12-1-1988

Huckleberry Finn: conduct Disordered Adolescent, Emerging Sociopath, or American Hero?

Robert J. Golonka

Huckleberry Finn: Conduct Disordered Adolescent, Emerging Sociopath, or American Hero?

A Thesis

Presented to the

Department of English

and the

Faculty of the College of Graduate Studies

University of Nebraska at Omaha

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

by

Robert J. Golonka

December 1988

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

Accepted for the faculty of the Graduate College of the University of Nebraska at Omaha, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Master of Arts.

Graduate Committee _____

Name	Department
Glen Newkirk	English
John R. Stewart	
Ross A. Pellington	

Bruce R. Baker

Chairman

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks to Dr. Glen Newkirk for his solid support and for so vividly remembering me when I telephoned him after almost twenty years. In addition, thanks to Dr. Bruce Baker, who helped generate the ideas for this project, and offered empathy, compassion, and step-by-step editorial assistance. Thanks also to Dr. Ross Pilkington whose specialized knowledge of Adlerian Psychology helped facilitate my understanding of Huckleberry Finn's **Gemeinschaftsgefühl**. Special thanks to Dean Margaret Gessaman whose heart saw fit to allow the completion of a long project and personal goal.

Finally, but most importantly, thanks to my mentor, John Atherton, the man who helped resurrect my zest for life and rekindle my passion for the truth.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction and Statement of Problem

In a "Notice" to the first edition of his Adventures of Huckleberry Finn, Mark Twain warned: "Persons attempting to find a motive in this narrative will be prosecuted; persons attempting to find a moral in it will be banished; persons attempting to find a plot in it will be shot" (Twain xxv). Critics have generally paid little attention to these cautionary remarks. In the one hundred and three years since its publication, Twain's novel has enjoyed major critical acclaim. HF has also been the subject of considerable critical debate.

The purpose of this investigation will be to examine this critical controversy and offer an analysis based on that which is observable and verifiable in the text. Modern behavioral psychology will assist in this analysis. Before describing specific methodology, a brief but representative critical review appears to be in order.

Twain's novel ran into problems almost immediately. Shortly after its initial publication, the book was banned in Boston. The Boston Transcript, in its issue published on the seventeenth of March 1885, summarized the board's opinion with these remarks:

> The Concord Public Library Committee has decided to exclude Mark Twain's latest book from the library. One member of the committee says that, while he does

> not wish to call it immoral, he thinks it contains but little humor, and that of a very coarse type. He regards it as the veriest trash. The librarian and the other members of the committee entertained similar views, characterizing it as rough, course, and inelegant, dealing with a series of experiences not elevating, the whole book being more suited to the slums than to intelligent, respectable people.

Twain was in trouble with the Brahmin followers of the Eastern literary establishment. In examining this reaction, Beaver, for example, notes that Louisa May Alcott backed the Concord committee: "'If Mr. Clemens cannot think of something better to tell our pure-minded lads and lasses, he had best stop writing for them.' Between 1902 and 1907 the libraries of Denver, Omaha, and Brooklyn, among others, banned Huckleberry Finn from their shelves" (41). Mark Twain's novel, nevertheless, became an enormous commercial success. Since its publication, more than a hundred years ago, Huckleberry Finn remained a best-seller, "in some instances the best- seller among the American literary classics. All-time world sales probably exceed 20 million in number" (Sattelmeyer 2).

As time passed, Twain's book continued to enjoy not only commercial success but critical acclaim as well. Many informed readers and responsible critics argue that Huckleberry Finn is the great American novel. In 1935, Hemingway, for example, said that "All modern American

literature comes from one book by Mark Twain called Huckleberry Finn. If you read it you must stop where the Nigger Jim [sic] is stolen from the boys. That is the real end. The rest is just cheating. But it's the best book we've had. All American writing comes from that. There was nothing before. There has been nothing since" (22).

T. S. Eliot, in an address delivered at Washington University over a decade later, used less hyperbole but essentially concurred. In HF Mark Twain "reveals himself to be one of those writers, of whom there are not a great many in any literature, who have discovered a new way of writing, valid not only for themselves but for others. I should place him, in this respect, even with Dryden and Swift, as one of those rare writers who have brought their language up to date, and in so doing, 'purified the dialect of the tribe.' In this respect I should put him above Hawthorne: though no finer a stylist, and in obvious ways a less profound explorer of the soul" (16-17). Posthumously Mark Twain became a novelist's novelist and a poet's poet. An army of literary critics agreed. Lionel Trilling, noting a weakness in the novel's ending, nevertheless, observed that "In form and style HF is an almost perfect work (xv-xvi).

H.L. Mencken, the master of American letters, read the book as a child and continued to read it annually. Twain's HF made him "the largest figure that ever reared itself out of the flat, damp, prairie of American literature"

(183). Mencken found the book above the art of Emerson, Whitman, and Hawthorne. "Huckleberry Finn is a truly stupendous piece of work--perhaps the greatest novel ever written in English . . . there is something that vastly transcends the merit of all ordinary books. It has a merit that is special and extraordinary; it lifts itself above all the hollow standards and criteria; it seems greater every time I read it . . ." (188-89).

Leo Marx, in a landmark critical essay, published in 1953, summarized this flood of positive critical reception and placed it in perspective. Noting the early remarks of the Concord Library Committee, Marx said: "So much for them. Today (we like to think) we know the true worth of the book. Everyone now agrees that Huckleberry Finn is a masterpiece: it is probably the one book in our literature about which highbrows and lowbrows can agree. Our most serious critics praise it." Marx, however, cautioned: "Nevertheless, a close look . . . will likewise reveal, I believe, serious weaknesses in current criticism. Today the problem of evaluating the book is as much obscured by unqualified praise as it once was by parochial hostility" (203). Marx's concern is that there are serious flaws in the ending alluded to by Hemingway and others. As a result, the last ten chapters of HF seriously detract from the book's status as one of great literary merit. Marx believes "the ending of Huckleberry Finn makes so many readers uneasy because they rightly sense that it jeopardizes the significance of the entire novel"

(203). Marx's observation parallels the same reasons Hemingway and Eliot temper their accolades. They also found the ending of the novel distressful. Hemingway would have cut the entire "evasion" from the book. Eliot agrees with Trilling and offers a formal defense. He maintains that the ending was a necessary part of the novel's structure. In answering a growing number of readers who saw the novel falling off as soon as Tom Sawyer reappears, Eliot responds:

> But it is right that the mood of the book should bring us back to that of the beginning. Or, if this was not the right ending for the book, what ending would have been right? For Huckleberry Finn, neither a tragic nor a happy ending would be suitable. No worldly success or social satisfaction would be worthy of him; a tragic end also would reduce him to the level of those we pity. Huck Finn must come from nowhere and be bound for nowhere . . . He has no beginning and no end. Hence, he can only disappear; and his disappearance can only be accomplished by bringing forward another performer to obscure the disappearance in a cloud of whimsicalities (xv-xvi).

Marx responds with this cogent argument which Beaver summarizes as follows: Huck and Jim, together on the run, establish an ideal society on the raft. Because they have a common bond, they form an ideal friendship which "is the prerequisite of an ideal society," a society opposed to the values they witness on the shore. Greed and complacency on

the shore triumph in light of the novel's ending because Jim and Huck go their separate ways and any quest engendered on the raft cannot succeed in a real world. (190) In noting "the disparity between [Huck's] best impulses and the behavior the community attempted to impose on him, Huck fails as a character of moral substance. This failure is not Huck's fault but Twain's. Marx concludes that " whatever the explanation, the faint-hearted ending of [HF] . . . must be accounted a major flaw in so great a work . . ." (210).

The Eliot-Trilling-Marx debate offers only a glimpse of the critical controversy that surrounded and continues to surround Twain's novel. Whether the novel is approached from a formalist, a biographical, a historical, a marxist, or a traditional Freudian approach, all critical appraisal ultimately lies in an analysis of Huck's character. What kind of person is he? What are his values? What are his strengths and weaknesses? Critical findings have been numerous. Robert Sattelmeyer, the editor of a Centennial collection of critical essays, writes in his preface:

> If the structure of the work has fascinated critics in the last three or four decades, Huck has entranced them. They have not been able to reach too deeply in their verbal bags for ways of describing him. Disregarding Mark Twain's injunction to avoid the adjective, they have called Huck accepting, accommodating, compassionate, decent, dirty, good-natured, helpful, honest, humorless, imaginative,

innocent, lonely, passive, pathetic, practical, pragmatic, poker-faced, mature, naive, bad, good, heroic, and unheroic. He is called a real boy, an unspoiled boy, a town boy, a river boy, a ragamuffin, a river rat, a picaresque saint, a liar, an imagist poet, a fugitive, a figure from folklore, an existential hero, the first absurd hero, a keen observer, and a literary sport. Metaphorically , he is a Prometheus, a frontier Thoreau, a Mississippi Moses, a Tocquevillian hero, and the devil's disciple who has become God's own child. We learn that he is both a fugitive and a joiner who longs for freedom and for acceptance by the community, an innocent as well as one who feels innately guilty. He is much like his father; indeed he has his father's strength. But he is searching for a mother substitute. He matures, but there is little that he really learns. He is hurt by experience, fears loneliness, and finds no code adequate for the demands of his moral nature. He is torn by the Leckian conflict between his heart and his conscience. His moral triumph (and agony) is when he decides not to return Jim to Miss Watson, but he learns little from the episode and never thinks of it again. He is nonjudgmental but exists to furnish us with a means of judging the world. He is the contemplative side of Mark Twain, the lonely spirit. He is also a shield behind which Mark Twain can let go. Despite all this

> and more, we learn from other critics that Huck is not a coherently developed character, his moral growth is overrated, and he lacks many of the basic interests and drives of a normal adolescent. (10-11).

Is Huck all of these? Is he some of these? Is he none of these? Which of these critical observations come closer to the truth? Are these valid critical observations or are they projections? Does evidence from the text support these findings, or are individual reactions to Twain's novel imposed on Huck? How can an apparently innocent boy's adventure story create such overwhelming critical controversy? To suggest answers to these questions, I will apply a systematic modern psychological approach in examining the nature of Huck's character. Such an analysis might offer an understanding based on that which is observable and verifiable in terms of narrative action in the text.

Chapter 1

The Tin Lamp: A Psychodynamic Review

Psychological approaches to literature have often received bad press. Several have been applied in examining Huck's character and ultimately Twain's novel. One of these exemplifies an extreme methodolgy. In his "Literary Masters and Masturbators: Sexuality, Fantasy, and Reality in Huckleberry Finn," Charles May examines the essential conflict between Twain's personality and his work. His is a classic Freudian approach. May notes a "rigid distinction between smoking-room sexuality and drawing room purity," in HF and in Twain's life (85). After summarizing critical debate about the novel's unity, May concludes that any attack on the aesthetic validity of the novel's ending is essentially an attack on Tom. For May, Tom represents a fantasy world. Huck signifies the world of reality. "The conflict between the fantasy world of Tom Sawyer and the so-called "real" world of Huckleberry Finn is related to Twain's ambiguous attitude toward sexuality" (86).

May uses biographical data, circumstances of composition, and two of Twain's bawdy pieces, "1601" and "Some Thoughts on the Science of Onanism," to illustrate repressed sexuality in Huckleberry Finn. At the end of

chapter three, when Tom disappears from the book, Huck rejects Tom's world of fantasy. He tires of Tom's games and his "hypocritical world of make-believe. After Tom has led the ambuscade of the Arabs, Huck complains that all he saw was a Sunday School Picnic. Tom explains that Huck could not see the soldiers, elephants, and treasure because of the same enchanters, the same characters that preserve the integrity of Don Quixote's fantasy world. However, Tom links Don Quixote's enchanters from the Arabian nights and tells Huck about rubbing an old tin lamp or iron ring to make the genies come [italics mine]. When Huck argues that if he were a genie 'he would see a man in Jerico' before he would drop everything for the rubbing of an old lamp, Tom replies, 'How you talk, Huck Finn. Why you'd have to come when he rubbed it, whether you wanted to or not'" (May 88).

May notes that other psychoanalytic critics have suggested that this scene is "remarkably suggestive of the pre-ejaculatory masturbation of latency" (88). He acknowledges this point but cites research by Kinsey to prove that the taboo of masturbation translates, in effect, to a cultural disdain toward fantasy. Huck, then represents a reaction against "fantasy-making and play" (90). At this point, May takes a giant step toward his final conclusion: "Huck Finn is in some ways the prototype of modern economic man as unimaginative realist" (92).

Certainly, a tension between fantasy and reality appears to be an important element in the foundation of

Twain's novel. Other critics have arrived at similar conclusions. (See Hamblen, vonFrank and Zuckert, for example) May's observations are well argued and cogently presented. His method, however, detracts from the salience of his observations. Many, therefore, might find this particular psychoanalytic approach tedious.

Guerin et al., in A Handbook of Critical Approaches to Literature, also depend on the Freudian model in an examination of Huckleberry Finn. However, this analysis focuses less on repressed sexuality. A brief comparison with Shakespeare's Hamlet shows that both central characters are in psychological conflict with their fathers. While the roots of this tension lie in Freud's Oedipus conflict, Guerin concentrates primarily on rebellion against authority rather than sexual attraction to the mother, and subsequent conflict with the father.

In examining Huck's primary conflict, Guerin says: "from the psychoanalytic viewpoint all rebellion is in essence rejection of parental, especially paternal authority. Sociologically speaking, Huck rebels against the unjust, inhumane restrictions of a society that condones slavery, hypocrisy, and cruelty" (143). Continuing in this vein, Guerin notes that "The main plot of the novel is launched with Huck's escape from 'pap' (whose name, in keeping with the reductive treatment of this father figure, is not capitalized), a flight that coincides with Jim's escape from Miss Watson" (134). Symbolically, then, pap and Miss Watson

represent authority, and in the framework of Twain's novel, an authority that manifests itself as ethically unsound. These critical observations are supported with evidence from the text. Guerin notes the maternal imagery Huck uses in describing the Mississippi. He also observes a tension between land and water in Twain's extended symbolic structure. Finally, he sees this interplay at work throuhgout the novel. "The tension between land and water may be seen as analogous to that between the conscious and the unconscious in Freudian theory" (136). This analysis also explores the theme of death and rebirth which began with pap's "reform" and was later developed with Huck's "suicide." Finally, this critical study shifts focus and examines Huckleberry Finn as "a story of the child as victim, embodying the betrayal-of-innocence theme that has become one of the chief motifs in American fiction" (137).

Guerin's findings, like May's, show a certain credibility. But unlike May's, Guerin's method seems less distasteful. By focusing on general Freudian concepts, and not emphasizing sex, Guerin draws critical conclusions that appear more believable. Freud's concept of ego as mediator between the conflicting impulses of the id and superego serve to explain Huck's apparently rebellious nature. The pressing question concerning this study is: Could similar conclusions have been reached without employing the psychoanalytic paradigm? Other critics have reached similar conclusions without using the Freudian model. Cox, for example, in his

critical essay "A Hard Book to take," draws similar conclusions from a more formal perspective. By focusing on the novel's inconsistencies, its language, and its humor, Cox notes that Twain created a rebellious character and "let Huck reject civilization and the adult conscience in the very last pages of his book--an ending that is, as Eliot so rightly realized, as perfect as any in literature" (403).

Another critical approach that examines literature in terms of a psychological paradigm depends on specifc methodology developed by C.J. Jung. For a time, a loyal follower of Freud, Jung found his mentor's unbending focus on sexuality difficult to accept. That all neurosis had its foundation in the primitive forces of the id, and that all behavior was a result of those energies, was, for Jung, limiting and without spiritual foundation. Jung approached human behavior by developing a system of ego structure that depended on a thread of common humanity. He found that throughout the history of mankind, there were common symbols, images, metaphors and myths. He called these shared universalities archetypes.

Leslie Fiedler, in an elegantly composed essay, examines Huck in terms of the Jungian archetype. In his controversial essay "Come Back to the Raft Ag'in, Huck Honey," Fiedler focuses on the theme of alienation and estrangement. He arques that Huckleberry Finn is a study in alienation, guilt, and the "archetypal love of white male and black" (90). An extended comparative analysis employing Melville's Ishmael

and Queequeg in Moby Dick, Cooper's Natty Bumpoo and Chingachgook in the Leatherstocking Tales, and Twain's Huck and Jim in HF explores overt homosexual elements and covert archetypal truth. The archetype, for Fiedler, is pure Jungian. By "archetype," he means "a coherent pattern of beliefs and feelings so widely shared at a level beneath consciousness that there exists no abstract vocabulary for representing it, and so 'sacred' that unexamined, irrational restraints inhibit any explicit analysis. Such a complex finds a formula or pattern story, which serves both to embody it, and at first at least, to conceal its full implications. Later, the secret may be revealed, the archetype 'analyzed' or 'allegorically ' interpreted according to the language of the day" (97).

This method may sound like an exercise in metaphysics because the Jungian paradigm is. Truth, in Huckleberry Finn, and the secrets revealed through Jungian allegorical analysis, manifest themselves as "The American Dream of isolation afloat . . .The notion of the negro as the unblemished bride blends with the myth of running away to sea, of running the great river down to the sea" (99). Others (Carrington, Gwin, and Hoffman, for example) have seen Huck and Jim's raft float down the Mississippi on a similar journey. Whether that movement connotes a flight from society or signifies a movement from innocence to experience similar conclusions have been made. The difference in these studies and Fiedler's findings lies in

method. More credible conclusions are the result of close attention to narrative action. Findings, therefore, appear more plausible. Fiedler's analysis reads like poetry. His truth is poetic truth. Jungian archetypal analysis of this kind often asks more questions than it answers. And these answers cannot be definitive because archetypal analysis depends on tautological truth, a truth that cannot be tested, measured, verified, or ultimately denied.

Robert Patterson's "Death on the Mississippi: Mark Twain's Huckleberry Finn," offers a more consistently applied Jungian analysis. Patterson explores the novel and Huck's character in terms of archetypal elements that have distinct and identifiable roots in world mythology. By focusing on the Jungian archetypes of transformation, he applies "an itemized Jungian approach" (9). This study shows that the novel has undeniable archetypal significance by closely examining parallels between archetypal images of transformation and narrative action in the text. Patterson believes, for example, that Huck's orchestrating his own death has its archetypal roots in the Eleusinian Mysteries, which are ancient rites of initiation. Patterson's method deserves full attention: "An Orphic legend claims that Iacchus was reared by Peresphone, when he awoke after three years in the liknon. It does not take much imagination to see that [Huck's] canoe, carrying corn-meal, may be viewed as a liknon, or cradle of Iacchus. Huck has just 'plowed' corn-meal into the earth, hence, the 'fresh-plowed boy'image

is consistent with that of the Mysteries and Orphic myths. Huck indeed falls asleep in his liknon, as did Iacchus. When he awakes, it is not after three years, but it is more than just a few hours, or so it seems to Huck. His powers of perception have been increased; he has been partially reborn. Huck recalls:

> When I woke up I didn't know where I was, for a minute. I set up and looked around a little scared. Then I remembered. The river looked miles and miles across. The moon was so bright . . . Everything was dead quiet, and it looked late and smelt late . . . The sky looks ever so deep when you lay on your back in the moonshine; I never knowed it before.'

The archetypal significance of Huck's rebirth through the sacrifice of the pig and the sowing of the corn is undeniable." (13).

Patterson's extended analysis explores the theme of death and rebirth in Huckleberry Finn from other archetypal angles and notes that "the detail in which Huck parallels those (and other) archetypal rites does, at times, reach a provocative, almost disturbing level of consistency" (15).

Archetypal parallels also offer an argument for thematic unity. Patterson notes that "This same archetypal imagery casts doubt on Huck's character development; it is highly questionable whether Huck matures significantly in this work. His attitude toward Jim seems at one point to 'mature,' but later appears to revert almost to its starting point as

revealed in the second chapter of the novel. In all other respects, Huck remains an Iacchus-figure, the 'eternal youth'" (20).

Patterson's mytho-archeological approach may appear closer to the truth; however, his critical findings have no empirical foundation. That all cultures have dragon myths does not prove the existence of dragons. Application of a modern behavioral method might lead closer to the truth. This next section will apply specific behavioral criteria which will serve to explore Huck's character in terms of what he does within the structure of the novel. Instead of applying an extratextual Freudian paradigm or drawing mythopoetic parallels, I will focus on that which is observable and verifiable by closely examining behavioral patterns expressed in Twain's text, a "what you see is what you get approach."

Chapter II

What You See Is What You Get

In 1952, the American Psychiatric Association published its first edition of The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-I). This manual offered a systematic modern behavioral approach to assist in identifying patterns of abnormal behavior; a new toxonomy had finally arrived. Prior to this, diagnosis had often been a hit and miss proposition, often relying on individual value system and particular clinical approach. A physician trained in the traditional Freudian school might, for example, focus on identifying neurotic behavior which was the result of ego dystonic conflict between the id and superego. On the other hand, a clinician trained in the Jungian analytical method might note the same behavioral patterns but focus on specific personality type, inefficient personality integration, and the resultant complex. Different diagnostic criteria could thus be assigned to the same patient.

DSM-I underwent several painstaking revisions until DSM-III-R was born. The third edition, revised, provides a classification based on two important elements in the empirical method, reliability and validity. "Reliability in this context refers to the extent to which different observers can agree that the behavior they observe does

indeed 'fit' a given diagnostic category. Validity means that a classification should be meaningful in the sense that it tells us something important or basic about the entity classified" (Coleman 16-17). For example, if the DSM system allows us to find some of Huck's behavior conduct disordered, or antisocial, then we should be able to infer some very important things about Huck--things that differentiate him from others. We should be able to see clusters of behavior that are common to delinquent adolescents and sociopathic adults.

Few critics disagree that HF is basically a story about a young boy growing up. Disagreement focuses, instead, on the personality of that young boy, and the direction in which his growth, if any, progresses. Is "Huckleberry" Finn, an "inconsequential or unimportant person," as his first name connotes? (Blair 375) Is he the purveyor of a new ethic that is morally sound, or is he a conduct disordered adolescent on his way to a life of sociopathy? DSM criteria may help answer these and other questions and serve to offer a better understanding. According to the DSM-III-R, certain clearly observable and verifiable clusters of behavior serve as a focal point for making any specific diagnosis. In order for an examiner to diagnose a patient schizophrenic, for example, clusters of behavior common to schizophrenics would have to be identified. DSM III-R diagnostic criteria for Conduct Disorder require:

A disturbance of conduct lasting at least six months,

during which at least three of the following have been present:

(1) has stolen without confrontation of a victim on more than one occasion (including forgery)

(2) has run away from home overnight at least twice while living in parental or parental surrogate home (or once without returning)

(3) often lies (other than to avoid physical or sexual abuse)

(4) has deliberately engaged in fire setting

(5) is often truant from school (for older person absent from work)

(6) has broken into someone else's house, building or car

(7) has deliberately destroyed others property (other than by fire setting)

(8) has been physically cruel to animals

(9) has forced someone into sexual activity with him or her

(10) has used a weapon in more than one fight

(11) often initiates physical fights

(12) has stolen with confrontation of a victim (e.g., mugging, purse-snatching, extortion, armed robbery)

(13) has been physically cruel to people (55; see appendix for additional criteria).

Which, if any of these, incorporate the behavioral repertoire of Huckleberry Finn? Huck does not set fires and he does not

engage in physical cruelty to animals. He appears to care nothing for sex; therefore, he never forces anyone into any kind of sexual activity. Indeed, Huck is asexual. Mark Twain, one of the pioneers of the American realistic school, made him that way. Fiedler would have us believe that there is a covertly symbolic homosexual relationship between Huck and Jim, but such a relationship lacks observable and verifiable evidence. The narrative action of the novel disproves this. Any closeness between Huck and Jim results from a shared closeness, not from lust. Huck and Jim become friends and form a relationship because of common interests. They are close because they help one another achieve a shared goal; both are runaways. Jim flees from a society with an ethical system that makes him less than human. Huck escapes from that same society because he finds that its values are personally restrictive. Huck and Jim are close because they have similar objectives. The ethical system from which they escape may view them as partners in crime, but they are not bed partners.

The asexual Huck also appears to be basically nonviolent. Twain created a young boy who, for the most part, tries to avoid violence; however, if circumstances dictate, Huck does not hesitate to ready himself. In chapter VI, Huck witnesses his father's struggle with delirium tremens. Pap, who is actively hallucinating, believes his son to be the "angel of death," and vows to kill him. Huck deliberately prepares to meet his father's threat.

> So he dozed off pretty soon. By and by I got the old split-bottom chair and clumb up, as easy as I could, not to make any noise, and got down the gun. I slipped the ramrod down it to make sure it was loaded, and then I laid it across the turnip barrel, pointing towards pap, and set down behind it to wait for him to stir. And how slow and still the time did drag along (36).

Huck prefers nonviolence, but he does not hesitate should fratricide be the only way to save his own skin. Superficially this passage might be read as a preparation for self defense by a severely abused victim, and our sympathies do indeed move in that direction, but note Huck's language. These are not the words of a panic stricken young boy. They are cold and calculating. Huck acts with deliberate intent. He is careful not to awaken his father, and he makes sure the gun is loaded. He props his weapon on the pickle barrel so that his aim will not be disturbed. The gun will also remain true to its target should Huck doze. Twain's teenager never actually uses the weapon and for the most part he avoids direct physical violence, but if need be, Huck prepares for violence with undeniable intent. Were Huck to follow through with his plans in contemporary society, our present, more liberal, criminal justice system would no doubt result in his conviction for manslaughter.

Huck does not initiate physical fights, and he does not steal by confronting his victim. There is no evidence in the text of mugging, purse-snatching, or armed robbery.

Huck is more sophisticated. He takes a disturbingly active and willing part in helping the King and Duke extort money from the townsfolk in the "Royal Nonesuch" scheme, for example. This confidence game does not employ physical force; but Huck, the King, and the Duke nevertheless swindle the residents of the "one-horse town" in "Arkansaw." After an initially roaring success, from the players' point of view, Huck recalls: "Next day you couldn't hear nothing around that town but how splendid that show was. House was jammed again, that night, and we [italics mine] sold this crowd the same way" (197).* Huck plays his part in this affair and makes no attempt to separate himself from the King and Duke. When Jim inquires about the performance and questions the integrity of their companions, Huck makes allowances and appears to side with these rogues. Jim queries and Huck responds:

> "Don't it sprise you, de way dem kings carries on Huck?"
>
> "No," I says, "it don't."
>
> "Why don't it, Huck?"
>
> "Well, it don't, because it's in the breed. I reckon they're all alike."
>
> "But Huck, dese kings o' ourn is reglar rapscallions; dat't jist what dey is; dey's regular rapscallions."
>
> "Well, that's what I'm a-saying; all kings is mostly rapscallions, as fur as I can make out" (199).

Huck verifies this observation by citing historical evidence with particular focus on "Henry the Eight." Jim still remains dissatisfied with the questionable motives of their companions: "Well, anyways, I doan hanker for no mo' un um, Huck. Dese is all I kin stan'" (200). Huck finally relents: "It's the way I feel, too, Jim. But we've got them on our hands, and we got to remember what they are, and make allowances" (201). Huck makes many allowances in choosing to participate in the King and Duke's confidence schemes. One might believe he compromises his integrity. But are these allowances? Huck has established himself as a professional runaway before he meets the Duke and the Dauphin. He has never had trouble slipping out for a night of adventure from the Widow Douglas's. He plans an elaborate scheme his friend Tom Sawyer would be proud of in order to escape from his father. Many critics wonder why Huck stays with these men. Why does he stay with the two confidence men? Perhaps these "rapscallions" complement something in Huck's character, and perhaps these two serve as a device through which Huck's true character might evolve. DSM criteria for Conduct Disorder may continue to provide a clue.

Huck is not a vandal. He has no interest in sex, and he does not initiate physical fights. He does not fit DSM criteria 4, 8 and 9. While he appears to shun physical violence, he nevertheless calculatingly prepares for it. His participation in the Royal Nonesuch and other confidence schemes makes him guilty of criterion 12, nonviolent extortion. Which of the remaining DSM criteria do Huck's

behaviors conform to?

DSM's first and most important criterion is theft without confrontation.* Huck steals not only in the company of the king and duke, but also when he is in the company of others and when he is alone. Huck learned to steal from his father and refined this activity to suit his own needs. Like the young Mark Twain of Hannibal, Huck steals a skiff in the opening pages of the novel, and he carefreely and willingly engages in thievery throughout the book. He calls stealing "borrowing," and has logically consistent reasoning for its justification. Most often he steals whatever he needs. Huck steals to survive and admits that he and Jim "lived pretty high" on the river. On one occasion in Chapter 12, he and Jim discuss the ethical ramifications of theft. Huck has impeccable logic. He admits that he lifts a chicken that "warn't roosting comfortably now and then,"and recalls what "Pap always said, take a chicken when you get the chance, because if you don't want him yourself, you can easy find somebody that does, and a good deed ain't never forgot" (79). Pap, of course, never wanted the chicken for anyone else, and neither does Huck.

Huck "borrows" watermelons, muskmelons, pumpkins, and sweet corn, various and sundry "things of that kind." According to pap, "borrowing" is alright "if you was meaning to pay them back, sometime." The widow Douglas would rightly disagree. For her, "Borrowing" would be "a soft name for stealing, and no decent body would do

it" (80). Huck and Jim, having nothing better to do, decide to think this over and pass some time on the raft:

> Jim said he reckoned the widow was partly right and pap was partly right; so the best way would be for us to pick out two or three things from the list and say we wouldn't borrow them anymore--then he reckoned it wouldn't be no harm to borrow the others. So we talked it over all one night, drifting along down the river, trying to make up our minds whether to drop the watermelons, or the cantelopes, or the mushmelons, or what. But towards daylight we got it all settled satisfactory, and concluded to drop crabapples and p'simmons. We warn't feeling just right, before that, but it was all comfortable now. I was glad the way it come out, too, because crabapples ain't ever good, and the p'simmons wouldn't be ripe for two or three months yet (80).

The best of Twain's humor shows in this passage. And Huck reveals clues to his primary ethical position, what James L. Kasteley calls an "ethics of self-interest" (413).

DSM's second criterion in order of "descending discriminating power" concerns running away from home overnight. When circumstances are favorable, Huck leaves wherever he is whenever he wants. His spirit is free and easy. He hears the call of the wild, and when the wilderness calls, he follows. Twain's story opens with Huck living with the widow Douglas and her sister Miss Watson. The first few

pages of the novel illustrate how quickly Huck tires of circumstances that are, for him, "dismal regular and decent." Of the widow's attempts "to sivilize" him, Huck has a simple solution: "when I couldn't stand it any longer, I lit out" (1). Shortly after revealing the manner in which he handles stress, Huck steals away by climbing from his window and joins his friend Tom Sawyer for a night on the town. Huck faces consequences when he finally returns, but punishment does not change his position. "Whenever I got uncommon tired I played hookey, and the hiding I got next day done me good and cheered me up," (18) Huck says.

Huck's "hidings" are the primary reason he plans his own death and escapes from pap. Huck grows to like the easy life with his father. He recalls that "It was kind of lazy and jolly, laying off comfortable all day, smoking and fishing, and no books nor study. . . . It was pretty good times up in the woods there, take it all around." Pap, however, "got too handy with his hick'ry." and Huck just "couldn't stand it" (30). DSM criteria cannot be applied to Huck's escape from pap because his reasons for leaving are understandable. What makes one wonder, however, is why he did not return to the protective custody of the widow or Judge Thatcher. Instead, Huck chooses the Mississippi river and his raft.

The third most important DSM criterion is lying "(other than to avoid physical or sexual abuse)." When Huck recognizes the signs and feels that pap is back, he immediately rushes to Judge Thatcher and legally transfers

the six thousand dollar reward. Huck goes to all this trouble because he anticipates his father's interest in the money. When pap inquires about his son's riches, Huck is ready with the truth: "I hain't got no money, I tell you. You ask Judge Thatcher; he'll tell you the same" (24). Huck finds it strangely difficult to lie to pap, but he has no trouble with "stretchers" when anyone else is concerned. Examine, for example, Huck's license with the truth when it is necessary for him to invent a background story for the King and the Duke:

> My folks was living in Pike County, In Missouri, where I was born, and they all died off but me and pa and my brother Ike. Pa, he 'lowed he'd break up and go down and live with uncle Ben, who's got a little one-horse place on the river , forty-mile below Orleans. Pa was pretty poor, and had some debts; so when he'd squared up there warn't nothing left but sixteen dollars and our nigger, Jim. That warn't enough to take us fourteen hundred mile, deck passengers nor no other way. Well, when the river rose, pa had a streak of luck one day; he ketched this piece of raft; so we reckoned we'd go down to Orleans on it . Pa's luck didn't hold out; a steamboat run over the forrard corner of the raft, one night, and we all went overboard and dove under the wheel ; Jim and me come up, all right, but pa was drunk, and Ike was only four years old, so they never come up no more" (166).

Taking into account this passage and adding Huck's version to Mrs. Judith Loftus, another to the ferryboat keeper, yet another in Chapter 16, and still another to the Grangerfords, Huck has quite a family tree. Hamlin Hill, in "Huck Finn's Humor Today," takes complete inventory:

> The total: four dead fathers and one with smallpox; three dead mothers and one marooned on a steamboat sinking in the Mississippi; three dead brothers and one disappeared; ubiquitous sister Mary Ann 'married and never . . . heard of no more,' bepoxed, and very possibly also on the sinking Walter Scott; other family members too numerous to mention, simply died off (301).

"Huck's imagination is fertile but lethal," Hill adds.

Remaining DSM criteria for conduct disorder involve truancy from school (5), destruction of property, (7) and physical cruelty to others (13). There is no doubt that Huck is frequently truant; criterion five has been discussed in the section on running away. Does Huck destroy others' property? He has little concern for what his father owns, and deliberately ransacks their cabin when he makes his escape. But this is not vandalism; Huck is more concerned with saving his own skin and a degree of comfort he has grown accustomed to. He does not destroy his father's possessions because of any malicious intent, but as part of a calculated plan. Huck and Jim ransack the Walter Scott and the houseboat but only for provisions. Therefore, DSM criterion seven cannot be met.

In the context of the narrative, Huck is physically cruel to others, most notably Jim. Huck's cruelty is, however, not always calculated. Shortly after he meets up with Jim, Huck plays a trick on him. The superstitious Jim expounds on the bad luck that comes from handling a snake skin. One night, Huck puts a dead snake next to the sleeping Jim. The dead snake's mate curls up next to Jim and bites him. Huck's practical joke, his attempt at mental cruelty, becomes a physically cruel, life threatening act. Huck appears to be sorry about his misfired prank and says: "That all comes from my being such a fool as to not remember that wherever you leave a dead snake its mate always comes there and curls around it" (64). Note the focus of Huck's regret. He seems more concerned with his own stupidity than with Jim's suffering.

This concern for self becomes more ambiguous in the Walter Scott episode. Huck and Jim find two robbers planning to leave their bound comrade on the sinking ship. Huck shows concern for the thief whose life is at stake, and intends to cut loose the gang's skiff so that all three will be stranded on the crippled vessel. Huck's motives appear admirable, and his intention eventually to turn the three over to the authorities seems even more admirable. Huck wishes the widow were there to see his noble action. Huck says: "I judged she would be proud of me for helping these rapscallions, because rapscallions and dead beats is the kind the widow and good people takes the most interest in" (91). Huck's admirable

ethical choice is, however, short lived. As soon as he finds that his raft is gone, his focus changes. "We'd got to find that boat now," he says of the robber's skiff, "[we] had to have it for ourselves [italics mine]" (86). As soon as Huck and Jim are safe, once there is no imminent danger to self, Huck does concoct a story that will lead to the robbers rescue. But it is too late. The sinking Scott carries with it the three men. Initially he is stunned, but this is Huck's final reaction: "I pulled all around her and, and hollered a little, but there wasn't any answer; all dead still. I felt a little bit heavy-hearted about the gang, but not much, for I reckoned if they could stand it, I could" (91). Huck's final comments appear to resolve any ambiguity. For Huck, concern for self is what matters most. Huck's conscience takes a vacation and his adventures continue.

HF offers numerous examples of physical cruelty to Jim. These are not necessarily overt abusive acts of violence, but Jim, nevertheless, suffers. In addition to experiencing physical pain from the snake bite, he is bound and left alone on the raft while Huck helps the Duke and Dauphin carry out their confidence schemes. Huck also helps Tom act out his elaborate plans for Jim in the "evasion" chapters. Indeed, the last ten chapters of the novel result in extreme physical discomfort for Jim. In these final chapters, Jim becomes a mere plaything for the two boys. Jim's escape must be arranged according to Tom Sawyer's fancy, and it must be accomplished with style because

"there's more honor in getting him out through a lot of difficulties and dangers" (298). Huck has minor objections, but any hesitation he may have results from the extra effort required of Tom's romantic scheme. Huck has little concern for Jim's circumstances and any severe physical and mental discomfort he may suffer as the result of the two boy's elaborate game. Covert physical cruelty results.

The physical cruelty to Jim demonstrated in these final chapters has been the subject of considerable critical debate. If Huck has changed appreciably since the beginning of the novel, how can he treat his friend Jim so cruelly? If the young protagonist in Twain's novel has adopted a higher ethical position than the society in which he lives, how can he revert to an ethics of self-interest. How can legitimate concern for Jim be put aside for play? Perhaps DSM criteria for Conduct Disorder can continue to provide a clue.

Thus far, a point by point analysis of DSM criteria has shown that, from a purely behavioral point of view, Huck Finn has a problem. Of the DSM's thirteen behavioral clusters used to identify Conduct Disorder, Huck's behavior closely fits most, borders some, and excludes others. Theft, running away, lying, truancy, stealing, little regard for others' property, and physical cruelty are all behavioral components of Huck's that are easily observed and verified by inspecting his action in the text. There is no evidence of arson, sexual promiscuity, outright bullying, cruelty to animals, or theft by direct physical confrontation. Huck Finn is,

nevertheless, Conduct Disordered according to DSM criteria, but what is the severity of his disorder?

DSM-III-R notes specific guidelines for determining severity of any disorder. Severity of Conduct Disorder depends on number of conduct problems and effect on others. When these factors are weighted, disordered conduct is described as "mild," "moderate," or "severe." Huck has conduct problems that are much more than "mild;" his are well in excess of the three required to make a diagnosis. In fact, Huck's problems are "severe." DSM weighting factors note that he has "many conduct problems in excess of those required to make the diagnosis, [and] conduct problems cause considerable harm to others, eg., serious physical injury to victims, extensive vandalism or theft, prolonged absence from home" (55).

Mark Twain's protagonist, then, exhibits a clearly defined cluster of behaviors that meet DSM criteria for "severe Conduct Disorder." Huck Finn exhibits "a persistent pattern of conduct in which the basic rights of others and major age-appropriate societal norms or rules are violated" (53). Huck's character, according to these criteria, seems less noble than many have made him.

Chapter III

"Pap Finn's Boy"

In a recent television newscast, a sports commentator, summarizing the third game of the world series, said: "The freckle-faced Mark McGwire, Oakland's resident Huckleberry Finn, hit a home run to give the struggling A's new life" (Huber). If modern behavioral psychology, through the application of DSM criteria, has shown that Mark Twain's hero is essentially a Conduct Disordered adolescent, why does contemporary society continue to grant him a hero's status? Application of DSM criteria can accurately measure specific behavioral patterns to identify particular behavioral disorders, but DSM-III-R offers no insight into the dynamics of those behaviors. Eric Berne's system of social psychiatry, Transactional Analysis, does.

Berne's paradigm offers a solid structural model for examining patterns of behavior and individual motivation behind these patterns. In explaining "recognition hunger" and the concept of stroking, Berne observes that once the intimate bonds of the first year are broken with the mother, the individual spends the rest of his or her life looking for units of recognition. This unending search presents a conflict between infantile needs and socially acceptable ways of fulfilling them. Obtaining strokes or social units of

recognition, then, becomes a life-long campaign for emotional survival. Berne underlines the importance of this quest by noting colloquially that "If you are not stroked, your spinal cord will shrivel up" (14). Securing strokes, then, is absolutely necessary for psychic survival. Huck manages to get the necessary strokes for his emotional survival; however, the means by which he obtains strokes remains, at times, questionable.

In Games People Play, an important elucidation of his work sometimes discounted because of its "pop" title, Berne reformulated Freud's theoretical constructs of superego, ego, and id with observable and verifiable ego states which he called respectively Parent, Adult, and Child. Berne capitalizes ego states to differentiate from parents, adults, and children, and to distinguish from behaviors associated with these. The Parent parallels Freud's superego; however, instead of acting as the opposing force that the ego uses to mediate libidinal energy, the Parent, for Berne emerges as one of three distinct parts of observable and verifiable personality function.

The Parent ego state defines self and others, and judges situations with values and opinions expressed through its controlling and nurturing functions. The controlling, or critical Parent disciplines, prohibits, and punishes. All prejudicial action comes from the critical Parent. Miss Watson's admonitions, pap's political tirades, and the Southern Slave ethic are all examples of the thoughtless

behaviors of the critical Parent. Huckleberry Finn's ethical system also comes from this part of his personality structure. Berne's nurturing Parent stands in direct opposition to the critical. The nurturing Parent offers a kind of maternal security, which provides protection with caring comfort and understanding. In spite of what Huck may think, the widow Douglas functions primarily from the nurturing Parent. As his foster parent, her primary concern is to nurture him. Jim also nurtures Huck; he treats him sweetly and calls him "honey." In some ways, he becomes Huck's surrogate parent on the raft, but the two are primarily playmates. In addition, Judge Thatcher looks out for Huck's interests as do the Phelpses; they also function from the nurturing Parent.

Parental behavior is learned behavior, and there exists a built-in efficiency in these actions. For example, when Miss Watson admonishes Huck for his unacceptable behavior and threatens him with "providence," she does not have to think. Her actions are rather like the playback mode of a video tape recorder which shows a collection of behaviors and attitudes imitated from her actual parents and from authority figures. Huck takes time to reflect on her values because they are essentially new to him. The widow, however, has no reason to question the validity of the values with which she attempts to indoctrinate Huck. These values are her imprinted ethical system on playback mode. The critical Parent also infiltrates the very language used in the novel. The word

nigger, for example, rasps easily and colloquially from the lips of numerous characters in Twain's novel. This word may be unpalatable to the modern reader, but Twain's characters mouth the word as they would any other part of their regular vocabulary. The characters in HF do not reflect upon the implications of this word. Actions, gestures, and language from the Parent represent a behavioral repertoire that has, in itself, no intrinsic moral value. These modeled behaviors involve no freedom of choice; they simply represent static, learned responses. In Huckleberry Finn, most characters act not on their own volition or from their own legitimate emotional needs, but according to Southern tradition. Twain's players act out all the values HF wishes to satirize.

If the Parent's parental actions, speech patterns, and behaviors are like a videotape recording, then the Adult, which Berne loosely associates with Freud's ego, functions like a computer. The Adult receives, analyzes, and integrates information which includes messages from the Parent, feelings from the Child, and data from others and from the environment. The Adult acts logically, systematically, and thinks and makes predictions about people and events. The Adult ego state recognizes the need for intimacy and has the capacity for straight communication. For example, when someone dares to say: "I like you; do you like me?" that person is acting from the Adult. By taking a risk and asking directly, the Adult secures honest strokes

and necessary units of recognition for the Child. Adult function becomes contaminated when values and opinion from the Parent are taken as fact or when the Child's fantasies are taken as reality. The Southern slave ethic contaminates Adult functioning in Huckleberry Finn. Under these circumstances, the Adult becomes incapable of intimacy, of securing strokes honestly. Huck is an adolescent; his Adult has not yet had time to develop fully or to emerge with any coherent system of reality testing. His "yaller dog" conscience, his gut feelings, tell him there is something wrong with the slave ethic, but an insufficiently developed Adult prevents him from making any real ethical choice. His delinquent behaviors continue because he lacks any Adult function that would allow him to reality test and choose otherwise. The needs of his Child are paramount, and he lives according to those needs.

The Child ego state parallels Freud's id. Berne distinguishes between the natural Child and the adapted Child. The natural Child is curious, creative, intuitive, and sensitive. Hester Prynne's daughter Pearl provides a good example of the natural Child. She is free but can also be greedy, vain, and unrestrainably impulsive. Huck is much like Hester. His primary value in life is living "free and easy." The adapted Child can be either conforming or rebellious. Huck conforms for awhile, and appears close to becoming a good citizen and adopting the values of St. Petersburg. But submissiveness leads to Huck's

fidgeting, pouting, and ultimately acting out by running away. Huck has little trouble saying "no" to the values of the genteel Southern tradition. In fact, his Conduct Disordered behavior appears to be in opposition to most traditional human values, respect for family, property, and the truth. When Huck feels constricted, he rebels, and his rebellion makes him a social outcast. His behavior removes him from the social system that Twain satirizes, but he is alienated from that system. Alienation in Eden carries a price, and Huck pays that price. In terms of the Bernian paradigm, Huck is incapable of honestly meeting his needs for recognition hunger. He needs strokes for emotional survival, but he must depend on crooked strokes. Huck's predominant ego state is that of the rebellious Child. He feels extreme discomfort because of injunctions from the critical Parent in his milieu, from Miss Watson and the widow Douglas, from Judge Thatcher and the cultural tradition he represents, and from the brutality of pap. Huck rebels by running from these, and his conduct disordered behavior serves as the means for his escape. His energies are not concerned with ethical choice; his actions are, rather, geared toward crooked emotional survival. Blatant disregard for the truth, others' property, and ultimately others' feelings is the way Huck secures the necessary strokes for his emotional survival. In short, Huck secures crooked strokes by playing psychological Games.

Transactional Analysis makes a distinction between

psychological Games and childhood play. Tom Sawyer's elaborate and ritualistic fantasies are all acted out in fun. Tom's lack of concern for Jim is not the result of any conscious cruelty because Jim's welfare remains secondary to his sense of play. Huckleberry Finn serves as a vehicle for Twain's sense of fun also. Twain, for example, experiences just as much enjoyment poking fun at Romantic literary tradition in the "Walter Scott" sequence as Tom does in the "evasion" episode. Huck, on the other hand, finds it difficult to play in the same spirit and with the same relish as his friend Tom. Any reservations to participate that Huck may have, come, not from a concern for Jim, but because he finds Tom's antics often tedious, troublesome, and time consuming. Huck does not actively take time out to play children's games, his behavior is directed toward fulfilling deep emotional needs. Huck fills his need for strokes by unconsciously indulging in psychological Games. His Conduct Disordered behavior, therefore, makes sense.

A psychological Game is, according to Berne, a way of structuring time, a "basically dishonest" way to get strokes, and ultimately a way to avoid intimacy (48). A Game involves a set of transactions or human interactions that seem plausible on the surface. The purpose of these transactions is, however, ulterior. Games conclude with a predictable payoff, which is the real purpose for playing. The payoff usually supports an existential position, a topdog/underdog way of relating with others. "Games prevent honest,

intimate, and open relationships between players. Yet people play them because they fill up time, provoke attention, reinforce early opinions about self and others, and fulfill a sense of destiny" (James 32). A good deal of psychological Game playing exists in Huckleberry Finn. The Boggs/Sherburn episode offers a classic example of a third degree psychological Game, a Game whose ultimate payoff ends in the morgue. Boggs rides into town drunk and vents a month's worth of anger toward colonel Sherburn. For the most part, the townsfolk and especially the layabouts pay little attention to him. In the past, this scene has apparently been repeated with unsurprising regularity. Boggs plays "Blemish" with Sherburn. According to Berne, "This game is the source of a large percentage of dissension in everyday life; it is played from the depressive Child position 'I am no good,' which is protectively transformed into the Parental position 'They are no good'" (112-113). Boggs taunts Sherburn. The colonel, on this occasion, has had enough. He issues an ultimatum from his critical Parent. Boggs's Child is hurt and he reacts by turning up the juice. Sherburn kills him. For Boggs, the payoff of the Game and the ultimate negative stroke is death, and depending on the early details of his life circumstances, perhaps a "Don't Be" life script has been dramatized.

Huck observes this Game and its consequences from the sidelines and simply reports the action. After Sherburn disperses the lynch mob, Huck says: "I could a staid, if I'd

a wanted to, but I didn't want to. I went to the circus, and loafed around the back side till the watchman went by, and then dived under the tent" (191). Huck, apparently unmoved by this drama, and unwilling to pass moral judgement, continues to meet the needs of his Child.

Huck's seemingly callous attitude toward most of the people he meets along the river has its genesis in the way he was raised. Pap's life game is "Alcoholic," and Huck is a child of confusion and brutality. Of its three variants, pap most often plays "Wino." His problem drinking has gone well beyond "Lush," or "Drunk and Proud." (For a detailed analysis of these variants see Steiner). The latter two variants play "Kick Me" as a correlative Game. "Wino" players play "Kick Me Real Hard." "Wino" is always part of a destructive life script, and the thesis of pap's Game is "I'm no good, you're O.K. (ha, ha)." This translates into "You're really no better than I am; Just try and fix me," or "See if you can help me, you SOB." Pap's status as the town drunk makes him privileged. He avoids responsibility: "What can you expect from the town drunk?" He always has a place to sleep, something to eat, and something to drink. His apparent existential position is that of victim, and there are a host of rescuers that reinforce his Game. Judge Thatcher's circuit replacement, for example, takes an interest in pap and thinks he has helped sober him up. Pap becomes a model citizen for a short time only to go on a roaring drunk and trash his benefactor's home. "The judge he felt kind of

sore," Huck recalls, "He said he reckoned a body could reform the old man with a shotgun, maybe, but he didn't know no other way" (28). The judge is rightly "sore" because pap's game calls for a shift in roles. The payoff is that the judge becomes the real victim of pap's binge. Staying drunk is a way for pap to avoid coming to terms with his own shortcomings. Being the town drunk is a symbolic way of gaining forgiveness, a method for attaining absolution without confession. Pap's game has its price. His severe involvement with alcohol means inevitable tissue destruction. His death, apparently in a drunken brawl, is the logical conclusion of a "Don't Be" life script.

Pap's game has undeniable effects on Huck's life. His drunken rages result in severe physical abuse. But, at times, Huck likes to be with his father. He enjoys the "free and easy" life with pap near the river, but he cannot stand the beatings. Worse yet is pap's example. The sins, or irresponsible behavior, of the father are passed on to the son. Scott Donaldson examines the notion of nurture in his essay "Pap Finn's Boy." Donaldon observes Huck's character from a nature v/s nurture perspective and contends that nurture is too strong to overcome, and that Huck remains much like his father. Huck's attitude toward negroes, for example, are the same as pap's. Donaldson argues: "Despite efforts to 'sivilize' him, Huck Finn remains the child of his father. He accepts pap's sense of superiority to niggers, he accepts pap's superstitious beliefs, and he accepts pap's

role. Huck Finn, like his father before him, is an outcast. The difference is that Huck rejects society, whereas society has rejected pap" (37).

Society appears to reject pap because of his alcohol abuse. At this early point in his life, Huck appears to be different. His drug abuse is limited to nicotine. He is only around fourteen years old, and he seems to shy away from alcohol. Nevertheless, pap's influence is undeniable. If Huck's Conduct Disordered behavior is closely examined in terms of Bernian Game theory, his delinquent actions seem to have dynamics similar to those in pap's playing "Alcoholic." In his analysis of pap's Game, Berne notes that "children of alcoholics often go through many of the maneuvers characteristic of the Alcoholic." Applying this clinical observation to Huck's Conduct Disordered behavior, Berne would continue by identifying Huck's primary Game as "See if you can catch me." For Huck specifically, this would translate into "'See if you can stop me,' which involves lying, hiding things, seeking derogatory comments, looking for helpful people, finding a benevolent neighbor who will give free handouts, etc." (80).

Narrative action in the text supports Berne's thesis. Close attention to the ulterior motives behind Huck's actions provides striking parallels to the purposes for pap's behavior. Like pap, Huck does not have to look at his own shortcomings because he is always on the move. Pap avoids introspection and evaluation by drinking alcohol. Huck

avoids insight and understanding by fleeing. Both have a host of characters that serve as a supporting cast to rescue them, take care of them, and castigate them. Both indulge in Game playing to fulfill a sense of destiny, satiate needs for recognition hunger crookedly, and avoid intimacy. Both operate from an existential position that says "Everybody wants to deprive me" (Berne 81). Huck, in particular, seems to tell himself, "Everyone wants to deprive me of my freedom, so I'll keep on running." Pap beats up not only his son, but also his child's Child. Huck stands little chance for autonomous living. He must play these games because his actions from the constant Child require that he rebel. He runs away from the widow's and Miss Watson's society from his father and from himself. Huck is scripted to become an outcast because of the way he was nurtured.

"See if you can catch me," is the primary Game Huck inherits from pap. A secondary Game that reinforces Huck's position is "Ain't it Awful." This Game is a parental pastime, an exchange of attitudes from the critical Parent. Pap's political tirades and his bigotry are an example of "Ain't it Awful:"

> Oh, yes, this is a wonderful govment, wonderful. Why looky here. There was a free nigger there, from Ohio; a mulatter, most as white as a white man.. . . and there ain't a man in that town that's got as fine clothes as what he had; and he had a gold watch and chain, and a silver-headed cane. . . And what do you

> think? they said he was a p'fessor in a college, and could talk all kinds of languages, and knowed everything. And that ain't the wust. They said he could vote, when he was at home. Well that let me out. Thinks I, what is the country a-coming to? (333-34).

Huck's version of the Game is less windy but much more sophisticated. "It made me so sick I most fell out of the tree," He says while witnessing the killing of Buck Grangerford (153); and "Well it made me sick to see it," he says of the tarred and feathered King and Duke. "Human beings can be awful cruel to one another" (290). These statements appear like legitimate personal concern on Huck's part. Twain's delinquent seems to have extreme sensitivity, but Huck notes that he is "too late" to do anything in his next breath, and dismisses his concern: "it don't make no difference whether you do right or wrong, a person's conscience ain't got no sense, and just goes for him anyway. If I had a yaller dog that didn't know no more than a person's conscience does, I would pison him. It takes up more room than all the rest of a person's insides, and yet ain't no good, nohow" (290). Huck's reaction to the events in both of these episodes is similar. Whenever he might feel the pangs of his conscience, he "pisons" his feelings by running away. He runs back to the "free and easy and comfortable" river immediately after the Shepherdon / Grangerford episode, and summarily begins to plan the "Evasion" with his friend Tom Sawyer soon after after the tar

and feathering. By noting real or imagined injustices but failing to take a position on them, both pap and Huck keep the focus shifted from themselves. Huck's "yaller dog conscience" is an inefficient moral gauge. As Thomas Harris notes, "He simply fails to do what he believes to be right--he isn't strong enough, hasn't the 'spunk of a rabbit'" (127). "By playing "Ain't it Awful," pap and Huck reinforce their respective Games, "Alcoholic" and "Runaway."

Another secondary Game Huck plays to reinforce his runaway position is "Now I've Got You, You, Son of a Bitch" (NGYSOB). This Game can best be explained in terms of the persecutor and victim roles. The player, who is the persecutor, gets even for real or imagined injustices by playing from a one-up position and proving the victim needs to punished. The "You're not O.K." position is reinforced for the victim. Walter Shear examines NGYSOB and other role playing devices in his analysis of Huckleberry Finn. Shear sees these as "the most insistent characteristic of the novel, [as a] plethora of role-playing situations--boy's games, disguises, tricks, plans, self-deceptions, hypocrisies, and public shows of various kinds" (379). Huck plays NGYSOB on Jim when he decides to frighten him with the snake. The same Game works when Huck pretends that he and Jim were never separated in the fog. Huck's elaborate lies are both pastimes and attempts at playing NGYSOB. The King and the Duke are excellent NGYSOB players; their confidence schemes utilize this game as the

foundation for their swindle's internal dynamics. Huck is no professional; he is still learning. Nevertheless, he is a willing accomplice. Under the tutelage of the King and Duke, his Game playing becomes refined. Shear notes that Huck is "willing to go along with what develops," (389) and that "he remains a character remarkably similar to what he has always been." Shear adds that "Twain's point seems to be that he does not change" (391).

Nurture has played a great part in determining why Huck's behavior is Conduct Disordered, and game theory has shown the dynamics behind that behavior. Huck, like most teenagers, acts primarily from the Child. However, unlike a normal teenager, he suffers because he is the product of extremely dysfunctional child-rearing practices. A normal teenager has the capacity to test reality by exercising a newly emerging Adult. Huck, on the other hand, has become scripted to stay primarily in the rebellious Child. He inherits pap's Games and plays variations on his own theme. Huck is "Pap Finn's boy" in the opening pages of the novel, and he remains "pap Finn's boy" at the novel's end. Huck's behavior appears to be pap's imprint; pap, however, has no appeal for the novel's reader. Huck's appeal is undeniable. Huckleberry Finn appears to be much more than a nineteenth-century delinquent. He is a household hero. What makes Twain's bad boy so appealing? What does the modern reader find so likeable in a Conduct Disordered adolescent apparently on his way to a life of sociopathy? This question remains to be answered.

Chapter IV

Lighting Out for the Territory

Perhaps it is unfair to ask what might become of Huck. Would Twain's lovable delinquent, for example, grow up to be like Murphy, Ken Kesey's rogue-protagonist in _One Flew Over the Cuckoos Nest_? DSM criteria have shown that, in the context of the novel's narrative action, Huck Finn exhibits a set of behaviors that undeniably qualify him as severely Conduct Disordered. TA has helped explain the behavioral dynamics behind Huck's Conduct Disordered Actions, and has also offered clues as to where he might be going in light of these dynamics. To guess about any future direction Huck's behavior may take remains pure speculation because any attempts at predicting his behavior would be extratextual. However, Huck does not live solely in the vacuum of the text. He survives as a legend, a singularly American character. Twain attempted to resurrect him in a sequel, and He continues to exist as a character living well beyond the novel's conclusion.

Huck creates additional scope for himself with his final words: "But I reckon I got to light out for the Territory ahead of the rest," he says, "because aunt Sally she's going to adopt me and sivilize me and I can't stand it. I been there before" (362). In deciding to "light out

for the Territory" and escape from "sivilization," Huck entices the reader to go with him; like a siren, he beckons us to follow. He seems to ask if we might tag along and join him as witness to further escape and more adventure. Huck remains a difficult character to leave alone. In fact, Twain found it hard to let him rest. "From Huckleberry Finn Twain dived straight into 'Huck Finn & Tom Sawyer among the Indians', taking his comic trio along the Oregon Trail from Missouri across Nebraska to the Platte River and along the Platte into Sioux Territory" (Beaver 187). Twain had to abandon this project after nine chapters because he got his characters into a tricky situation involving sexual innuendo, but Huck, nevertheless, lived on. Twain's trio, Huck, Tom, and Jim, survived in plans for a Broadway stage production, well in advance of the one realized in 1985, not only for commercial purposes but because of Twain's intense personal interest as well. Huck's magnetism, for author and reader alike, appears to demand some critical speculation.

According to DSM-III-R, Conduct Disorder is a necessary prerequisite for diagnosing a sociopath, or someone with Antisocial Personality Disorder. "The essential feature of this disorder is a pattern of irresponsible and antisocial behavior beginning in childhood or early adolescence and continuing into adulthood. For this diagnosis to be given, the person must be at least 18 years of age and have a history of Conduct Disorder before the age of 15" (342). Huck does not meet the criterion for age, but of the ten

items (see appendix) necessary for making this diagnosis, Huck, in all probability, might qualify for at least four, the minimum number of required behaviors. Huck would surely be unable "to sustain consistent work behavior," which would involve "significant unemployment. . . repeated absences. . . [and/or] abandonment of several jobs without realistic plans for others." He would most certainly "fail to conform to social norms with respect to lawful behavior." That Huck would be willing to stop "borrowing," seems incomprehensible. It appears safe to assume that Huck would continue to show disregard for others' property, and that he would continue to have "no regard for the truth." He would most likely carry on with his lies, use aliases, and continue "'conning' others for personal profit or pleasure" (345). As a willing accomplice of the King and Duke, Huck has learned his lessons well. Finally, Huck would persist in showing a conspicuous lack of remorse for his actions. That is, he would feel "justified in having hurt, mistreated, or stolen from another" (346). Huck's maltreatment of Jim in the final chapters of the novel and his continuous disregard for others' property are life-long patterns of behavior that would be difficult for him to break. Huck's renunciation of "sivilization" and any chance for behavioral intervention through structured life with the widow, would, in all probability, lead to a life of sociopathy, an existence well outside the parameters of the law. These behavioral projections can be verified by applying the Bernian paradigm.

Sociopathy, according to the transactional model, represents personality structure consisting of a Child-contaminated Adult, and a blocked-out Parent. Any normal teenager's emerging Adult function is Child-contamintated. The normal adolescent growth process represents a time when Adult function competes with the Child's needs. Social and ethical considerations are weighed against fantasy and fun. The healthy Adult, in this process, emerges as a life-long vehicle for processing information and making decisions based on values learned from the Parent and from experential evidence. In healthy development, the Adult engages in a process of separation from the Child, but the Child still recognizes its needs, preserves them and functions within acceptable social and ethical parameters. In abnormal development, the Sociopath uses the Adult to process information only to get what he wants--to meet the needs of his Child without ethical restriction. Each time Huck plays "See if you can catch me," or any of his other Games, he reinforces behaviors typical of the Child and restricts the emergence of his Adult.

The blocked-out Parent results because of dysfunctional child-rearing. Thomas H. Harris, M.D. addresses this issue in I'm OK--You're OK. Harris's observations seem especially relevant to Huck:

> This condition develops in the person whose real parents, or those who fulfilled the parental role, were so brutal and terrifying or, in the other extreme, so

doltishly indulgent that the only way to preserve life was to 'shut them off' or block them out. This is typical of the psychopath, the person who at some point early in life gives up the first position I'm Not OK--You're OK, and assumes a new one, I'm OK--You're not OK. This little person concludes correctly that his parents are in fact NOT OK. They are so NOT OK that he excludes them entirely. In the extreme he may do this by homicide. If not this, he at least excludes them psychologically, so that, in a sense, he does not have a Parent. He excludes the painful Parent, but he also excludes what little "good" there is in the Parent. Such a person does not have available to his current transactions any tapes which supply data having to do with social control, appropriate 'shoulds' and 'should nots,' cultural norms, or what, in one sense, may be referred to as conscience. His behavior is dominated by his Child which, through the contaminated Adult, manipulates other people to his own ends. His Adult is able to estimate consequences, but the consequences he is concerned with have to do with whether or not he will be caught and seldom contain elements of concern for others. Although there may be exceptions, the general rule is that we do not learn to be loving if we have never been loved. If the first five years of life consist totally of a critical struggle for physical and psychological survival, this

struggle is likely to persist throughout life (128-29). Harris's description of the sociopath describes Huck appropriately. Indeed, Huck's behavior appears to be that of an emerging sociopath. We must remember, however, that he is not yet an adult, and even though he qualifies for the diagnosis by meeting the minimum four of ten DSM diagnostic criteria, and even though he exhibits behavior well within the parameters of Harris's guidelines, an ultimately definitive diagnosis for Antisocial Personality Disorder cannot be made.

Troublesome questions remain. Considering his behavior, what is the nature of Huck's appeal? Why does he continue to enjoy a hero's status? How can an essentially nonviolent delinquent possibly on his way to becoming a hardened criminal continue to have such enormous appeal? Why do both critic and public continue to disregard Huck's shortcomings and grant him such uncommon favor? Perhaps TA can continue to provide answers.

Structural analysis, especially examination of primary ego states, has shown that, like most teenagers, Huck functions primarily from the mode of the Child. Huck's friend Tom Sawyer does too. Therefore, both boys engage the reader's Child. On this primary level, both account for reader appeal. Reading Huckleberry Finn involves engaging the Adult to process information contained in the written word. Once the story begins to unfold, however, reading becomes automatic, and Twain's characters capture the

reader's Child, especially the natural Child. On this level, Huckleberry Finn is pure escape. Tom's elaborate fantasies and Romantic schemes take the reader back to childhood. Huck's "free and easy and comfortable" life on the raft, his dream-like life on the river becomes the reader's reverie. Life on the raft is pure pleasure principle. Huck's creator knew this. Beaver, for example, notes Twain's thoughts on rafting from his book of German travels:

> 'The motion of the raft . . . is gentle, and gliding, and smooth, and noiseless; it calms down all feverish activities, it soothes to sleep all nervous hurry and impatience; under its restful influence all the troubles and vexations and sorrows that harness the mind vanish away, existence becomes a dream, a charm, a deep and tranquil ecstasy' (98).

Twain seduces the reader's natural Child. Huck's ecstasy becomes our ecstasy.

Both Huck and Tom capture our natural Child. Huck's "gentle, and gliding, and smooth, and noiseless" movement down the Mississippi offers a consistent means for escape. Tom's fantasies serve the same purpose. His attraction for the Child, however, becomes at times, tedious. As the last ten chapters show, escape through consistent Child identification with Tom can prove boring, at times, as the the evasion episode proves. Too much is simply too much. Tom's Romantic fantasies prove tiresome, and his appeal for the reader's Child loses force. Both Huck and Tom hook our

Child, but where Tom fails, Huck continues to set the hook. Both appeal to our natural sense of fun and offer an escape from our parental admonitions and critical injunctions. Both help us temporarily lose our sense of right and wrong. Both allow us some free time, some relief. But we find more release through Huck because he does not occupy respectable status in his society. Tom plays his fantasies but remains a respectable member of the community. Tom's Child is that of a normal adolescent. Huck is a rebel.

Since he is a rebel, Huck engages the reader's child in more sophisticated ways. He appeals not only to our natural Child but to our rebellious Child as well. Each of us has discomforting parental messages that cause stress. Healthy individuals process these "shoulds" and "should nots" from the critical Parent by engaging the Adult because our Adult has the capacity to reevaluate archaic opinions and attitudes. "Shoulds," "Have tos," and "Oughts" are all injunctions inherited from the critical Parent, for example. The Adult evaluates these injunctions for perfection in realistic terms. Any given task can thus be perceived in terms of performance rather than unrealistic expectation. The Adult acts as moderator for healthy personality function. But evaluation and moderation require work. Escape is "free and easy." Huck appeals to us because our proclivity for inaction is as great as our capacity for action. Our tendency toward rebellion is just as strong.

Each of us has an innate tendency to act out, to pout,

to become frustrated and angry if we don't get our own way. Our social conscience, however, and our Adult and its private sense of right and wrong offer an ethical system to temper our capacity for unrestrained rebellion. If, for example, a superior unjustly criticizes our performance, we might experience an impulse to strike back or to run. Or we could restrain our impulses and communicate dissatisfaction appropriately. In short, we have the capacity either to engage our Adult and work toward a solution, or to take the easy way out and run from any attempts at resolving the problem. Huck beckons us to run, to "light out for the territory." When we run with Huck we run from responsibility. Each of us experiences these sociopathic tendencies, but integrated personality function restrains them. In a sense, when we travel with Huck, we lose this restraint. When we distance ourselves from ourselves in HF we find relief through escape, from our instincts, from our compulsions, and from our social selves. When we as readers live in the escapist world of the novel, we also experience minimal Adult function. Like Huck, who has been scripted to run from maturity, we are temporarily allowed to run from responsibility. Huck sees through the eyes of a child and acts primarily from the Child. And we, as readers, join him in that flight. Like Huck, we becomes observers of action rather than examples of behavior.

In fact, Twain has Huck, the narrator, report not as exemplar but as observer. Huck's delinquent behavior, in

this sense, does not conflict with ethical purpose. Huck's behavior removes him from real ethical choice. This ethical disassociation manifests itself in Huck's decision not to expose Jim's presence to Miss Watson. Huck destroys the letter he has written not as a solution to any moral dilemma, but because he "feels" for Jim. Jim sometimes enjoys and other times suffers the status of Huck's playmate for a good part of the novel. Initially, the two become childhood friends. Both are runaways; both function from the natural and rebellious Child. Both are involved in play. Kids, in short, like the company of kids. Huck's love for Jim, then, is a childlike love, a "felt" love. In showing concern for Jim, Huck proves that he cares for Jim because they are playmates and partners in crime, not because he makes an ethical decision or an Adult choice. Huck makes choices with his emotions, not his intellect. He "feels" his way through right and wrong. And his feelings are mutable.

When Huck's loyalties switch to Tom in the final chapters, he shows cold disregard for Jim. Jim becomes a pawn for further adventures once Huck finds a new playmate. As observer rather than exemplar, Huck's delinquent behavior does not conflict with ethical purpose. If Huck were a moral model, he would fail as a character. His behavior would, then, be totally incongruent with his ethical system. His real behavior and his "felt" ethical system, remove him from real moral choice. He reports sensitive moral issues, but he is not required to pass judgement on those issues. Likewise,

Twain does not require him to suggest solutions or solve problems. Huck is ethically distanced, and his function, both as character and as narrator removes him from the distastefulness of the novel's action. Huck as constant Child, does not have the capacity to pass moral judgement. His Adult does not process information and weigh evidence. He acts, instead, according to his feelings, his "yaller dog conscience," his Child. He simply reports what Twain wishes to satirize. Chicanery, slavery, and chivalry are all exposed through the eyes of a young boy who has undeniable behavioral problems of his own.

Part of Huck's appeal, then, also lies in the aesthetic distance he helps create. Huck takes the reader with him in dissociating from the novel's distasteful events. Huck escapes from the social circumstances of the novel because he is scripted to escape. But he also escapes because escape is a hidden but necessary requirement of the American dream. Today, most concur with what Horatio Alger articulated this fantasy to be. "In America, we all start the same. With a little luck and a lot of hard work, anyone can become a millionaire."

Americans are scripted to believe this but most experience proves otherwise. Huck offers temporary relief, escape, from the hard realities of the American experience. And the reader subconsciously joins him in this escape. Huck's "free and easy and comfortable" time on the Mississippi becomes part of the reader's time-out. Huck's

lighting out for the Territory becomes the reader's lighting out for the Territory. Ultimately, Huck's escape from "sivilization" becomes an escape from intimacy and responsibility, and we join him in that escape. Huck's fantasies on the river become our fantasies of withdrawal. His appeal for us, then, translates into a kind of opiate like state of unadulterated bliss, a return to the halcyon days of our youth, a time when we were not obligated to concern ourselves with social structure, ethical systems, or our own place in a society that promised so much for so many but proved to reward only a few.

Huck primarily appeals to us in spite of his Conduct Disordered behavior and potential for sociopathy because he offers us a sense of play. He also appeals to us because when we join him in his adventures, we are allowed to escape with him. In addition, as narrator, he helps create distance for us from ethical issues. When we play "Ain't It Awful" with him, we are both absolved of responsibility and we both avoid intimacy. We secure dishonest strokes with Huck by criticizing others and thereby, shift focus from ourselves. Finally, Huck appeals to us because HF acts as a kind of tranquilizing agent. When we so completely offer Huckleberry Finn our sentiments, he, in turn, dispenses palliative relief from the harsh realities of the novel and from our own discontent with the harsh realities of the American dream.

Conclusion

Application of DSM criteria and Transactional Analysis has shown that Mark Twain's Huckleberry Finn is a complex character who appears deceptively simple. This disparity has helped account for over one hundred years of critical debate. Huck is not the complete saint. Nor is he the superlative sinner. Those who see him as total saint have difficulty with the novel's conclusion. Those who see him as sinner have trouble with Huck's unequivocal appeal. Both generally find the novel's ending inconsistent with the rapturous tone of the middle section. Both, therefore, experience difficulties with structure and unity.

Unlike the traditional Freudian or Jungian approaches, contemporary behavioral psychology has helped provide insight into Huck's character without focusing on disturbing sexual overtones or transcendent mythic elements. DSM criteria and the Bernian paradigm have provided a systematic method for analysis that focuses on specific behaviors rather than extratextual concerns. These disciplines and this analysis have shown that Huck is much more than Mark Twain's apparently simple and innocent adolescent narrator. Huck's behavior proves him to be a troubled adolescent incapable of ethical choice.

Huck seems to struggle with apparent ethical choice when he decides not to reveal the whereabouts of his friend Jim.

Many, like Hemingway, have seen this episode as the true climax of the novel. Huck tears up the letter he has written to Miss Watson and says to himself, "All right, then, I'll go to hell" (271). Many have perceived Huck's affirmation as the purity of conscious moral choice, as the noble savage acting from a posture that proves man's innate decency. But closer inspection, in the light of contemporary behavioral psychology, has shown that Huck's words are an additional decision made from the constant Child ego state. Huck decides not to turn in his friend, Jim, because they are playmates, and they share the loyalties of friendship. Huck's love for Jim is a felt love, not a clearly defined cognitive care. Furthermore, Huck's decision to "go to hell" appears to be another act of rebellion not thought out, but acted out from his Child. In refusing to accept ethical standards that condone slavery, Huck continues to reject all ethical standards. He chooses to burn for eternity because he continues to act against and defy Miss Watson's ethical system, Judge Thatcher's ethical system, the widow Douglas's, and the entire moral structure Twain wishes to satirize.

DSM criteria have shown that Huck is Conduct Disordered, that his actions are delinquent by both DSM and any reasonable standards. His behavior also indicates that he may be headed toward a life of sociopathy. TA has shown that Huck learned these behaviors from pap, and that like his father, he is scripted to avoid intimacy and to run from responsibility. The Games Huck plays allow him to shift

focus from himself and find blame in others.

This shift in focus, this other-directed point of view makes Huck an almost perfect narrator. By engaging the reader's Child, Huck helps place aesthetic distance between individual ethics and the novel's harsh realities. Twain uses Huck, the almost amoral adolescent, to report a series of events and episodes that he wishes to satirize. Huck, as delinquent observer, reports what he sees but has no clearly articulated ethical system to make judgements about what he reports. He leaves that to us. Once we put the book down and once our Adult begins to process information, we realize that any ethical choice and any consequent change must come from us. Huck remains incapable of evaluating and acting. Ultimately, the responsibility of choice and change lies with us.

When we look at Huckleberry Finn in terms of what contemporary behavioral psychology has shown, we discover that HF is a complete work. Twain's novel has a beginning, a middle, and an end that are all compatible with Huck's character. Huck, the consistently Conduct Disordered adolescent, runs away in the first chapter, continues to run with Jim, and "lights out for the territory" in the end. He experiences no significant change in character for the better. In fact, he appears to learn his lessons well. His alliance with the King and the Duke equips him with additional underhanded survival techniques. Huck remains ready to fulfill a life script demanding that he continue to

avoid intimacy and responsibility. By making the novel's conclusion consistent with the beginning, by having Huck run both in the initial chapter and in the end, Twain seems to ask if we as reader have the courage to evaluate, to act and to effect change. Huck makes us feel like children, and he allows us to withdraw into our innate capacity for escape and rebellion, but what he reports also appeals to our ethical sense, our sense of social responsibility, our final sense of right and wrong. Through our personal ethical choice, the consistently unifying theme of the Adventures of Huckleberry Finn, Twain reminds us that Huck cannot act, but we can.

Works Cited

American Psychiatric Association: Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Third Edition, Revised. Washington, DC, American Psychiatric Association, 1987.

Beaver, Harold. Huckleberry Finn. London: Unwin, 1987.

Bennet, Johnathan. "The Conscience of Huckleberry Finn." Philosophy 49 (1974): 123-134.

Bloom, Harold. ed. Mark Twain's Adventures of Huckleberry Finn: Modern Critical Interpretations. New York: Chelsea, 1986.

Carrington, George C. Jr. The Dramatic Unity of Huckleberry Finn. Columbus: OSUP, 1976.

Coleman, James C., James N. Butcher, and Robert C, Carson. Abnormal Psychology and Modern Life. 7th ed. Glenview: Scott, 1984.

Donaldson, Scott. "Pap Finn's Boy." South Atlantic Bulletin 36 (1971): 32-37.

Eliot, T.S. "American Literature and the American Language." Address delivered at Washington University, 9 June 1953. Rpt. Sewanee Review 74 (1966): 751-56.

Fiedler, Leslie. "Come Back to the Raft Ag'in Huck Honey." Partisan Review 15 (1948): 664-71. Rpt. in Inge (1985): 93-101.

Guerin, Wilfred L., Earle G. Labor, Lee Morgan, and John Willingham. "The Psychological Approach," A Handbook of Critical Approaches to Literature. 2nd ed. New York: Harper, 1979, 134-138.

Gwin Minrose C. "Repetition and Recollection: The Unconscious Discourse of Mark Twain's Autobiography." Literature and Psychology 33.3,4 (1987): 120-129.

Hamblen, Abigail. "The Best-Known Teenager: Huck Finn." Mark Twain Journal 13.3 (1966-67): 66-67.

Harris, John. "Principles, Sympathy and Doing What's Right." Philosophy 52 (1977): 96-99.

Harris, Thomas A. I'm OK You're OK. 1967. New York: Avon, 1973.

Hemingway, Ernest. "Pursuit and Conversation," Green Hills of Africa. New York: Scribner, 1935.

Hill, Hamlin. "Huck Finn's Humor Today." Sattelmeyer 297-307.

Hoffman, Michael J. "Huck's Ironic Circle." originally entitled "Three problems of Fictional Form: First-Person Narration in David Copperfield and Huckleberry Finn." From Experience in the Novel. New York: Columbia UP, 1968. Rpt in Bloom 21-44.

Huber, James. CNN Daybreak. CNN, Atlanta. 20 Oct. 1988.

Inge, Thomas M. Huck Finn among the Critics: A Centennial Selection. Frederick, Maryland: UP of America, 1985.

Kasteley, James L. "The Ethics of Self-Interest: Narrative Logic in HuckleberryFinn. "Nineteenth-Century Fiction 40.4 (1986): 412-437.

Marx, Leo. "Mr. Eliot, Mr. Trilling, and Huckleberry Finn." American Scholar 22.4 (1953), 423-40. Rpt. Kenneth S. Lynn. Huckleberry Finn: Text, Sources, and Criticism. New York: Harcourt, 1961. 202-210.

May, Charles E. "Literary Masters and Masturbators: Sexuality, Fantasy, and Reality in Huckleberry Finn." Literature and Psychology. 28.2 (1978): 85-92.

Mencken, H. L. "Final Estimate." The Smart Set. Ed. William H. Nolte. 15.3 Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1968.

Patterson, Robert G. "Death on the Mississippi: Mark Twain's Huckleberry Finn." Psychological Perspectives 7 (1976): 9-32.

Sattelmeyer, Robert and J. Donald Crowley. eds. One Hundred Years of Huckleberry Finn: The Boy, His Book, and American Culture. Columbia: U of Missouri P, 1985.

Shear, Walter. "Games People Play in Huckleberry Finn." Midwest Quarterly 20.4 (1979): 378-393.

Steiner, Claude. Games Alcoholics Play: The Analysis of Life Scripts. 1971. New York: Ballantine, 1984.

Twain, Mark. Adventures of Huckleberry Finn. 1885. Berkeley: U of California P, 1985.

Trilling, Lionel. Introduction. The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn. By Mark Twain. New York: Rinehart, 1948.

von Frank, Albert J. "Huck Finn and the Flight from Maturity." Studies in American Fiction 7 (1979): 1-15.

Zuckert, Catherine H. "Law and Nature in the Adventures of Huckleberry Finn." Proteus 1.2 (1984): 27-35. Rep. in Inge, (231-246).

Appendix

Diagnostic criteria for Conduct Disorder

A. A disturbance of conduct lasting at least six months, during which at least three of the following have been present:

(1) has stolen without confrontation of a victim on more than one occasion (including forgery)
(2) has run away from home overnight at least twice while living in parental or parental surrogate home (or once without returning)
(3) often lies (other than to avoid physical or sexual abuse)
(4) has deliberately engaged in fire setting
(5) is often truant from school (for older person absent from work)
(6) has broken into someone else's house, building or car
(7) has deliberately destroyed others property (other than by fire setting)
(8) has been physically cruel to animals
(9) has forced someone into sexual activity with him or her
(10) has used a weapon in more than one fight
(11) often initiates physical fights
(12) has stolen with confrontation of a victim (e.g., mugging, purse-snatching, extortion, armed robbery)
(13) has been physically cruel to people

Note:The above items are listed in descending order of discriminating power based on data from a national field trial of the DSM-III-R criteria for Disruptive Behavior Disorders.

B. If 18 or older, does not meet criteria for Antisocial Personality Disorder.

Criteria for severity of Conduct Disorder:

Mild: Few if any conduct problems in excess of those required to make the diagnosis, and conduct problems cause only minor harm to others.

Moderate: Number of conduct problems and effect on others intermediate between 'mild' and 'severe'.

Severe: Many conduct problems in excess of those required to make the diagnosis, or conduct problems cause considerable harm to others, e.g., serious physical injury to victims,extensive vandalism or theft, prolonged absence from home (55).

Diagnostic Criteria for Antisocial Personality Disorder

A. Current age at least 18.

B. Evidence of Conduct Disorder with onset before age 15, as indicated by a history of three or more of the following:

(1) was often truant
(2) ran away from home overnight at least twice while living in parental or parental surrogate home (or once without returning)
(3) often initiated physical fights
(4) used a weapon in more than one fight
(5) forced someone into sexual activity
(6) was physically cruel to animals
(7) was physically cruel to other people
(8) deliberately destroyed others' property (other than by fire-setting)
(9) deliberately engaged in fire-setting
(10) often lied (other than to avoid physical or sexual abuse)
(11) has stolen without confrontation of a victim on more than one occasion (including forgery)
(12) has stolen with confrontation of a victim (e.g., mugging, purse-snatching, extortion, armed robbery)

C. A pattern of irresponsible and antisocial behavior, as indicated by at least four of the following:

(1) is unable to sustain consistent work behavior, as indicated by any of the following (including similar behavior in academic settings if the person is a student)

(a) significant unemployment for six months or more within five years when expected to work and work was available
(b) repeated absences from work unexplained by illness in self or family
(c) abandonment of several jobs without realistic plans for others

(2) fails to conform to social norms with respect to lawful behavior, as indicated by repeatedly performing antisocial acts that are grounds for arrest (whether arrested or not), e.g., destroying property, harassing others, stealing, pursuing an illegal occupation
(3) is irritable and aggressive, as indicated by repeated physical fights or assaults (not required by one's job or to defend someone or self), including spouse or child-beating

(4) repeatedly fails to honor financial obligations, as indicated by defaulting on debts or failing to provide child support or support for other dependents on a regular basis
(5) fails to plan ahead, or is impulsive, as indicated by one or both of the following:

(a) traveling from place to place without a prearranged job or clear goal for the period of travel or clear idea about when the travel will terminate
(b) lack of a fixed address for a month or more

(6) has no regard for the truth, as indicated by repeated lying, use of aliases, or "conning" others for personal profit or pleasure
(7) is reckless regarding his or her own or others' personal safety, as indicated by driving while intoxicated, or recurrent speeding
(8) if a parent or guardian, lacks ability to function as a responsible parent, as indicated by one or more of the following:

(a) malnutrition of a child
(b) child's illness from lack of minimal hygiene
(c) failure to obtain medical care for a seriously ill child
(d) child's dependence on neighbors or nonresident relatives for food or shelter
(e) failure to arrange for a caretaker for a young child when parent is away from home
(f) repeated squandering, on personal items, of money required for household necessities

(9) has never sustained a totally monogamous relationship for more than one year
(10) lacks remorse (feels justified in having hurt, mistreated, or stolen from another)

D. Occurrence of antisocial behavior not exclusively during the course of Schizophrenia or Manic Episodes (344-346).