I stopped to talk with Huck Finn!
>
> Mr. Dobbins: Huckleberry Finn! Does your aunt allow you to associate with such riff-raff?
>
> Tom: Well...I...
>
> Mr. Dobbins: Of course not! Go and sit with the girls.[219]

The audience cannot be certain if what Tom says is true, for we do not actually see the purported conversation, and Tom could very well be using Huck's reputation to deliberately get himself punished so he can sit next to Becky. It does successfully establish Huckleberry Finn's reputation for the audience however – Huck Finn is not an approved playmate for he is "white trash" who respectable children should not be associated with.

"White trash" is itself a derogatory word, and though neither Twain nor the adaptations use it, and neither does Harper Lee in describing the Ewells in *To Kill A Mockingbird*, it is heavily implied.

In the Reader's Digest version of 1973, there is no narration but one of Huck's first lines in the film, "I haven't been to school a day in my life" firmly places him as the outsider, the class Other. In this version however, this status does not span the entire film – after Huck and Tom return from Jackson's Island and Tom crashes his own funeral, Huck is adopted by

---

218 Ibid, 181

219 *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer*, prod. David O. Selznick, 1938, 19:00 – 19:30

Widow Douglas. He hates the starchy regulations he has suddenly been thrust into, but he stays with her nonetheless. The "lavish affection"[220] by Aunt Polly which makes him uncomfortable in the pre-text is transferred to Widow Douglas here.

It is unclear if the funeral held for Joe Harper and Tom also includes Huck, or if anyone missed him at all. In the 1938 adaptation, the sermon does include a few lines on Huck but no one welcomes him back and neither does Tom say, ""Aunt Polly, it ain't fair. Somebody's got to be glad to see Huck."[221] *Huckleberry Finn and His Friends* goes the similar route, but Huck's eulogy given by the town constable does recognize that he was hardened because of the life he led but he was not mean. In the 2014 production the line becomes "somebody's gotta be happy Huck's still around, other than me." In Episode 16 of the anime, Mr. Dobbins informs the class that there is to be a funeral for Tom and Ben Rogers, conveniently forgetting Huck till one of his students remind him that the funeral will be for Huck too, but the preacher remembers him in his sermon. But no remembers to welcome him back and neither does Tom himself. As for the German production, he is neither remembered in the sermon nor welcomed.

In Episode 24 of *Tom Sawyer no Bōken*, Tom addresses this treatment of Huck. As per the American dub:

> Aunt Polly: Oh, honestly Tom. What do you see in that Huckleberry Finn, anyway?
>
> Tom: Nothing special, he's just my friend.
>
> Aunt Polly: But he doesn't even go to school Tom!

220 Twain, *Tom Sawyer*, 116.

221 Ibid, 116

Tom: Well, shucks, I don't rightly see what reading and writing has to do with a good friend. Grown-ups just don't like Huck because he lives in a tree-house, but that don't make him a bad person, you know? After all, it ain't Huck's fault his no-good daddy ran off and left him.

Mary: That's right. Perhaps we should have more of spirit of Christian charity towards Huck don't you think?

Aunt Polly: I know, but I worry about Tom.

Mary: You don't have to. He's a good boy and so is Huck. Everyone in town is always making fun of poor Huck but I think it's very courageous to live on his own and fend for himself the way he does without any friends or family to take care of him.

Tom: ...and I learn a whole lot of real important stuff talking to Huck, like how to get by if I should end up being on my own one day.

...

Tom: I just get along with Huck and I think he should be allowed to have friends like everybody else. He ain't really a bad sort.[222]

This exchange succinctly encapsulates the highly hypocritical treatment meted out to Huck and I would not entirely agree with Tsuyoshi Ishihara's view that "there are no townspeople who despise Huck as an underclass homeless boy"[223], for even in Episode 49, Aunt Polly insists that "everybody knows that Huckleberry Finn is nothing but trouble", till she sees the treasure he and Tom have found.

---

222 *Tom Sawyer no Bōken*, English Dub, 1988, 05:05 – 06:07

223 Ishihara, *In Japan*, 104

Huck is not a literally silent character by any means because the focalising character in the novel is Tom, whose own actions and friendship with Huck ensure that he is frequently in the picture; or rather, it is Twain's own construction of the text given that Huck is a symbol of the censored, the forbidden that made up a part of boyhood nostalgia in his time and we occasionally get a glimpse of the harshness of Huck's life beyond the romance that the respectable boys view his lifestyle with. Nevertheless, within the scope of the structure of the society, Huck is silenced for the adults do not care to show him concern, compassion, or kindness, till he is has some wealth. The anime provides for Huck the most sustained periods of un-silencing without it becoming re-silencing, for Tom defends Huck as a child defending a fellow child. For the millions of children who watched the American dub, it might read as a moment of empowerment. The original was one of the few which were translated and distributed internationally, so there will be elements meant to pander to the foreign audience and thus, cannot be read as inclusion of elements of Japanese culture; the anime was for family viewing, part of the dinnertime slot, touted as family entertainment[224] therefore children would in all likelihood watch this anime based on an American classic with their parents. That the anime is kept as American – or what they understand as American – as possible is implicit in the lack of honorifics. Certainly addresses like *Okaa-san* (Mother), *Obaa-san* (Aunt) and *Sensei* (Teacher) are used to address the adults but the ones children use among each other are not. Hence, Becky simply calls Tom "Tommu" instead of "Tommu-kun", and what the children are given is an American story to familiarise themselves with the culture, and not something they can entirely relate to.

Even when Huck gets control of his own narrative in *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*, his autonomy is first usurped by King and Duke, and then Tom Sawyer, the difference being that though he is rendered silent within the events of the text, he is in constant communication

224 Ibid, 104

with the reader. Huck's silence within-the-text is therefore false, because he constantly undermines and judges the duo.

The one character who is actually silenced is Muff Potter – he is manipulated by Injun Joe into believing that he killed Doc Robinson and due to the gaps in his memory, he is even unable to defend himself, especially after Injun Joe testifies against him after he is arrested. The public, which does not hesitate to declare he will be hanged and lynched, even before the trial, are fickle: once he is cleared of all charges, their attitude turns completely.[225] The adaptations all approach Muff differently. The 2014 adaptation treats him similarly to the way the1993 Disney adaptation treats Jim at the end – they are both nearly hanged without trial by a crazed mob, till they are rescued by Widow Douglas in Muff's case and Mary Jane Wilks in Jim's. If Muff is Sirius Black here – thrown into Azkaban and sentenced to be Kissed without trial – Jim is the house-elf Winky – not allowed to defend herself after the fiasco at the Quidditch World Cup and unceremoniously dismissed from her job after a false accusation. That Muff's lawyer remains silent in his defence till Tom's testimony leaves Muff doubly silenced. In the text, the 2014 adaptation and the anime however, the lawyer used silence as a strategy since they were aware of Tom's confession; but the other adaptations depict Tom interrupting the judgement – the lawyers were not actually going to speak in Muff's defense.

The 1973 adaptation sketches Muff's character out more fully; he is even given a song of his own which he duets with Tom – "A Man's Gotta Be" – which not only establishes him as a friendly person around town, jobless and drunk though he may be, but also works to align the viewer's sympathy with him, especially since immediately after this is the graveyard scene and the murder.

225 Twain, *Tom Sawyer*, 149

Eventually however, as it s with the portrayal of Huck, it is the children – or just Tom – who defends them, calls out society on its hypocrisies, looks beyond class division and displays a sense of humanity the grown-ups seem to lack.

Unlike Huck, who does not wish to be "civilized" and chafes under the rules and regulations for his new class position and station in life, comparing it to a prison in Episode 49 of *Tom Sawyer no Bōken,* and triggering the entire plot of *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*, Tom Canty in *The Prince and The Pauper*, is "happy to imagine the possibility" of upward class mobility. Born in the slums of Tudor London, he learns Latin from dispossessed priest Father Andrew – itself a marker of the learned, wealthy classes – and dreams of meeting a real prince. He tries his utmost to stay clean, to read and learn, till, in a reversal of roles, the adults begin to approach Tom for advice and he organises his own mock court. His reading gives him a station without-his-class while within-his-class and it is this which helps him acclimate to life at court so speedily.

While at the beginning he finds the Court to be like a prison, as Huck does Widow Douglas' house and civil society, unlike Huck, Tom slowly acclimates himself to it, even gaining some confidence. His fear, after all, stems from the worry that he has committed treason by posturing as The Prince of Wales and later the King, for this swapping of class is the most extreme possible – with the ruler and the subaltern exchanging places, for Tom is the ultimate subaltern; not only is he poor, he is a beggar boy, with no financial, political, and legal power and a child. By this switching of class position, the un-silencing of the subaltern works in two ways therefore: Tom-as-Edward judiciously speaks for the subaltern without upsetting the prevailing structures, and Edward-as-Tom becomes one of the subaltern to learn of their condition.

The primary differences that lead to the conflict in the novel, is the difference of attitude with which Edward and Tom approach their new situations. Both of them initially insist on their actual identities but once Tom-as-Edward is assumed to be mad, he realises all protestations will be futile, unlike Edward, who continues to insist on his identity till the end, even when everyone thinks him mad. The incorrect diagnosis of madness continuously threatens to silence Edward, but he battles it at every moment by clinging to the truth of his identity and asserting it whenever he can – to Tom's parents, to Miles Hendon, at the palace gates, at Guildhall, to the gypsies. In that regard, one could almost say that Sirius Black was like Edward Tudor as created by Mark Twain, for he kept his sanity for twelve years in Azkaban by clinging to the truth that he did not assist Voldemort in murdering the Potters. Edward refuses to be silenced and along the way he unlearns the disconnected snobbery of his class and learns of the hardships and lives of the multitude, his subjects. If the walls of the ivory tower is the physical border between classes, Edward and Tom both break it to splinters when they exchange clothes.

> A few minutes later the little Prince of Wales was garlanded with Tom's fluttering odds and ends, and the little Prince of Pauperdom was tricked out in the gaudy plumage of royalty. The two went and stood side by side before a great mirror, and lo, a miracle: there did not seem to have been any change made![226]

This moment can be read as either a moment of absolute class equality or of perfect classnessness, for there are no longer any distinguishing markers between the two. This moment is only reinforced by the scene in Chapter 19 when Edward the Sixth, wearing rags sits down to a meal with peasants who think him a tramp. There is an unconscious and inadvertent forgoing of class position on both sides and humbles the King.

---

226 Mark Twain, *The Prince and the Pauper*, ed. Jerry Griswold, (Penguin Books: 1997), 18

> The boy made a hearty and satisfying meal, and was greatly refreshed and gladdened by it. It was a meal which was distinguished by this curious feature, that rank was waived on both sides; yet neither recipient of the favour was aware that it had been extended. The goodwife had intended to feed this young tramp with broken victuals in a corner, like any other tramp or like a dog; but she was so remorseful for the scolding she had given him, that she did what she could to atone for it by allowing him to sit at the family table and eat with his betters, on ostensible terms of equality with them; and the King, on his side, was so remorseful for having broken his trust, after the family had been so kind to him, that he forced himself to atone for it by humbling himself to the family level, instead of requiring the woman and her children to stand and wait upon him, while he occupied their table in the solitary state due to his birth and dignity.[227]

When Tom and Edward exchange clothes, the moment of absolute class equality or classlessness is utopian, for while within the royal chambers they are safely ensconced in a protective bubble; they are wearing each other's class markers – Tom in Edward's princely robes, and Edward in Tom's rags. The minute the bubble breaks and they separate from each other to absorb themselves in each other's worlds out of curiosity, the absolute equality will be dissolved. Switching class allows for a greater understanding of class differences and politics, for what is commonplace to Tom will be a new experience for Edward, allowing that to be examined in detail when Edward is the focalising character in the narrative, and likewise.

Twain uses the phrase "gaudy plumage" to describe Edward's clothes, hinting at Edward's vanity which is evident every time he says, "I am the Prince of Wales" to a jeering and

227 Ibid, 111

disbelieving crowd. It is his naiveté and ignorance which prompts him to do so, but he had suggested the exchange of clothes so he could experience Tom's life for little while. Did he really think saying he is The Prince of Wales at every minute and asking everyone to defer to him as he has been used to so far, would allow him to experience the other life? Moreover, did Tom's clothes not serve as a hint to the kind of life he has? Edward's best defence for this is his age – he is after all 9 – but his maturity is belied when he faces other trials, like being sent to prison. He does have Miles Hendon to nudge him in the right direction but he approaches the situations sensibly and logically and even in his vanity there is humility, marking his developing maturity – "'"Thou art right; say no more; thou shalt see that whatsoever the King of England requires a subject to suffer, under the law, he will himself suffer while he holdeth the station of a subject."[228]

How, therefore, does he think that his disguise will be effective and allow him to play in the mud without imposed rules, if he keeps proclaiming his identity? Even after he notes the remarkable similarity of countenance he shares with Tom Canty, how do both of them not realize that immediately they would be mistaken for the other, especially if they are wearing each other's clothes?

Tom does not consider these questions either, but then, he had not asked to experience the life of a prince; he had just wanted to wear Edward's garments for a short while. And unlike Edward, who is ignorant of the punishments his subjects face for treason, for begging, for religious difference, Tom knows full well what would happen if he was truly uncovered as an imposter, so firstly he confesses to the King that he is Tom Canty not Edward, Prince of Wales, hoping that his honesty would grant him some reprieve, and when he realizes that he is not believed by anyone, but rather declared mad, he does his best to adjust to his new situation, and unlike Edward, who does not have a book on living like a pauper, Tom finds a

228 Ibid, 123

book on courtly etiquette to help him along. If Hollywood fetishises poverty in the designated Third World, the reverse happens here – the lifestyle of kings and princes is glamorized and romanticised for the general public, without any reverse flow. Kings, Princes and nobles, as depicted here, remain wholly ignorant of the reality of the lives of the common people, who are presented with stories of the greatness and wealth of kings, appealing to a very basic human instinct to aspire for a better life. By glorifying the greatness and sanctity of kings, the hierarchy aims to enforce a respect for the monarchical institution and by doing so exert a silence by power and control, especially over the oppressed lower classes. This potentially quells any scope of rebellion and ensures continuation of existing forms of governance, as it has for over a millennium in Japan, where the Emperor was viewed as the divine descendent of the sun-goddess Amaterasu, till Emperor Showa was forced to appear in public after Japan's surrender in the Second World War.

This silence by power and control is also exerted by the fostering of fear by punishment. With crimes like stealing food can be punishable by hanging; begging due to extenuating circumstances punishable by prison and eventually the brand of a slave, instead of working to alleviate their problems that have led them to beg; religious difference punishable by burning at the stake; all in the name of the king, his subjects are controlled by fear of punishment. Coupled with the loyalty to the Crown which is a result of the glorification of the King's magnificence, it produces a paradox within the people – while the King is both respected and feared, the system he is head of is hated. As the ruffle from the band of gypsies, who have all suffered under from oppressive laws, tell Edward:

> "BE King, if it please thy mad humour, but be not harmful in it. Sink the title thou hast uttered—' tis treason; we be bad men in some few trifling

ways, but none among us is so base as to be traitor to his King; we be loving and loyal hearts, in that regard. Note if I speak truth."[229]

This puts Edward in a greater quandary than it does Tom. Edward knows he is King, but because he is dressed as a pauper he could get hanged for masquerading as himself. The irony is lost on the gypsies because the visual has silenced the actual truth. So could Tom, for being a pretender, but as has already been mentioned, Tom is more wordly-wise than Edward and slowly learns to perform as Prince and then King.

With Tom Canty's successful performance as Edward, Twain tries to establish something similar to what he does with Huck's cross-dressing – that class position can be learnt, mimicked and performed, especially etiquette, thereby exposing the superficiality of the dominant classes who dominate the lesser privileged. With Tom, Twain also explores the issue of the responsible use of privilege. While at the beginning, Tom is literally silenced by Henry VIII's proclamation that no one is to talk to about the Prince's madness - which silences the expression of everyone else's judgements in turn – he gradually finds his voice and begins exercising the privilege his present position affords him, even becoming comfortable with the intense scrutiny that accompanies his (fake) status.

After he is mistakenly confined to the position of Prince of Wales, in Chapter 6, "Tom receives instructions" from the Earl of Hertford, Edward's uncle, regarding his behaviour now that he has been struck by this malady, so as to not arouse suspicion that the heir to the throne is not in his right mind, especially when the King is terminally ill. This puts Hertford in a position of power over Tom-as-Edward, not just because Tom-as-Edward is a child, but because he is also "mad". This power is only reinforced when Hertford becomes Lord Protector of the new Edward the Sixth, and Tom gets doubly silenced – on account of his age, and on account of his "madness" – and though the adults and the court defer to him, their

229 Ibid, 99

expectations and scrutiny silence him even further by the controlling of his actions and movements by wielding the power of collective, adult maturity, which could potentially make the boy-King's position unstable and tenuous.

> Tom made a good dinner, notwithstanding he was conscious that hundreds of eyes followed each morsel to his mouth and watched him eat it with an interest which could not have been more intense if it had been a deadly explosive and was expected to blow him up and scatter him all about the place. He was careful not to hurry, and equally careful not to do anything whatever for himself, but wait till the proper official knelt down and did it for him. He got through without a mistake— flawless and precious triumph.[230]

If this is a example of a successful performance of royal etiquette, and a construction built on the training he has had since he became "prince", the events of that very morning, which are juxtaposed with this State Dinner, is an example of the responsible use of privilege, when Tom-as-Edward uses his own humane, common sense to pardon condemned bodies, by firstly listening to their side of the story in the case of the man who was sentenced to death by being boiled alive and overturning the inhumane law, and secondly by using simple scientific, and commonsensical logic to save the lives of a mother and a child while dispelling a superstition. This raises the question of how representative Tom is of his own class, for would anyone else from his original situation act the same way if they suddenly found themselves in the position of ultimate power in the realm? Or would they rather exhibit the other side of Tom's behaviour for at the same time, Tom-as-Edward also gets acclimated to the excesses his assumed class position provides and adds to those. These are excesses that Twain satirizes when he describes Tom-as-Edward's toilette in the morning in Chapter 14, when Tom is yet to

230 Ibid, 91

feel comfortable in his new situation and feels like "a captive" and a king[231]. In the same chapter, he meets Edward's whipping boy, a concept he finds both horrifying and ridiculous, but the whipping boy is in a way, the double of the Prince's/King's body which is sacred and cannot be touched. The body of the whipping boy is the substitute for the body of the King which has been constituted by the divine power of kingship, and Tom, beaten by his father and grandmother all his life, employs his services if only to provide him with an income.

The body of the real King, Edward the Sixth does not fare so kindly, for not only does he get beaten by John Canty and Grandmother Canty, but also by the palace guards at the gate, and the boys at Christ's Church.

> Then followed such a thing as England had never seen before— the sacred person of the heir to the throne rudely buffeted by plebeian hands, and set upon and torn by dogs.[232]

This traumatic experience for Edward-as-Tom is laterally mirrored later when Miles Hendon takes Edward's whipping for him, also doubling as his whipping boy, not out of respect for his King as Edward assumes but out of sheer affection for the boy. Both times, however, Edward displays the other aspect of privilege as implied by Twain. In the first instance, he resolves to ensure that the inhabitants of Christ's Church are also educated along with fed and clothed and in the case of Miles Hendon, Edward raises him to Earl, banishes his treacherous brother, and returns to Sir Miles his title, estate, and betrothed. Edward's experience among the gypasies and the tramps, and in prison in Kent with Miles Hendon, seeing the burning at the stake of two women who were Baptists, teach him enough about his people that he uses the privilege of this experience to continue what Tom-as-Edward had begun – the overturning of cruel and inhumane laws and the institution of religious tolerance.

---

231 Ibid, 71

232 Ibid, 21

Twain un-silences the oppressed, poverty ridden classes in two ways – firstly, by placing Edward at the heart of the space they occupy, and secondly, by placing one of their own at the heart of the nobility who are depicted satirically. Even Miles Hendon, who indulges Edward, protects him and guides him, does not have a very kind introduction.

> Rest thy small jaw, my child; I talk the language of these base kennel-rats like to a very native."[233]

are some of his first words. Firstly, this is an impoverished nobleman speaking as if he is in a foreign country and not his own, and what right has he to refer to the people of any country as "base kennel rats'? It expresses his arrogance and contempt for the very people he lives among. Secondly, the psychological gap in perceived class difference is gapingly visible here. The gap, in its very magnitude, has taken tangible form. However, what we read as a critical introduction of a character, might not have actually been so, given Twain's own situation as a Southern American who despised Native Americans.

This is a difference that is not greatly explored in the adaptations, except perhaps in *I Am The King* (2012), the South Korean adaptation of the novel. In *Raja aur Runk* (1968), the Hindi adaptation, class difference is explored near the beginning, before it is forgotten. When the pauper Raja is born, his father says, "ah gaya bhukhe ke ghar me aur bhukha", and when Raja and Yuvraj Narendradev meet, Raja paints a very poetic and romantic picture of his life for the yuvraj, fooling him to thinking Raja's life is utopian. However, apart from this, the class difference is not explored. Miles Hendon, who becomes Subir/Vijay here, certainly protects Narendradev-as-Raja from whipping and humours his claims of being the yuvraj – though like Sir Miles, he does not believe it – but he does it less out concern for the prince himself, than out of love for Sujata, who is Raja's older sister, since he thinks he is protecting Raja. Subir/Vijay is constructed as a character who is an amalgamation of Twain's Miles Hendon,

233 Ibid, 55

with his robbed identity and story of betrayal, and Errol Flynn's Miles Hendon from *The Prince and the Pauper* (1937), who has no story of his own, but is suave, charming and dashing. As such, Subir/Vijay has something of a forced cheerfulness about him, though the movie anyway constructs him with comic undertones and gives him a friend whose only purpose is to add to the comedy.

As for Raja and Narendradev, their trajectories of development, as explored by Twain in the pre-text, is eliminated completely. Raja becomes victim of Senapati Vikram's plot to rule the kingdom by installing Raja as the puppet king, and Nraendradev vacillates between his need to reclaim his identity and bask in newfound maternal love. In between getting caught and imprisoned by Raja's father, and getting imprisoned for "impersonating as the Prince" and then getting rescued from there by Raja's father and taken to a bandit hideout, Narendradev falls ill and finds that Raja's mother Shanta had undergone a punishing ritual to return him to his sanity, for she believed him to be her son who had gone mad. This enormous endeavour on Shanta's part endears her to Narendradev who starts to call her Ma (Song: Tu Kitni Achhi Hai) and seems to have lost sight of his goal. However soon enough, Raja goes by in procession and while Narendradev remembers his goal to reclaim his identity, Raja, who never reaches Tom Canty's level of ease with his situation, spots his mother Shanta in the crowd and tries calling out to her, which reverses not just the moment in the book when Tom's mother touches his hand in the coronation procession, recognizing him as her son and he cruelly rejects her, but also eliminates all the embarrassment Tom begins to experience on account of his mother and sisters and fear that someday they may come looking for him.

After a dramatic climatic scene where the captain of the guards drags Narendradev away – after he and Raja reunited after their ordeal – and nearly kills him in the forest, only for him to be saved by Sudhir/Vijay and Raja's father, Narendredev returns to stop the coronoation in time only to say that he wants to stay a pauper with his mother – Shanta, who is actually

Raja's mother –and Raja can be king. It is this which is most puzzling about the production, for it reduces Narendradev journey, the Prince's experience of the subaltern Other in the pre-text, into a search for a mother, and shrinks the class question into a few token moments. By making the Raja who held mock courts as king in the slum a pawn in the realization of the Senapati's ambitions, this adaptation seems to posit that actual class mobility is not a possibility – the nobility will always stay noble in any situation and the pauper will always be a pauper, however finely he is garbed.

The 1937 Warner Brothers production eliminates Tom Canty's mother completely and its primary focus is the villainy of the Earl of Herford, who orchestrates killing his nephew, the real Prince and wielding the power of the Crown through the puppet king Tom. In this adaptation however, Tom does his utmost to resist Hertford's puppeteering, for example, when he logically explains why he should not sign a decree increasing tax on windows, but he fails for Hertford threatens to expose him as a fraud and get him condemned for treason. This becomes a trope throughout the adaptations: the treacherous nobleman/minister/general who wishes to use Tom Canty or the translated equivalent as a puppet as they rule the kingdom, seen in *Raja aur Runk*, *I Am The King*, subsequent faithful adaptations of *The Prince and The Pauper*, and even *Barbie as The Princess and The Pauper*. The pre-text, which children can identify with, either by relating to Tom Canty's dreams, or by sympathising with Edward's troubles, becomes far more simplistic and with the introduction of tropes like this, and takes it from a text with a didactic purpose to one with just entertainment value.

Even though Miles Hendon is reduced to just a protector in this production and at no point does Errol Flynn seem to be anyone other than Errol Flynn, Edward-as-Tom does get beaten by the guards, and kidnapped by John Canty and taken to the gypsies, though the entire execution of the scene makes it seem like it was meant to scare the child audience rather than educate Edward about his subjects. The capture by the Captain of the Guards and the near

regicide in the forest, which is stopped by Miles Hendon, is near faithfully recreated in both *Raja aur Runk* and *I Am The King*. The issue of Tom-as-Edward's madness is silenced out completely after the first declaration by the King, almost as though the adaptations themselves were following the King's Proclamation to not discuss or even mention the Prince is mad. *The Prince and the Pauper* (1937) has a greater influence on the subsequent adaptations than the pre-text itself. Tom, as the voice of the subaltern, is completely re-silenced in these productions, with the focus on Edward's development, even in the 1990 Disney featurette featuring Mickey Mouse as the titular characters. Even in the span of 25 minutes, it endeavours to show the Prince striving to help his starving subjects but Mickey is silenced by the Captain, Pete, who threatens him with Pluto's life.

Whereas in the pre-text, Tom-as-Edward is initially silenced by the power and control exercised by the collective Court, in the adaptations, he is silenced by the greed of one individual, and doubly silenced because that individual is legally placed in a position of authority as Lord Protector of the boy-king. The gradual erasure of the arrogance Edward displays at the beginning of the novel, where he excepts to be treated as befitting his original class status and position – manifest in his insistence that no one can sit in front of the King – till he does not chastise the peasant woman and her children to eat with him, is relatively maintained in most of the adaptations, though most of the episodes from Edward's tramp lifestyle is not rendered on screen. Thus, in most of the adaptations, the focus shifts from the critique of class difference that Twain offers to the growth and humbling of a young king and the fulfilment of childhood fantasies of becoming royalty.

The Prince and the Pauper (2000), a Hallmark production and *I Am the King* (2012), the South Korean version, which sets the plot in the Joseon dynasty, in the months before the coronation of Sejong the Great, are two adaptations which transfer on-screen and translate not only the situations as crafted by Twain as faithfully as possible, but also the social critique he

underlines the text with. Tom Canty of the former and Deok Chil of the latter are the closest to Twain's Tom Canty.

Even with a scheming Lord Hertford, Tom Canty, in the Hallmark production resists the control which attempts to literally silence him, assumes authority and speaks for the people. In one powerful moment near the end of the film, when Hertford insists that he sign a bill imposing more taxes on the people, Tom-as-Edward defies him openly and publicly in front of his council.

> Tom-as-Edward: No. No, I won't sign this.
>
> Official: But, er...Your Majesty...
>
> Tom-as-Edward: More taxes? The people have nothing left to tax.
>
> Hertford (to the council): Leave us.
>
> Tom-as-Edward: No. Remain.
>
> Hertford: Your Majesty, these taxes are necessary. It has been agreed.
>
> Tom-as-Edward: Not with me. What are they for?
>
> Offcial: Er...they are for the...for the...er...the Royal Court...for the...er...
>
> Tom-as-Edward: The new desks when the old ones will do?
>
> Hertford: As your Lord Protector, I insist.
>
> Tom-as-Edward: No. As your King, *I* must insist. I want this spending explained. Every penny.[234]

234 *The Prince and The Pauper*, dir. Giles Foster, Hallmark, 2000, 1:10:50 -1:11:27.

Later, in private, Hertford threatens him with the lives of his mother and sisters and he is coerced into signing the bill. In public, however, Tom's display establishes Edward as a King who speaks for his people.

Likewise, short of running in with the tramps, Edward here experiences all that Twain's Edward does and like his source, develops a horror at the laws exercised in his name but cruelly oppress the common people while he is helpless at the moment. When he gets accused of stealing a pig and gets put on trial, he gives his name as Edward Tudor, insisting on his identity, but Miles Hendon tries to save him by calling Edward his own son and saying that Edward is mad and thus should be pardoned. Madness here becomes a shield against severe punishment and creates a false silence around Edward-as-Tom, which he breaks completely by writing a letter declaring his identity in French, Latin and Greek, at last convincing Miles Hendon that he is who he said he was.

This Edward does not bear Tom any ill-will either. After the exchange of clothes, before Edward had left the castle, he told Tom, "You are Prince until I return" and Tom had maintained that faithfully. Both of them knew exactly what they were getting into when they exchanged clothes, which why Edward does not let his disguise slip till he finds the palace doors shut and he is forced to seek out the Cantys. Till then, Edward keeps his vanity and arrogance in check, which is not only unlike the Edwards in the other adaptations but also the one in the pre-text. Tom, for his part, plays the role of Prince well, till he realizes that Edward is not going to return, which is when he starts exposing his actual identity.

More so than any other adaptation of the text, this production depicts the sense and maturity of the titular children and the importance of maintaining one's truth, of rising to the occasion and making the best out of an unwanted situation.

In *I Am the King*, it is adults, not children, who are put on a journey to personal growth and the prince and the pauper in this film are wildly different from Edward Tudor and Tom Canty, though faithful to the history of the Joseon dynasty. Prince Chung-nyeong, who becomes Crown Prince overnight after his eldest brother Prince Yangnyeong is removed as Crown Prince and his second brother becomes a monk, was historically very bookish. What the film does is explore and question what started this notoriously bookish Prince, who did not want to be King, on the path to becoming Sejong the Great, one of Korea's greatest rulers. The rest is secondary to this. Both Crown Prince Chung-nyeong and the slave Deok Chil, who is installed as the Crown Prince in the real one's absence runs away, though for different reasons – the former because he wants to escape being King, and the latter to escape blackmail by the Prime Minister and build a life away from this oppression with his lover, who had been captured into servitude for the Royal family and had been nearly raped by the Ambassador from the Ming Empire. Their form for resistance is running away, and then when the two meet for the first time – for the first exchange had happened while Deok Chil was drunk and unconscious – they re-assume their original identities and defeat the Prime Minister together. Deok Chil, unlike Twain's Tom Canty, however, does not speak for his class, despite the conditions slaves have to live in and the torture they face. He is motivated by his love for Soo-yeon, his beloved who he finds and sees by using his newfound power. As a private slave, Deok Chil had a comparatively better life, and it is the Crown Prince who actually experiences the life of a public slave, which slowly transforms him from a whiny, lazy, pampered boy to a mature, sensitive, confident man who would be King. As can be understood, this is an adaptation aimed at an adult audience; even its humour.

Class is the one social construct where borders can be crossed, where mobility can be upward and downward, and as such, silence becomes an abstraction in flux when applied here.

Eventually, what each of these texts, through their depiction of class politics, by silencing and un-silencing, do is encourage children to aspire to better possibilities and to continue their dreams, at the same time fostering empathy. This is not including race and gender politics where Twain continues to grapple with his dilemma; class difference, for him, is far clearer and negotiable.

Conclusion

Mark Twain had wanted to publish *The Prince and The Pauper* anonymously.[235] He had not wanted the reader to delve into the book thinking that it would be similar to his other works; for even though his satirical humour does find expression occasionally in the book, stylistically it is a wholly different book. Mark Twain had therefore chosen to silence his own identity and he would have successfully done so, if he had not been convinced otherwise by his family, or his readers would have been robbed of knowing his range as a writer and social commentator. He would have doubly silenced himself – firstly, by displacement of his identity from Samuel Clemens to Mark Twain, and secondly, by imposing a literal silence on himself.

Multiple forms of silence, as established in Chapter 1, can work simultaneously on the same subject, hence. As that aspect of the greater abstraction of silence, which can be applied to social issues, silences are ever present by virtue of being absent in the written word, or rather the presence of the written word, by its very existence, establishes the existence of a silence. The repeated use of a single, derogatory, racist word which appears as frequently as character names in *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* can carry within it the potential for multiple forms of silencing. It can cause hierarchical silencing, silencing by stereotype, enforced silencing by speaking, re-silencing a person over and over again till their individual identity is erased. That the usage of word "nigger" causes such controversy is not surprising. While in many ways, it certainly does seem like censoring the word and banning the book is more for the sensibility of the adult than the child reader, as mentioned earlier in the Introduction, not every reader would react to the word in the same way. Discussing the uncensored book with the child reader might help the child reader familiarise themselves with the history and uncensored truth of slavery, but that would be the child reader who has been removed of all

235 Scarnhorst, *Interviews*, Interview 90, 225.

cultural, racial, gender, class markers. The racialized child, who would find in the character of Jim the history of their ancestors, might react differently to the repeated use of the n-word. Does one avoid all texts which mention historically degrading terms then? In a film adaptation, there are other visual cues which can substitute for the use of the word, but within a written text, the words become the most successful tool in exposing the truth of the system. In doing so, it also locates and reveals the silence the word imposes.

Do all women then stop reading or watching texts and visual media which make misogynistic remarks? If it is in a contemporary setting, or still in production, it should be protested, but for a historical drama, or historical fiction, or a text written 150 years ago, ought they be read as outside of their time? Twain wrote in the 1870s – 1880s, a time soon after the Civil War, when the South found ways of instituting neo-slavery without calling it slavery, and he set his stories 30 to 40 years before that, to a pre-Civil War era. Is appreciating the nostalgia of the antebellum South as remembered by Twain, but condemning his very frank portrayal of the inhumane realities of the time, not a way of selective silencing?

In March 2019, two lawmakers in New Jersey moved to ban *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* from the school syllabi, on account of its usage of the "n-word".[236] According to them, the book would make the African-American students uncomfortable, "marginalized, humiliated" as it had made them uncomfortable as African-Americans themselves, as a "racist" book, and there are other books which can teach about racism and slavery. What this issue reads as is a selective silencing again, because the lawmakers essentially seem to be proposing for the teaching of a glossed account of racism. The book is disturbing, but that is the point of the book and the capacity for silence that it holds.

---

236 Anapol Avery, "New Jersey lawmakers propose resolution asking schools not to teach 'Huckleberry Finn', in *The Hill*, 23rd March 2019.

Censorship does not confront the problem or solve it; censorship is how one hides in the sand. Silencing does not erase difference or eliminate discomfort; racial, gender and class silencing only leads to the clash between a festering dominant power and the revolutionary other.

Hence, with the issue of Tom-as-Edward's "madness" censored by the King, all members of the Court conceal their opinions and adopt a literal silence regarding that, which is carried further by the ceremonial show of deference to him by kissing his hand, afforded to him by the virtue of the position he occupies. In Chapter 7, when Tom-as-Edward has his first meal after the King's proclamation, the repeated emphasis on the literal silence of the servants and courtiers when Tom continuously makes mistakes in deportment and etiquette, their silence begins to speak volumes and Tom-as-Edward is himself painfully aware of that. In their silence, the magnitude of the scrutiny the Prince is under almost makes the Prince similar to a circus animal. The measure of scrutiny is accentuated by Tom's unfamiliarity with a position like this; Edward would not have felt like a fly under a microscope since he has been used to this all his life. What becomes apparent by placing the pauper Tom Canty in this situation is that through their literal silence the courtiers and servants both impose a silence by power and control. Through this intense scrutiny, they control Tom-as-Edward's actions and make his assumption of the mantle of royalty even more of a performance. The positions of Prince of Wales, and later the King, commands such deference but it is Tom-as-Edward's position as a child which complicates this extended moment of silence. The courtiers and palace staff are literally silenced by their King's command, but in their scrutiny, his literal silence is converted to a false silence, for in their silence is expressed their judgement reading Tom-as-Edward's blunders, and through that scrutiny they exert and enforce upon Tom-as-Edward a silence by through the power and control that their human ability to form judgements affords them, which is added to by the quiet shows of obedience and obeisance, the seemingly unnatural silence of their actions adding another level of silencing over already silenced Tom-as-

Edward.. And yet even as Tom-as-Edward and Edward exercise power in this realm, and their hands are kissed by their grovelling courtiers, there is a mixture of the imposition of silence practiced and enforced by action and speaking, as the courtiers openly defer to the boy-king, and the silence created by exercise of power and control, for the Boy-king, must also perform successfully in front of the courtiers, along with the literal silence of the Court in which resides these forms that silence can take, as emphasised in the state dinner.. The power of the realm rests with a child and the adults most bow to it, but adults will also use this opportunity to subvert this power by exercising their own power of judgement and thereby controlling the Child's performance, the pressure to perform in front of audience and maintain his authority becoming almost tangible in its weight. Multiple forms of silence coalesce here then, only displaying the interconnectedness, and mutable nature of silence.

In Tom and the restored King Edward's perspective, the power afforded them is the opportunity of doing the right things by the people, which un-silences the oppressed subaltern of the realm to an extent, because both of them have had the felt experience of being a part of that class. Therefore, Tom-as-Edward uses his logic and power to listen to and understand both sides of the stories and save condemned people from their grisly faith and rule wisely in Edward's name. In a way, the child is the regent for the child , but he must balance the unstable equation between the un-silencing and power his position provides him and the silence imposed on him, firstly by his madness, for it masks his truth, and then by the silence imposed on him by the literal and false silence that speaks in the actions of the court and the power of scrutiny that they wield over him. In a way, it works as a check on the King's power, but since the King here is a child, he is expected to fail that much more and the pressure on Tom-as-Edward keeps increasing, even as he finds himself getting acclimated to it.

In *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* too, the child is the one invested with power, but Huck and Jim's race positions in the racialized South does not render the silence so complicated and intertwined as it does in *The Prince and The Pauper*.

Silence here, cannot be called a hybrid however, because all these forms of silence arise out of the abstract, all-encompassing , intangible mass of silence which lurks as the darkness lurks. The texts, however, can be read as hybrids, for the adaptations leave as much as, if not a greater impression in popular memory. Thus the trope of the wicked Earl of Hertford, who would use the boy-king for his own greed has become a permanent enough fixture in the adaptations that the actual construction of Hertford's character as done by Twain is superseded by this. It develops subtly enough, as a magnification of the control Hertford has over the newly "mad" Prince of Wales, till it mutates into a greed for power in the adaptations. The final text therefore, with Twain's novel as the original text, is thus a hybrid text, inserting into, and sustaining within the original text, a definitive view of the Earl of Hertford, whose own actual conduct in history after the demise of Henry VIII, is yet a matter of debate and a point Twain dances on, for even as he shows Hertford, controlling and directing Edward, as Prince and then King, he also talks about the good heart of the newly raised Duke of Somerset.

Likewise in *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer* is the much-used and accepted trope of showing Injun Joe falling to his death, which has already been discussed in Chapter 2, where the issue of the use of silence is examined with regards to the race question. In Chapter 2, Twain's clearly fixed racist opinion of Native Americans is studied alongside his moral conflicts regarding slavery and the treatment of African-Americans though that does not mean that holds African-Americans to be racially equal to white people. The chapter tried to see this in the light of the effect the novel has on the child reader, who are uniformly white – if any African-African child had read *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* or *The Adventures of Tom*

Sawyer during Twain's lifetime, they certainly never wrote to Twain about it, for all the letters from his readers extant, and as collected by R. Kent Rasmussen in *Dear Mark Twain*, identify the children who wrote him as white. Seen in the light of reports that *Huck Finn* makes African-American children uncomfortable (as discussed previously), which speaks volumes regarding Twain's anti-racism, this is not surprising. Rasmussen identifies just one letter as possibly written by an African-American writer but he cannot be certain for the letter has no definitive identifying markers[237].

In Chapter 3 was studied Twain's exploration of gender binaries and the increasingly feminist readings of the women characters that each subsequent adaptation of the novels pursues, especially in light of their own cultural understanding of feminism and the fallacy of gender divisions.

In Chapter 4, I examined the portrayal of class and class politics, not just in the novels, but also in the adaptations, specifically those of *The Prince and The Pauper*, where explorations of class difference are mostly forgone in favour of a very clear good vs. evil conflict and heightened dramatic tension, which would entertainment more than educate the child reader.

The concepts of silence, as employed in each these chapters, is outlined and defined in Chapter 1, which tried to establish the many forms silence can mutate into, into definitive terms for the purpose of application within this thesis. The list and discussion is by no means complete or exhaustive, as silence, by virtue of being a vague abstraction appeals to individual understanding of it as a phenomenon to garner definition.

This thesis is primarily limited by its non-inclusion of the opinions of children's themselves with respect to the texts it examines. As such, there is scope for further study and practical

237 Rasmussen, *Dear Mark Twain*, Letter 121.

application by interacting with child readers and viewers of the novels and the adaptations. Along with this, it is limited by its lack of access to the physical archives, for the partially digitized archives have also been mediated upon by the editors. Therefore, the texts have not been studied the original manuscripts and gaps that developed during the writing process are unstudied.

By studying varied adaptations of Twain's children's fiction, this thesis, has hoped to add to Twain studies and make a start at filling the gap which exists with regards to the adaptations within Twain studies, for it is the adaptations which keep Twain's fiction alive and in public memory. But more than that, it has tried to be useful in the development of silence theory, beyond the specialized studies which only look at select aspects of silence. Most importantly, it hopes to be a useful addition to children's literary theory by studying the effect of silence on children, as moulded and employed by former children.

Bibliography

Primary Texts:

Rowling, J. K. *Harry Potter*. United Kingdom: Bloomsbury Publishing. 1997 – 2007.

The Mark Twain Papers, The Bancroft Library, University of California. Headed by Robert Hirst. Partially digtized in The Mark Twain Project. http://www.marktwainproject.org/

Twain, Mark. *Huck Finn and Tom Sawyer among the Indians and Other Unfinished Stories.* Edited by Dahlia Armon and Walter Blair. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: The Mark Twain Project of Bancroft Library and University of California Press. 1989.

Twain, Mark. *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*. Edited by Peter Coveney. Penguin Books, 2003. [Second Reprint of 1966 Penguin English Library edition by Coveney, with a new Chronology and Further Reading by Richard Maxwell. First published in 1884 by Chatto & Windus in England, and Twain himself in 1885 in America.]

Twain, Mark. *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer*. Edited by R. Kent Rasmussen. New York: Penguin Books, 2014 [First published by American Publishing Company in 1876].

Twain, Mark. *The Prince and the Pauper*. Edited by Jerry Griswold. Penguin Books, 1997. [First American edition, Boston: James R. Osgood & Company, 1881. First British edition, London: Chatto & Windus, 1881.]

Twain, Mark. *Tom Sawyer Abroad & Tom Sawyer Detective.* Edited by Stuart Hutchinson. Wordsworth Classics, 2009.

The Prince and the Pauper. Directed by William Kneighley. United States: Jack L. Warner & Hal B. Wallis, 1937.

The Adventures of Tom Sawyer. Directed by Norman Taurog. United States of America: David O. Selznick, Selnick International Pictures, 1938.

The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn. Directed by Richard Thorpe. United States: Joseph L. Mankiewicz, 1939.

Raja aur Runk. Directed by Kottaya Pratyagatma. India: LV Prasad, 1968.

Tom Sawyer. Directed by Don Taylor. United States: Arthur P. Jacobs & Frank Capra Jr., 1973.

Huckleberry Finn. Directed by J. Lee Thompson. United States: APJAC Productions & Reader's Digest, 1974.

The Adventures of Tom Sawyer. Japan: Nippon Animation, 1980.

Huckleberry Finn Monogatari. Japan: NHK, 1994.

Huckleberry Finn and His Friends. British Columbia, Canada. 1979.

The Prince and the Pauper. Directed by George Scribner. United States: Walt Disney Pictures & Walt Disney Feature Animation, 1990.

The Adventures of Huck Finn. Directed by Stephen Sommers. United States: Walt Disney Pictures, 1993.

Tom Sawyer. United States: Metro-Goldwyn-Meyer Animation, 2000.

Barbie as the Princess and the Pauper. Canada & United States: Mainframe Entertainment & Mattel Entertainment, 2004.

Tom Sawyer. Directed by Hermine Huntgeburth. Germany. 2011

I Am The King. Directed by Jang Kyu-Sung. South Korea: Daisy Entertainment, 2012.

Tom Sawyer and Huckleberry Finn. Directed by Jo Kastner. United States: cine-partners, 2014.

Secondary Texts:

Ariès, Phillipe. *Centuries of Childhood: A Social History of Family Life*. Translated by Robert Baldick. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962.

Awkward, Michael. *Negotiating Difference: Race, Gender and the Politics of Positionality*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1995.

Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. London and New York: Routledge Classics, 1994. [Indian Reprint: 2010].

Blair, Walter. "Was *Huckleberry Finn* Written?". *Mark Twain Journal* 19, number 4 (Summer 1979): 1-3, http://www.jstor.org/stable/41641093.

Bosha, Francis T. "Mark Twain in Japan: A Checklist of Translations, 1899-1978". *Mark Twain Journal* 19, number 4 (Summer, 1979): 8-13, http://www.jstor.org/stable/41641095.

Bradford, Clare. *Unsettling Narratives: Postcolonial Readings of Children's Literature*. Canada: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 2007.

Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York and London: Routledge, 2002 (1st ed. 1999).

Chambers, Aidan. "The Reader in the Book: Notes from Work in Progress". *Children's Literature Association Quarterly*, 1978 Proceedings, 1 – 19, doi: https://doi.org/10.1353/chq.1978.0000

Cooley, Thomas. *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*. New York and London: A Norton Critical Edition, W.W. Norton & Company, 1999.

Cullingford, Cedric. *Children's Literature and its Effects: The Formative Years*. London and Washington: Cassell, 1998.

Dauncey, Sarah. "The Uses of Silence: A Twentieth-Century Preoccupation in The Light of Fictional Examples 1900 – 1950". PhD dissertation, University of Warwick, 2003, http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/4054/

Foucault, Michel. *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason.* Translated by Richard Howard. London and New York: Routedge, 2001.

Freud, Sigmund. *Totem and Taboo: Some points of Agreement between the Mental Lives of Savages and Neurotics*. Translated by James Strachey. London and New York: Routledge, 2011. (1st ed, 1913, Hugh Heller)

Graff. Gerald and James Phelan. *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn: A Case Study in Critical Controversy.* Boston, New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2004.

Grenby, M.O. and Andrea Immel, eds. *Cambridge Companion to Children's Literature*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.

- Andrea Immel. "Children's books and constructions of childhood". 19 – 34.
- Brian Alderson. "The making of children's books". 35 – 54.
- John Stephens. "Retelling stories across time and cultures". 91 – 107.
- Deborah Stevenson. "Classics and canons". 108 – 123.
- Judy Simons. "Gender roles in children's fiction". 143 – 158.
- U.C. Knoepflmacher. "Children's texts and the grown-up reader". 159 – 173.
- Lynne Vallone. "Ideas of difference in children's literature". 174 – 189.

Hassan, Ihab. "The Literature of Silence: From Henry Miller to Beckett and Burroughs". *Encounter*, January 1967. 74 – 81.

Hillman, Judith. *Discovering Children's Literature*. Columbus Ohio: Prentice Hall, 1995.

hooks, bell. *Yearning: Race, Gender and Cultural Politics*. New York and London: Routledge, 2015. (1st ed, 1990, South End Press).

Hunt, Peter. *Children's Literature*. Blackwell Publishers, 2001.

Hunt, Peter, ed. *International Companion Encyclopaedia of Children's Literature*. 2nd edition, Volume 1. London and New York: Routledge, 2004.

- Margaret Meek. "Introduction: definitions, themes, changes, attitudes". 1 – 12.
- Emer O'Sullivan. "Internationalism, the universal child and the world of children's literature". 13 – 25.
- "Comparative children's literature". 191 – 202.
- David Rudd. "Theorising and theories: the conditions of possibility of children's literature". 29 – 43.
- Deborah Cogan Thacker. "Criticism and the critical mainstream". 44 – 55.
- Charles Sarland. "Critical tradition and ideological positioning". 56 – 75.
- John Stephens. "Linguistics and stylistics". 99 -111.
- Michael Benton. "Reader-response criticism". 112 – 128.
- Hamida Bosmajian. "Psychoanalytical criticism". 129 – 139.
- Lissa Paul. "Feminism revisited". 140 – 153.
- Maria Nikolajeva. "Narrative theory and children's literature". 166 – 178.
- Christine Wilkie-Stibbs. "Intertextuality and the child reader". 179 – 190.

Ishihara, Tsuyoshi. *Mark Twain in Japan: The Cultural Reception of an American Icon*. Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 2005.

Kamei, Shunsuke. "Mark Twain in Japan". *Mark Twain Journal* 12, number 1 (Spring, 1963): 10-11, 20. http://www.jstor.org/stable/41999918

Lear, Bernadette A. "Were Tom and Huck On-Shelf? Public Libraries, Mark Twain, and the Formation of Accessible Canons, 1869–1910". *Nineteenth-Century Literature* 64, number 2, University of California Press (September 2009): 189-224, http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/ncl.2009.64.2.189.

Lerer, Seth. *Children's Literature: A Reader's History from Aesop to Harry Potter*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago, 2008.

Lesnik-Oberstein, Karin, ed. *Children's Literature: New Approaches*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

Li, Xilao. "The Adventures of Mark Twain in China: Translation and Appreciation of More than a Century". *The Mark Twain Annual*, No. 6, Penn State University Press (2008): 65-76, http://www.jstor.org/stable/41582241

Macherey, Pierre. *A Theory of Literary Production*. Translated by Geoffrey Wall. London, Henley & Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978.

May, Jill P. *Children's Literature and Critical Theory: Reading and Writing for Understanding*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Messent, Peter. *The Cambridge Introduction to Mark Twain*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Morris, Linda A. *Gender Play in Mark Twain: Cross-Dressing and Transgression*. Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 2007.

Morisson, Toni. *Playing in the Dark: Whiteness and Literary Imagination*. Harvard University Press, 1992.

Morrison, Toni. *The Origin of Others*. Cambridge, Massachusetts & London, England: Harvard University Press. 2017

Newell, Kate. ""You don't know about me without you have read a book": Authenticity in Adaptations of Adventures of Huckleberry Finn". *Literature/Film Quarterly* 41, number 4 (2013): 303-316. http://www.jstor.org/stable/43798888.

Pettit, Arthur G. “Mark Twain and the Negro, 1867 – 1869”. *The Journal of Negro History*, Volume. 56, No. 2 (Apr., 1971), 88-96.

Picard, Max. *The World of Silence*. Regenary Gateway, 1952.

Pratt, Linda and Janice J. Beaty. *Transcultural Children’s Literature*. Columbus, Ohio: Prentice Hall, 1999.

Rasmussen, R. Kent. *Dear Mark Twain: Letters From His Readers*. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press, 2013.

Rose, Jacqueline. “The Case of Peter Pan: The Impossibility of Children’s Fiction”. In *The Children’s Culture Reader*. Edited by Henry Jenkins. New York: New York Press, 1998. 58 – 66.

Rudd, David, ed. *The Routledge Companion to Children’s Literature*. London and New York: Routledge, 2010.

- David Rudd, “The development of children’s literature”. 3 – 13.
- Roderick McGillis. “‘Criticism is the theory of literature’: theory is the criticism of literature”. 14 – 25.
- Victoria Flanagan. “Gender studies”. 26 – 38.
- Clare Bradford. “Race, Ethnicity and Colonialism”. 39 – 50.
- John Stephens. “Narratology”. 51 – 62.

Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*. London: Penguin. 1977.

Scarnhorst, Gary. *Mark Twain: The Complete Interviews*. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2006.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. “Can the Subaltern Speak?”. In *Colonial discourse and post-colonial theory: a reader*. Edited by Laura Chrisman and Patrick Williams. New York and Sydney: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1993. 66 – 111.

Steiner, George. *Language and Silence: Essays on Language, Literature, and the Inhuman*. New York: Open Road Integrated Media. (1st ed. 1967).

Stephens, John. *Language and Ideology in Children's Fiction*. United Kingdom: Longman, 1992.

Miscellaneous Sources:

Avery, Anapol. "New Jersey lawmakers propose resolution asking schools not to teach 'Huckleberry Finn'. In *The Hill*. 23rd March 2019.

Blyton, Enid. *Second Form at Malory Towers*. Mammoth, 1995. 2004 reprint.

Blyton, Enid. *St. Clare's Again*. Mammoth, 1996. 2004 reprint

Ellis-Petersen, Hannah and Lily Kuo. "Where are the brown people? Crazy Rich Asians Draws Tepid Response in Singapore". In *The Gaurdian*. 21st August 2018.

Hartley-Parkinson, Richard. "Supermarket removes all foreign groceries from shelves to make point about racism". In Metro UK. 23rd August 2017.

Kilkenny, Katie**.** "'Simpsons' Creator: "No Nuance" Around Apu Debate, Decries "Outrage of the Week" Culture**". I**n *The Hollywood Reporter.* 18th July 2018.

Phillips, Kristine. "A school district drops 'To Kill a Mockingbird' and 'Huckleberry Finn' over use of the n-word". In *The Washington Post*. 7th February 2018.

Sepsey, Loralee. "Dear J. K. Rowling: We're Still Here". In blog *Natives in North America*, 1st July, 2016.

Walker, Shaun. "Harry Potter among books burned by priests in Poland". In *The Gaurdian*. 1st April 2019.