



Article Type: Original Research

Page Numbers: 75-93

Received: 04 May 2023

Accepted: 22 February 2024

Published: 10 September 2024

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.22034/cls.2024.63090>

Author Details:

1. PhD Candidate of English Literature, Department of Foreign Languages and Linguistics, College of Literature and Humanities, International Campus of Shiraz University, Shiraz, Iran.

a.moulavi.n@gmail.com

2. Professor of English Literature, Department of Foreign Languages and Linguistics, College of Literature and Humanities, Shiraz University, Shiraz, Iran.

anushir@shirazu.ac.ir

3. Assistant Professor of English Literature, Department of Foreign Languages and Linguistics, College of Literature and Humanities, Shiraz University, Shiraz, Iran. (Corresponding Author)

laleh.atashi@shirazu.ac.ir

Georgiy Daneliya's *Hopelessly Lost* (1973): A Narrative of the Cold War in a Film Adaptation of Twain's *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*

Asghar Moulavinafchi¹; Alireza Anushiravani²; Laleh Atashi^{3*}

Abstract: In the twenty-first century, film adaptation studies shifted to the reworking of the literary text within the new sociopolitical situation of the time. Such literary theories as cultural materialism can explicate the film adaptation. Here, Daneliya's *Hopelessly Lost* (1973) is investigated focusing on the political orientations of the Soviet-American Cold War. Hence, through cultural materialism a window is opened unto the past literary text of Twain's *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* to be read within the political presence of the Cold War. Per se, Sinfield's practice of reading known as a 'theater of war' is applied to show the cracks and the faultlines that the director has used to depict his narrative of the Cold War. Therefore, it is demonstrated that *Hopelessly Lost* (1973) is a film adaptation that has focused on those parts of the novel that contain the dark images of the United States and attempts to develop the types of mutations that are in line with this orientation. Altogether the narrative of the film adaptation promulgates a grim reality that implicates the inevitable downfall of the United States amidst the political alignment of the Cold War through the character of Uncle Sam.

Keywords: Adaptation Studies; *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*; Cold War; Cultural Materialism; *Hopelessly Lost*; Theatre of war.

Citation: Asghar Moulavinafchi; Alireza Anushirvani; Laleh Atashi. "Georgiy Daneliya's *Hopelessly Lost* (1973): A Narrative of the Cold War in a Film Adaptation of Twain's *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*". *Critical Literary Studies*, 6, 2, 2024, -. doi: 10.22034/cls.2024.63090

1. Introduction

Literature is never as nascent as the art of cinema is, but the two have been constant companions since the emergence of cinema in the twentieth century. The purpose that has intertwined the art of literature and cinema more than anything else is the resolution of many directors and producers to adapt literary masterpieces into filmic adaptations. From its early stages, the art of cinema began to profit from literary works and on the other hand, literature found a new narrative to express itself. Though literature and film follow two different kinds of narratives, their perfect symbiosis in the realm of adaptation has substantiated a unique side to art and reveals the majestic aspect that includes various forms of art under one umbrella revealing a brighter glamor and glow to the audience. This can clearly demonstrate how “art can serve as a gateway drug into the ecstasies of the other arts and the jouissance of their intercourse” (Stam 2). Even overlooking Virginia Woolf's unfavorable comment¹ on literary adaptations with the justification that the art of cinema was on its starting point, enumerating the list of negative attributes like “‘tampering,’ ‘interference,’ ‘violation,’ ‘betrayal,’ ‘deformation,’ ‘perversion,’ ‘infidelity,’ and ‘desecration’” (Hutcheon 2), it should be noted that following the notion of literary adaptation is debatable since these two companions have proved to coexist peacefully with each other since the concept of adaptation has made a considerable portion of film awards:

A high proportion of Oscars for Best Picture—85% in 1992—go to film adaptations of literature. Adaptations make up to 95% of American miniseries and 70% of movies of the week that win Emmies. The books in question tend to be middle-brow fictions like *The Godfather* or *The Silence of the Lambs*, with rare forays into the upper ranges of World Literature such as *Hamlet* in 1948 and *Tom Jones* in 1963. (*World Literature, Transnational Cinema* 72)

As demonstrated above, famed literary adaptations have mostly been produced out of less renowned literary books, though certain classical literary works like *Hamlet* or *Tom Jones* could find a niche among the cinematic awards. Still, at the closing the second decade of the twentieth century, the majority of awards are given to less famous literary books, “like *The Godfather* or *The Silence of the Lambs*, with rare forays into the upper ranges of World Literature” (63). It is from this point that we try to engage with the adaptations of *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* which is deemed as “the ideal or quintessential American” (Budd 265). The important and undeniable fact about the

¹ Virginia Woolf has berated the simplification of the literary work that unavoidably happens in “its transposition to the new visual medium and called film a ‘parasite’ and literature its ‘prey’ and ‘victim’” (qtd. in Hutcheon 3)

adaptations of *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* is that seventeen adaptations have been produced out of this specific novel of Mark Twain's throughout the last century while none of them has gained a deep cinematic appreciation². More interestingly, even though, none of these adaptations has achieved significant recognition, the novel has been readapted in countries other than the United States. In this vein, the originality of this article stands on the fact that it attempts to show how a Soviet adaptation of *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* is mainly prioritizing the promoting of tensions and politics of the USSR with the United States over their cinematic success mostly because *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* stands as the ideal sense of being American as it expands on the idea of freedom and the American dream. Therefore, the cultural product is established by the literary adaptation which situates it as a political tool for the reading of the cultural war between the USSR and the United States during the Cold War. This being the case, our investigation considers the ways in which the film adaptation entitled *Hopelessly Lost* (1973) has been shaped by the political discourses of the Cold War. In what follows this research focuses on such questions as why Huck is portrayed as a lost boy, why Jim remains in shackles by the end of the film, and what ideological purpose Uncle Sam serves at the end of the film.

2. Literature Review

Twain's *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* as a nationally definitive work in the United States is supported by a gigantic film industry like Hollywood. From its first silent version in 1920, Hollywood has produced a considerable number of film adaptations out of this novel. Apart from that so-called instance from the silent era, *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* has always been there for film adaptation; ranging from film adaptations produced in 1931, 1939, 1960, 1974, 1993 and the recent loose adaptation entitled *The Peanut Butter Falcon* (2019). Hollywood has never been the sole springboard to introduce Mark Twain's *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* to the world. Twain's masterpiece has also been adapted to film adaptations in other countries; *Hopelessly Lost* (1974) is produced amid the Cold War in the USSR, *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* (2012) is further produced in Germany while *Huckleberry no Bōken* (1976) has been already produced as an anime in Japan. In this regard, *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* as a cross-national adapted film would "create an interface across multiple times and cultures" (Brannigan 88). As such, it is from this point that one needs to engage with *The Adventures of*

² None of the literary adaptations has won a great literary prize. Moreover, based upon IMBD website that ranks films on their popularity among the viewers on the 1-10 scale, fifteen out of seventeen film adaptations have been given the rate of less than six which shows the mediocre status of films adaptations.

Huckleberry Finn and consider it as “a sensitive socio-cultural barometer registering discursive fluctuations” (ibid). Although, the adaptations that are produced out of Twain’s *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* have worked as a barometer noticing the line of American nationality through history. Nevertheless, not so many articles have been written on the varieties of the film adaptations. In a short review of the musical adaptation of Twain’s *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*, Laurie Champion brings the reasons of the difficulty of adapting Twain’s work and she never refers adequately to the specific film adaptation (238). In another rather long article, Perry Frank makes more effort than Laurie Champion for summarizing the plots of the main film adaptations and relating the difficulty of adapting the film to the reason that “Hollywood . . . has been uncertain about whether to treat [it] as a major adult work, or as a children’s tale” (305). The other piece of writing on the film adaptations of *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* is conducted by Clyde Haupt who attempts to study eleven adaptation with regard to the sociopolitical situation of the time and how each one is presented to “critical and popular receptions” and give an “overall evaluation” (2). Altogether the number of critical studies conducted on the film adaptations of *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* is never in proportion with the number of films produced out of Twain’s *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*. R. Kent Rasmussen in his recent article entitled “MGM’s *Huckleberry Finn* Musical That Never Reached the Screen, Part 1” has referred to this lack in the critical studies of *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*:

Between 1920 and 1993, American production companies adapted Mark Twain’s novel *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* (1885) to cinema and television screens eleven times, and foreign producers added their own versions. Despite the vast resources invested in those productions, few of them have won respect from either film or literary critics, and most are now nearly forgotten. (25)

What Rasmussen claims is the difficulty of adapting Twain’s *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* as the reason for it is not being welcomed by the viewers around the world and as such in his further analysis of the reason of this difficulty, he counts the “loosely connected episodes in *Huckleberry Finn*” and “presenting Huck’s story from his point of view” (27) as the reasons for the unqualified film adaptations produced out of Twain’s *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*. Nevertheless, the film adaptations are mainly produced in critical historical times whether in the United States or other countries being involved with the political tensions of the United States.

3. Theoretical Frameworks

The roads of literature and film adaptation as two technically different domains have considerably come close to each other in the twentieth-first century, and the production of a visual representation of written words has become a common business. The convergence of these two roads into parallel directions received full attention recently and as a result the need for conducting a detailed research on this subject is felt with greater intention. If the literary text is to be studied within the context which it is produced and distributed, the amalgam of literary texts and their film adaptations should undergo more rigorous scrutiny. And if the road from literature to cinema is adaptation studies, uncovering the exchanging of ideas between these two domains is the main task. As such, by the end of the twentieth century, adaptation studies distanced itself from the derogatory remarks directed at movie adaptations, describing it as an enemy of literature may not be quite reasonable because cinema can be seen as a potential savior “by popularizing literature through adaptations” (*World Literature, Transnational Cinema* 67). And as the latter part of the twentieth century focused on how the notion of meanings should get decentralized, the gradual spreading of these ideas produced the viewpoint that the centrality of meaning and ideas should be replaced with the relativity of ideas and meaning; “the text feeds on and is fed into an infinitely permutating intertext, which is seen through ever-shifting grids of interpretation” (*The Dialogics of Adaptation* 56). Adaptation studies, if understood to be a platform for reinterpretation, serves “to engage new versions of earlier texts as a means of grappling with the present” (Grossman5). Given the ways, adaptation copes with the present, it never comes close to replacing the present but to read the present in the context of the old text. This is arresting on the point that adaptation studies is the process of understanding of the mutation of the text to screen and to “bring out an agency in viewers, who are positioned to make connections between and among past cultures and texts, and their present re-visioning” (ibid). Since this process is accompanied by constant mutation, adaptations inevitably carry changes and are often exerting the updating of the known texts to match them with the present or a new perspective. Bearing on this view, scholars and writers are edged toward an outlook on adaptation “promoting progressive views and politics, as texts can be rewritten with new attention paid to minority voices” (6). The significance of this view is highlighted when the relation of society and politics tends to be studied together in hierarchical and static system while not tolerating any change to the basic system; this being the case, adaptation studies can serve as an important tool for implementing and detecting other voices in the voice of majority. In this regard, “politics of adaptation

reveals the ideological tendencies of source materials as well as the adapted works” (Göçmen and Akdoğan, 49). More to this point, Margitta Rouse in her article “‘My Country Has (Never) Suffered Defeat’: Adapting Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* for Postwar European Television.” has treated adaptation with regard to history and politics and developed his method of the analysis of Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* as “history politics as adaptation politics” (185). This view shares some similarities with the theory of cultural materialism which is involved in the construction and reconstruction of the culture within the matrix of society so that a detailed analysis of the disrupted society is revealed to the readers and it is with a redeeming power for the betterment of the society or in Milner's term with “an emancipatory politics” (114). Scott Wilson in his article entitled “Revisiting Keywords of Cultural Materialism” extrapolates that the entire notion of cultural materialism never constitutes a coherent theory whereas it has always worked “on the margins of other theories, discourses, disciplines” (307). This explains why cultural materialists tend to lean on the recruitment of history, politics, sociology etc. to create a niche for themselves. Also, more it seems that cultural materialists are emphasizing “the fact that texts can be mobilized and used for political and ideological ends” (Brannigan 98). In this sense, cultural materialism tries to investigate any of the material circumstances in which ideas coexist with each other:

Materialist criticism relates both the literary canon and changing interpretations of it to the cultural formations which produce(d) them, and which those interpretations in turn reproduce, or help to change. In the process it attends to non-canonical texts and offers different conceptions of (for instance) human identity, cultural, social and historical process, as well as the activity of criticism itself. (Dollimore xv)

Within cultural materialist's perspective, a scholar in adaptation studies uncovers reproducers' ideological motives, relating the texts to specific political and historical contexts so as to study whether they are subversive or supportive of the ideological stance obtained in the original text. What cultural materialist proposes here is against the traditional criticism in which a tendency was shared to achieve one goal, however, cultural materialists are with “a call to the democratic ideals of potential, difference and the collective definition of social and political goals” (Brannigan 105). As such, the central puzzle for a cultural materialist is to explore “the implications of literary texts in history” (Dollimore and Sinfield viii). The other point regarding the theory of cultural materialism apart from its unanimity of views is the tunnel that is created by them from the present to the past. In a related note, Catherine Belsey in her *The Subject of Tragedy*,

refers to the end of such undertaking by claiming that the understanding of past is contingent on the present and it is through the present that one gets to the past:

We make a narrative out of the available 'documents', the written texts (and maps and buildings and suits of armour) we interpret in order to produce a knowledge of a world which is no longer present. And yet it is always from the present that we produce this knowledge: from the present in the sense that it is only from what is still extant, still available, that we make it; and from the present in the sense that we make it out of an understanding formed by the present. (1)

Cultural materialists attempt to tread on the same path but with a political orientation. They construct cultural products while actively engaging them with politics. Hence, by engaging literary and cultural criticism in politics, they accentuate the dissenting and opposing features embedded in the literary texts to stand against the conservative orthodoxies. As such, “a literary text yields dissident or subversive reading and that these can be read against the grain of dominant or conservative readings” (Brannigan 110). Dissidence is received as an integral part of cultural materialism but not directed against the dominant ideology; whereas rooted in that dominant ideology and playing with the possible contradictions existing in that system. In this regard, the crucial moments of dissidence are constructed in a narrative similar to that of the dominant ideology but initiating the assumption of dissidence:

dissidence operates, necessarily, with reference to dominant structures. It has to invoke these structures to oppose them, and therefore can always, ipso facto, be discovered reinscribing something that which it proposes to critique...a dissident text may derive its leverage, its purchase, precisely from its partial implication with the dominant. It may embarrass the dominant by appropriating its concepts and imagery. (Sinfield 48)

The important point implied here is that though there is the preconceived notion that the dominant ideology is totally uniform and shaped, still it is filled with “‘fault lines’, cracks ... through which dissident perspectives can be formulated and represented” (Brannigan 172). Hence, Sinfield’s discussion of cultural materialism is shorn of the containment of the binary opposition of theorizing power in the form of dominant and supportive, but to provide the reader with “a dissident reading that is formulated as a means of breaking free from the stultifying limitations of the subversion/containment debate” (Hadfield 462). As such, if the dominant ideology is never totalized, the cracks will be revealed through historical upheavals. On this account, cultural materialist takes oppositional reading out of the text loaded with the dominant ideology, always pointing

to the existence of dissident reading with the traditional reading of the text. They mostly tackle with the issues that are hotly debated and controversial by pulling them out of the cracks that exist in the dominant ideology. No wonder that Sinfield calls the practice of reading “a theatre of war” (1992). Nevertheless, this should be noted that this war of ideas is never followed by a constraint in the vocabularies used by the perpetrators of this war as they are free to debate any legitimate understanding or firmly accepted notions (Brannigan 175). Altogether, cultural materialists attempt to offer a sustained critique of texts while undergoing different historical moments in the timeline of history. For them, literary texts reveal some enlightening moments into understanding new forms of realities constructed with respect to the tenets of each historical era. In short, Sinfield summarizes the main task of cultural materialists as follows:

History affords a better route away from the embarrassment of the text ... a literary text may be understood not as a privileged mode of insight, nor as a privileged formal construction. Initially, it is a project devised within a certain set of practices (the institutions and forms of writing as currently operative), and producing a version of reality which is promulgated as meaningful and persuasive at a certain historical conjuncture. And then, subsequently, it is re-used - reproduced - in terms of other practices and other historical conditions. (48)

Thus, cultural materialism argues for, and demonstrates, a new turn to reading the literary text by mixing some already existing methodology including the historicist, formalist, feminist, socialist and pluralist reading. It raises new and unsettling questions about the dominant ideology by going against the current of the accepted notions and understandings. Cultural materialism, as Dollimore and Sinfield write, “registers its commitment to the transformation of a social order which exploits people on grounds of race, gender and class” (viii). With a view to locate the dissent cracks in each reading of the literary text, cultural materialism’s main task will be “the focus on the possibilities of subversion, the bifocal perspective on both the past and the present ... the view that all forms of representation are engaged in political struggle” (Brannigan 109). Like literary works, adaptation studies can also motivate us to reconsider the world that we are living in and consequently the values that we are attributing to the world. This being the case, adaptation studies are like a vehicle “for promoting progressive views and politics” (Grossman 6) of the present time in which the literary work is adapted. As such, a bridge is built between the past and the present with a focus on studying the issues of the present time. Therefore, adaptation studies are the window through which the past literary works are opened to the present time but with producer’s interest and mind orientation.

4. Film Adaptation: *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* (1973)

In each society, the cultural capital may get refined or enriched. In this regard, the past reality that is the main focus of this study is the text of Mark Twain's *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*. For American literature, undoubtedly, Mark Twain is "the true father of national literature, the first genuinely American author" (Foerstal 190). For readers, to get access to the core of American literature, they should read Mark Twain's works as they are "not less than definitive in American literature" (Trilling 115-6). And among his works, *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* is the one which is "the exemplary great American book" (Arac 184) and with conviction, one can call Huck to be "the representative American" (ibid). This being the case, regarding *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*, this can be drawn that the text is associated with the matter of what it means to be American, thus, there has been a high tendency to adapt the text into film adaptations not only in America but also in other countries. Indeed, the reality that is produced and reproduced by the text amounts to the fact that Americans should refer back to the text to remind themselves of what it means to be American. As such, as the text is adapted into various film adaptations, one should note the discursive formation grappling with the reconstruction of reality out of the original text since no past entity is to be narrated objectively but relatively.

Historically, from the first adaptation of *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* which is a silent movie entitled *Huckleberry Finn* (1920) to the most recent movie entitled *Band of Robbers* (2015) which is a modern and loose adaptation of Twain's *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*, Huck as the central character of the novel and the adventures that are followed by Huck have been intriguing enough for the directors to attempt multiple film and TV adaptations of Twain's classical novel. A great number of adaptations have been scattered in the timeline of cinema and television, nevertheless, three adaptations were produced within two years in the 1980s which is the decade that the world was exposed to the high tensions of the Cold War. First, an adaptation of Twain's *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* is produced in the USSR with the title of *Hopelessly Lost* (1973). Then, two consecutive adaptations are produced in America in 1974 and in 1975 respectively, the first one is a musical adaptation while the second one is adapted for television. Seemingly, the gesture the two countries took during the Cold War was carried into the film adaptations of *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*. *Hopelessly Lost* (1973) can be considered as a product of the cultural war between the United States and the USSR; therefore, the adapted film is studied with respect to the narrative of the Cold War dominating the era. Moreover, as stated by Rushing et al. "film projects the collective

images, fantasies, and values of the culture in which the film is created...film often dramatizes symptoms of particular societal needs of an era" (64). For this purpose, films uncover the cultural consciousness in which they are embedded and created and for which they act as visual markers. As such, an attempt is made to historicize *Hopelessly Lost* (1973) within the context of the Cold War while following the steps of cultural materialism that are mainly adopted for the analysis of the literary texts since it is related to "both the literary canon and changing interpretations of it, to the cultural formations which produce(d) them, and which those interpretations in turn reproduce, or help to change" (Dollimore xv). This being the case, a window is opened from the Cold War to the analysis of *Hopelessly Lost* (1973) while situating it beside Twain's *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*. For this purpose, Twain's masterpiece has become a source text that fits an elaborate depiction of the narrative of the Cold War. Although it is mostly a straight adaptation, a comparative reading of the novel and the film reveals deliberate elisions that require critical attention.

The history of the world in the twentieth century is ravaged by full-scale wars. If the dark image of the First and Second World Wars overshadowed the first half of this century, the second half got frozen within the Cold War. The Cold War with an invisible wall, divided the whole world into two parts of East and West. The main two players of this war were the United States and the Soviet Union that adopted adverse ideologies, respectively. Nevertheless, the Cold War relied more heavily on cultural war rather than battles on the frontier. As Peter G. Boyle mentions it in a study of the role of United States in Cold War:

The Hollywood film, rock 'n' roll music, television soap operas, Coca-Cola, blue jeans and McDonald's hamburgers had much greater influence in undermining communism in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, it might be suggested, than the deterrent power of SDI [Strategic Defense Initiative] or perishing of missiles. (Boyle 488)

As Boyle's comment is expressive, the Cold War leaned on cultural tools more than missiles. Indeed, virtually anything possible "from sport to ballet to comic books and space travel, assumed political significance and hence potentially could be deployed as a weapon both to shape opinion at home and to subvert societies abroad" (Shaw 59). Both sides of the war aimed at people's minds but with cultural tools ranging diversely. In fact, the Cold War provoked an ideological challenge in the context of people living in the 1980s and 1990s. The root of this kind of thinking is stemming from Vladimir Lenin who attached the "success of communism to its ability to achieve a complete

upheaval in the cultural development of the masses” (Hazan 60). For Lenin, “scientists, artists, writers, painters, and musicians became active fighters on the ideological front” (ibid). Undoubtedly, at the time of Lenin, the power of cinema was not as pervasive as during the Cold War; otherwise, he would have persisted on cinema and its effect on the masses. Apart from a number of movies produced during this era that directly dealt with the Cold War like “*From Russia with Love* (1963), *Goldfinger* (1964) and *You Only Live Twice* (1967), together with those produced during the early stages of the “second” Cold War in the early 1980s: *For Your Eyes Only* (1981), *Octopussy* (1983), *Never Say Never Again* (1983), and *A View to a Kill* (1985)” (73), an adaptation of *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* is also produced in Russia that can be analyzed and studied while historicizing it within the Cold War.

Twain’s *The Adventures of Huckleberry* was adapted into a feature film entitled *Hopelessly Lost* in 1973. The adapted film was even selected to represent the Soviet Union in the 1974 Cannes Film Festival which can show its importance to the government of the Soviet Union, although the film was shorn of any prize. Studying the adapted film with respect to the conflict of the Cold War, one can notice the strange title selected for the film, *Hopelessly Lost*. The selected title with the disturbed face of a boy at the poster of the film (Figure 1) is in total contradiction with one of the main principles of the book which is happy freedom. Huck is a boy in whom “other boys see ... a freedom from constraint” (Stoneley 71). In fact, Huck is never lost, he escapes from the civilization and its constraints to achieve freedom and indeed, he seems to achieve the notion of freedom: “but I reckon I got to light out for the Territory ahead of the rest, because Aunt Sally she’s going to adopt me and sivilize me, and I can’t stand it. I been there before” (Twain 13). Regardless of all the issues discussed in the book by Twain, the idea or ideal of freedom is intrinsically attached to America and though challenged by some people in the book, “the relationship of the individual to society, and the meaning of freedom is persistently investigated through Huck by Twain” (Bloom 67). Determined to appeal to the communist ideology of USSR, this title is created by the film director to indicate the extent from which the American society loaded with ideas of freedom and dreams, is lost. Moreover, the controversial change in the title of the film is provocative especially in a time when fidelity to the original text was deemed as an important feature of the adaptation studies. Undoubtedly, ideological challenge posed as the production of this film and pushing it toward this title, implicates the weakness of the system of America against the USSR. As it continues, the adapted film is focusing on the narrative of Widow Douglas’s description of Huck; “the widow she cried over me, and called me a poor lost

lamb, and she called me a lot of other names, too, but she never meant no harm by it” (2), to show that Huck is a desperate boy unable to narrate a new history for the American people. However, following the steps of Huck, it becomes clear that Huck is not taking Douglas’s description and is comprehending Widow Douglas’s sense of sympathy. For Mark Twain, Huck is the model boy who truly fights for freedom and never allows other to constrain him. Huck’s journey on the raft symbolizes the search for freedom. However, in the adaptation of the source text, the director produces a change of focus from Huck’s desire to freedom to Huck being hopeless of ever achieving freedom; from Huck’s escapism to his passivity; and from his romance to grotesque realism.

Huck’s depiction marks the significant deviation from the novel in the film adaptation and demands the structure of cultural materialism to be applied in the study of this film adaptation. Through the tension created by the Cold War, the film director is adapting the film from his contemporary presence, so as to resonate the political narrative of the Cold war. In this regard, situating Huck as lost boy at the title of the book demonstrates the dissenting element embedded in the novel but taken out of the book to be used against America as the land of dreams and freedom. Arising from this circumstance is the new type reality produced by the adapted film. For the rest of the film, there exists no considerable difference between the film and its adaptation and no controversial implication is conveyed other than the moment that Pap visits Huck in his room. In the book when Pap unexpectedly meets Huck in his room, he tells him: “You’re educated, too, they say—can read and write. You think you’re better’n your father, now, don’t you, because he can’t? I’LL take it out of you” (22), but the film adaptation is rather different when Pap asks Huck to read to see if Huck is able to read or not: “Read what is written here. They told him: Ceasar’s” (22). The word ‘Ceasar’ never exists in the text and its adding in the film version is to be read with relation to the Cold War and the conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union. This means that not only the political orientation of the film is consciously aligned with the accredited system of thinking in the USSR but also through the method upon which Huck is forced to repeat the word ‘Ceasar’, this can be suggested that the system of thinking in USSR is attempting to dictate his view on the world and prove its authority in comparison with the American system of government.

Later on, Huck is able to feint his death and escape from his dad and to finally take on a journey on the raft alongside of Mississippi river by Jim. As their journey continues, they get on lands once in a while to take a rest and then resume their journey in the Mississippi river. In one of their stops, Huck is acquainted by Buck, a character who is

finally killed in a feud. In terms of characterization, the film maintains the representation of Buck in the novel. Actually, Buck's portrayal is so genuine that one readily starts to visualize him as the character performed in the novel. However, his mimics, hair, make-up and the way he acts and talks, follows the steps of the hopeless boy that the director has epitomized in the character of Huck. This being the case, Buck takes on greater significance by contributing to the narrative of the Cold War in the film. The film thus shows his positions in comparison to Huck, and also helps us better comprehend the brutal and grim reality that exists in American society. The film adaptation also covers this scene quickly but with a difference which is pointed at the American West. Twain describes the moment Huck arrives at the land by referring to great mansions built by its residents to later make a contrast between civilization and untouched land of areas:

It was a mighty nice family, and a mighty nice house, too. I hadn't seen no house out in the country before that was so nice and had so much style. It didn't have an iron latch on the front door, nor a wooden one with a buckskin string, but a brass knob to turn, the same as houses in town. There warn't no bed in the parlor, nor a sign of a bed; but heaps of parlors in towns has beds in them. There was a big fireplace that was bricked on the bottom, and the bricks was kept clean and red by pouring water on them and scrubbing them with another brick; sometimes they wash them over with red water-paint that they call Spanish-brown, same as they do in town. (103)

At first, it is supposed that the residents who are living within these houses are highly civilized but as they get into a senseless feud that only results in killing, Twain makes his point that great houses and technology are necessary enough to civilize people whereas they may live in great houses but conduct the dastardliest deeds. Nevertheless, the adapted film focuses on the act of killing while providing the audience with long shots of vast plains which are the significant features of American West without any references to the great houses. As the construction of American nationalistic image is attached with the "history and mythology of the American West" (Wade 285), the director is attempting to associate the wildness of the American West with the kind of savage embedded in these people who are killing each other with no sensible reason. In this reference, the main purpose of this change in the narrative of this film is related to hostility between the two sides of the Cold War. And here the USSR narrative is to imply the point that the American West which is originally considered to be the breed of American identity is totally flawed and savage, therefore, it is expected to watch their savage acts on the global context. This being the case, the adapted film is working like a vehicle "for promoting progressive views and politics" (Grossman 6) of the present time which is here the hostile view of the Cold War in the cultural context.

However, the noticeable difference is when the part of Duke and King is adapted in the film. The book narrates the story of these two as they are tarred and feathered for their punishment and Huck reacts to this punishment like this: "Well, it made me sick to see it; and I was sorry for them poor pitiful rascals, it seemed like I couldn't ever feel any hardness against them any more in the world. It was a dreadful thing to see. Human beings can be awful cruel to one another" (231). Nevertheless, a different narration is followed in the film adaptation. Though Duke and the King are tarred and feathered, they are not omitted from the rest of the film as they are omitted in the book (because they are killed), whereas they are pushed to the raft again. Indeed, a long shot (Figure II) at the end of the film shows that these two imposters are rolled down from a long and steep hill and while they reach the bottom of the hill, they invade the raft which is occupied by Huck and Jim who is in chains. The filmmaker has purposefully not effaced the characters of Duke and King from the book and has kept them until the end of the film which repeatedly shows an anti-American stance. It seems that the flawed characters of Duke and King have provided fertile ground for the development of this anti-American sentiment. Moreover, the way they are pushed from the top of the hill to its down part implicate this view that the USSR Communist system is able to perform the same act upon the system of the United States. This is highly prominent when the act of throwing the Duke and the King from the top of the hill is done and motivated by a character most resembling the personage of Uncle Sam which always evokes two possibilities in the minds of the American people "one comforting, the other perplexing" (Robertson 157). The personage of Uncle Sam (Figure III) representing the face of the American government is always double-faced, endowed with the halo of image and reality. For the American people, the image of Uncle Sam is always imbued with a looking forward to "a commonwealth of free nations supporting and supported by the United States" or a backward step to "see the British Empire and our colonial status" (163). This being the case, the image of Uncle Sam is adopted by the Soviet film producer to represent the ugly and imperialist nature of the United States. In line with the dominant mood, the final scenes of the film evoke a sense of fictional reality as the film concludes on a note of contemplation over the dramatic gesture of Uncle Sam.

As such, the ending of the film is really captivating. Since the camera stays in the raft in a close-up (Figure IV) for a rather long time to fix its image in the viewer's minds. The point that the director aims to imply while fixing the viewer's mind in the image of Jim being in chains is in contrast with the ending of the book which shows how the director is adopting the image of Uncle Sam to convey the destructive side of American

policy to lead the so-called free people of America to chains and slavery. The book ends while Jim is not a slave anymore and is restored to his family, and Huck by himself decides to continue his journey alongside the Mississippi River as he talks of his aim in this manner; “but I reckon I got to light out for the Territory ahead of the rest, because Aunt Sally she's going to adopt me and sivilize me, and I can't stand it. I been there before” (Twain 292). Huck's decision to leave the others at the end of the book is to gain more freedom while the end of the film pictures Huck as a boy who is not determined and is seemingly lost. Moreover, the existence of Jim who is in chains may imply the point that slavery will forever remain in America. Undoubtedly, the most important point is the reentrance of the Duke and the King as the symbols of depraved activities onto the raft. Altogether, the aggregate of all these people on the raft shows that America is not in line with any kind of progress and is being pushed back by its racism and other abominable acts. If adaptation studies are to follow another narration of past events and texts, this adaptation of *Huckleberry Finn* produced in the Soviet Union in 1973 has followed the same route. The adapted film is produced amidst the Cold War in which the United States and the Soviet Union were in a state of zero connection and both countries were fighting within cultural zoom. As such, it is expected to see an adapted film in the Soviet Union modifying the original text so as to reflect the righteousness of the Soviet system of governing against that of the American political system.

5. Conclusion

The 1973 Soviet version of *The Adventures of Huckleberry* discussed here showed that the act of adaptation is not firstly limited to the country in which the literary work is produced and neither to the manner the adaptation can be developed to work against the dominant ideology of the culture of the literary work. *Hopelessly Lost* (1973) has not only been adapted from Twain's *The Adventures of Huckleberry* but has also been influenced by the ideological narrative of the USSR against the opposing narrative of the United States during the Cold War. The film adaptation is reading the high tension of the time while cutting through Twain's *The Adventures of Huckleberry* and considerably changing the idea of freedom cherished in the book, to prove the ominous future of the United States charged with the ideas of dreams and freedom. The method used to study this film adaptation has been cultural materialism as it opens a window to understanding the present political orientation dominating the era while reading the past. In a similar context, the notion of adaptation opens a unique window which in turn connects the present, the film adaptation, to the past, the literary book, while comprehending the thought orientation imposed at the film adaptation. Thus, cultural materialism's

tendency to make this connection between the past and the present has contributed to a better of understanding of *Hopelessly Lost* (1973). This being the case, the 1973 Soviet film adaptation overspread the shadow of such evil characters as the Duke and the King or the notion of slavery until the end of the narrative of the film which demonstrates a clear ideological shift in the film adaptation of Twain's *The Adventures of Huckleberry* as it is reproduced by the Soviet system of thinking.

Funding:

No funding has been received for conducting this research.

Conflict of Interests:

There is no conflict of interest to disclose.

References

- Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*. Writ. Guy Gallo. Dir. Peter H. Hunt. Perf. Patrick Day, Samm-Art Williams. Great Amwell Company (for PBS American Playhouse Series), 1985. DVD.
- Arac, Jonathan. *Huckleberry Finn as Idol and Target: The Functions of Criticism in Our Time*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1997. Print.
- Belsey, Catherine. *The Subject of Tragedy*. Methuen, 1985.
- Bloom, Harold. *Bloom's Guide to Mark Twain's The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*, Chelsea House Publishers, 2005.
- Boyle, Peter G. "The Cold War Revisited." *Journal of Contemporary History*, vol. 35, no. 3, 2000, pp. 479–489., <https://doi.org/10.1177/002200940003500309>.
- Brannigan, John. *New Historicism and Cultural Materialism*. St. Martin's Press, 1998.
- Budd, Louis J. "Mark Twain Sounds off on the Fourth of July", *American Literary Realism*, Vol. 34, No. 3 (Spring, 2002), pp. 265-280 (16 pages).
- Champion, Laurie. "Critical Views on Adaptations of *Huckleberry Finn*." *The Critical Response to Mark Twain's Huckleberry Finn*. Ed. Laurie Champion. NY: Greenwood P, 1991. 238-244.
- Dollimore, Jonathan, and Alan Sinfield. *Political Shakespeare: New Essays in Cultural Materialism*. Manchester University, 1992.
- Dollimore, Jonathan. "Shakespeare, Cultural Materialism, Feminism and Marxist Humanism." *New Literary History*, vol. 21, no. 3, 1990, p. 471., <https://doi.org/10.2307/469122>.
- Frank, Perry. "Adventures of *Huckleberry Finn* on Film." *Huck Finn among the Critics: A Centennial Selection*. Ed. M. Thomas Inge. Frederick, MD: U Publications of America, 1985. 293-313.
- Foerstel, Herbert N. *Banned in the U.S.A.: A Reference Guide to Book Censorship in Schools and Public Libraries*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 2002. Print.
- Göçmen G., and Özlem Özmen Akdoğan. "Nostalgic (Re)Visions of Englishness in Merchant Ivory's Adaptation of Kazuo Ishiguro's *The Remains of the Day*." *Journal of Language, Literature and Culture*, 68:1, 2021, pp. 49-63., doi: 10.1080/20512856.2021.1907016

- Grossman, Julie. "What Adaptations and Adaptation Studies Tell Us (and Sometimes Don't Tell Us) about Politics, Culture, and Social Change." *Adaptation*, vol. 14, no. 2, 2020, pp. 274–288., <https://doi.org/10.1093/adaptation/apaa019>.
- Hadfield, Andrew. "Shakespeare and republicanism: history and cultural materialism." *Textual Practice*, 17:3, 2003, pp. 461-483., doi: 10.1080/0950236032000140087
- Haupt, Clyde V. *Huckleberry Finn on Film*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 1994.
- Hazan, Baruch A. *Soviet Impregnational Propaganda*. Ardis, 1982.
- Hopelessly Lost*. Georgiy Daneliya, Mosfilm, 1974, DVD.
- Hutcheon, Linda. *A Theory of Adaptation*. Routledge, 2006.
- McFarlane, Brian. *Novel to Film: An Introduction to the Theory of Adaptation*. Clarendon Press, 2004.
- Messent, Peter B., and Louis J. Budd. *A Companion to Mark Twain*. Wiley Blackwell, 2015.
- Milner, Andrew. *Cultural Materialism*. Melbourne University Press, 1993.
- Parvini, Neema. *Shakespeare and Contemporary Theory: New Historicism and Cultural Materialism*. Bloomsbury Publishing, 2015.
- Rasmussen, R. Kent. "MGM's Huckleberry Finn Musical That Never Reached the Screen, Part 1." *Mark Twain Journal*, vol. 57, no. 1, spring 2019, pp. 25 + . Gale Academic OneFile, link.gale.com/apps/doc/A590952632/AONE?u=anon~aceee346&sid=bookmark-AONE&xid=4f8ff812. Accessed 13 Nov. 2022.
- Robertson, R. T. "Uncle Sam — Image and Reality." *Peabody Journal of Education*, vol. 40, no. 3, 1962, pp. 157–166., <https://doi.org/10.1080/01619566209537108>.
- Rouse, M. "'My Country Has (Never) Suffered Defeat': Adapting Defoe's Robinson Crusoe for Postwar European Television." *Adaptation*, vol. 5, no. 2, 2011, pp. 185–202., <https://doi.org/10.1093/adaptation/apr020>.
- Rushing, Janice Hocker, and Thomas S. Frentz. "The Rhetoric of 'Rocky': A Social Value Model of Criticism." *Western Journal of Speech Communication*, vol. 42, no. 2, 1978, pp. 63–72., <https://doi.org/10.1080/10570317809373925>.
- Shaw, Tony. "The Politics of Cold War Culture." *Journal of Cold War Studies*, vol. 3, no. 3, 2001, pp. 59–76., <https://doi.org/10.1162/152039701750419510>.

- Sinfield, Alan. *Faultlines: Cultural Materialism and the Politics of Dissident Reading*. University of California Press, 1992.
- Stam, Robert. *World Literature, Transnational Cinema, and Global Media: towards a Transartistic Commons*. Routledge, 2019.
- Stam, Robert. "Beyond Fidelity: The Dialogics of Adaptation," in James Naremore, ed. *Film Adaptation* 2000.
- Stoneley, Peter. *Mark Twain and the Feminine Aesthetic*. Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Twain, Mark. *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn: The Only Authoritative Text Based on the Complete, Original Manuscript*. Ed. Victor Fischer et al. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2010. Print.
- Tompkins, Jane P. *Sensational Designs: The Cultural Work of American Fiction: 1790-1860*. Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Trilling, Lionel. *The Liberal Imagination: Essays on Literature and Society*. Anchor Books Ed. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1953. Print.
- Wade, Leslie A. "Sam Shepard and the American Sunset: Enchantment of the Mythic West." *A Companion to Twentieth-Century American Drama*, 2007, pp. 285–300., doi:10.1002/9780470996805. ch18.
- Wilson, Scott. "Revisiting Keywords of Cultural Materialism." *European Journal of English Studies*, 6:3, 2002, pp. 307-325., doi: 10.1076/ejes.6.3.307.14833