

Chapter-I

Introduction

1.1 Background, Purpose and Scope

Mulk Raj Anand exposes the scenario of exploited class, the victim under the influence of British Indian rule. *The Sword and the Sickle* reflects the conflict between the suppressive and the suppressed class. It portrays the peasants independence from the colonizers. The British intention of expanding bourgeois rule a awakens the peasants. Government takes away the land of Indian peasants at the cost of the working class people.

The Sword and the Sickle shows sympathy towards Lalu, the protagonist. He leaves his country and becomes prisoner of war camp in Germany. Later, he faces accusation of sedition that empties his hand from ex-sepoy life. It infuriates Lalu and unites oppressed peasants to overthrow British Indian government. Although he observes the Gandhian theory of non-violence for the time being, he finds the spiritual struggle useless to resolve the existing problem. The Muslium oppose Hindu leaders. But leaders like Rampal Singh, and prof. Verma, do not have any rigid principle to organize the peasant's revolution. They betray Lalu's intention for the radical change of society.

Lalu sees future only with the inspiration of comrade, Sarshar who is bold and stern in

revolution. Lalu admires the strong opinion and addresses the organization in a single union of the peasants with the Marxist strategy.

Anand was born in Peshawar of India on December 12, 1905. His father, Lal Chand was a coppersmith in Amritsar but later joined the British Indian army. His father's cantonment life inspired him to know the areas like Mainmir and Nowshera where his father had fought in the favour of the Indian peasant people's protest. His mother Ishwar was from the peasant family and was a devotee to Hindu God typically Indian and yet nearly a mythic figure. Anand got her love, piety and innocent contribution of her daily round of rituals prayers and songs. His mother nourished him with the songs tales, myths etc. He was influenced by his cousin, Kaushalya who was a playmate in his childhood. The sudden death of Kaushalya created a void in his life. He formed the foundation of his literary career. Lal Chand and Ishwar Kaur had five sons, Mulk Raj Anand was the third one. He studied at Khalsa College in Amritsar from where he got graduate with honors in 1924. He reads the works of the great writers like Karl Marx, Gorky, Keats, Hardy etc in Khalsa College. Moreover, he was highly influenced by the poet, Mohammed Iqbal whom he would visit in Lahor. In 1925, went to London for further study. He joined University College and studied the philosophy of John Lock, George Barkeley, David Hume and Bertrand Russell. Finally, he won a doctoral degree in 1929, under the supervision of G. Dawcs Hicks.

Anand was influeced by to the general strike of 1926 in London and found class struggle between the rich and the poor. He began to participate actively the meetings of British Trade Union and Marxist Study Circles. Anand underwent a period in search of faith, re-examining Hinduism exploring as the optimum to exploit the poor class like peasant, labourer. But he could not accept it at last. The Marxist impact touched Anand's

faith due to his reading of Karl Marx *Letter on India* in New York Herald Tribune of 1953. Anand's faith in Marxism appears as an inexorable philosophy:

The whole new world opened to me. All the threads of my past reading which has got tied up into knots, seemed suddenly to straighten out and I began to see not only the society in some sorts of inner connection ... Nothing less was involved than a re-orientation of one's outlook on history as well s complete transformation of present day society from the new point of view. (15)

Similarly, Anand shows his disillusionment after reading Marxist philosophy and says:

As I did not join the communist Party (because I honestly believed that I would never as an intellectual, to be able to accept the almost religious discipline demanded by a group of people who involved changing tactics around a minimum manifesto with maximum sanction) I was somewhat saved from the blind acceptance of all Marx's strategic actions and the dogmas propounded in his name by many of the verbal jugglers among his orthodox party line followers. Besides, I had come to socialism through Tolstoy, Ruskin Morris and Gandhi imbedded with the sense of his doctrine as the embodiment to an ethnical creed in so far as it was a protest against misery, ugliness and inequality. (65)

Anand gained knowledge about various things from his tour to different countries. He was highly influenced not only by the communist movement, propounded by Karl Marx's theory of conflict but also equally impressed by the Gandhian theory of Non-Violence, Social Disobedience, and Simple Living and Higher thinking. His

method of spiritual struggle was against bourgeois system handled by the imperialistic government. He was simple in nature. His love for Indian culture, professing religion are very remarkable. Anand exhibits mainly three types of leaders leading the peasant in their own ways. The interest of conservatism and progressivism appears as an ideological conflict. The thought of the count and his followers are moderate, imposters as well as dual supporters to the Communist and The Congress party of Gandhism. Some of the leaders like the Count Rampal Singh and his group who, at first supports the physical revolution for the social transformation but at last support Gandhian theory of Non-Violence that brings revolution into chaos. Lalu, the protagonist, realizes the need of Marxian theory instructed by the communist leader Comrade Sarshar. The *Sword and the Sickle* searches physical force to overthrow the capitalism handled by the imperialistic thought.

Among many Indian writers, Anand is considered to be one of the distinguished, prolific and committed ones. He is known not only in the Indian sub-continent but all over the world. He has written many master novels, short stories, art criticism and essays. He is respected as a great humanist in India and abroad. Some critics have considered him as a propagandist but some favour Anand due to his true realistic reflection in his texts. A large number of writers are not ready to accept it and say he is as a genius and a true artist.

K.N. Sinha makes a comment on Anand: "Anand is a man of marvelous imaginative power. Due to his imagination, today he is taken as a great writer of Anglo-Indian fiction." We can recognize them as a trinity of Anglo-Indian literature. Even though, all of them began their literary career in the same period, they are different from one another in terms of writing style. R.K. Narayan focuses on middle-class people in a

fictional area called "Magudi" with a light irony and humour. Raja Rao writes about religious life of the Indian people under the condition of poverty and misery. Anand's novel addresses the picture of human suffering. In other words, the theme of Raja Rao exposes poverty, misery and injustice. He presents in his novel how people are facing the problems of caste, class, religion, politics and commerce etc. He expresses fight against each other those malpractices prevailing in Indian society in his writing. He believes when people realize that what makes others suffer, they will stop such activities and thus continue toward the development of society and people.

Anand is a voracious reader of Western philosophy and literature. His sympathy goes to the down-trodden people of India that makes him a world famous creative writer. His novels are also translated forms in other languages. He had good relationship with some great writers like E.M. Forster, T.S. Eliot, Rudyard Kipling, Aldous Huxley and George Orwell which helped Anand to produce marvelous fictions.

K.N. Sinha comments Anand as a dynamic and marvelous figure. He observes him in various colours which is impossible to fix. The conflict of progressivism and conservatism comes as a theme. Sinha admires Anand as a great writer and writes"; like many coloured glass, it reflects the various lights and shades of experience" (qtd in Gautam 49).

According to Berry, Anand began his school in "The Nowsera Government Primary School, under a Pathan headmaster and a ferocious' Afridi teacher [...]" (Berry 12). Anand was not satisfied with the British School where he studies. In Anand's works, "the education imparted in those schools was imitative giving very little idea of Indian tradition but mainly bastardized version of English curricula [...]" (Apology 33). The another critic who views Anand in the light of progressivism, believes that Anand's

novels contain the element of socialistic approach. Commenting upon Anand's novels, Prabhakar Machwe in his book *Modernity and Contemporary Indian Literature* witnesses." In English the novels and stories of Mulk Raj Anand like *Untouchable*, *Coolie* and *The Sword and the Sickle* and others as well as the early novels of Bhabani Bhattacharya like *So Many Hungers* are good examples of progressive approach (62). Similarly another critic, Mr. S. Lakshman Shastry, the editor of the contemporary Indian literature writes "Dr. Mulk Raj Anand is a critic of optimistic human who is capable of moving the most pessimistic man to action. He is a very sensitive lover of all that is good and lovable on the earth, good books, fine pieces of art, good manners"(qtd in Gupta 10).

Humanism and progressivism are the basic philosophical aspects of life found in Anand's novels. Philosophy is to do with betterment of human life. It is an essential part of literature too. In this regard, G.S Balram Gupta says; "It is natural that a creative artist's works should be deeply colored by the philosophy of life that he espouses. Anand is no exceptional case" (13).

Mulk Raj Anand is frequently compared with English writer, Charles Dickens. Dickens has "an acute consciousness of his middle class origin and the unhappy circumstances of his own childhood and a sentimentally humanitarian attitude towards human problems" (Daiches 1050). His novels have been promoted by his sympathy for the downtrodden members of society. Almost all the novels of Dickens contain social evils. The malfunctioning of schools, the malpractices rampant in the legal system, and the prison of time and the exploitation of child labor are the prevalence of crime and evils resulting from poverty all of reform and improvement in English social conditions. Anand is definitely a novelist in the benefit of progressive movement

which could not have been dreamed of Indian nor Anglican fiction that it could be read and involve as long as English is read. Anglican literature is continued to be enjoyed.

Iyeger in his book *Indian Writing in English*, avers:

As a writer of fiction, Anand's notable marks are vital and taken a keen sense of actuality. He is a variable Dickens for describing the inequalities and idiosyncrasies in the current human situation with condor as well as accuracy of Anand's early novels at least it can be said that they came fresh from contact with the flesh and blood of every existence. (356)

The Village, Across the Black Water and *The Sword and the Sickle* are the novels of trilogy. These novels talk about contemporary Indian political, social and economic situation. The trilogy addresses the peasant people of India under the rule of the British government. The strong opposition of peasant to overthrow the bourgeois production is handled by the imperialistic interest of the government. These words of Anand expose the protagonist's protest against the existing exploitation constructed by oppressors. The rural setting and agriculture fields where the landlords evicted the peasant and gradually the peasant family become homeless and landless due to feudal trick of exploitation. The conflict generally and gradually increases having the hope of reformation and restructuring. The novels of Anand have the same protagonist in all novels but themes are different. It can be known through the comment of trilogy as said by Sinha; "It is a chronicle of Indian peasant life and adventure of Lal Singh from early childhood to maturity" (Sinha 46). All these novels have the same character, Lalu, but themes and presentation are different from one to another as well as its presentation. Each novel explores different themes. Thus the three novels however are epic fragments not unified whole" (46).

To encourage the peasant of India against foreign policies, Anand exposes it for the sake of freedom against the chain of the British government. Anand admires the revolution for transformation of India. The sympathy of Anand upon peasants, labourers and downtrodden implies his interest towards proleterianism. Towards the end of the novel, he expresses the need of strong organization with physical force and this is perhaps due to the failure of non-violence, the creed of Gandhi. Anand establishes the classless world but there are various political debates as well. It is protest for the logical purpose that faces in the tour of Lalu's experience in relation with the individual and instructional group like Muslim sect. Lalu does not get the support of his own wife, Maya. Anyway, Lalu wants a radical change that gives the justice to the base structure like peasant surviving under miserable condition in the feudalistic system. Since the publication of *The Sword and the Sickle*, the critics like Margaret Berry has attacked Arya Samaj, the Sanatanis and the Congress. He observes and comments; "Anand's most prejudiced version of the Sanatanis and Congressman is Tiwari of *The Sword and the Sickle*" (5). She again says that "In *The Sword and the Sickle*" holy man provocateurs, engaged by the capitalistic hired police addictive disrupt the organization meeting of Kishan Sabha" (53).

Likewise, another critic P.K. Rajan who has praised the novel stating that it is the best among Anand's other novels in the trilogy. Admiring and praising it he views: "Lal Singh is seen as a tormented soul demobilized from the Army without reward and shaken by series of domestic tragedies finding himself at least with in the fold of an insurrection group led by the Count Knawar Rampal Singh of Rajgarh" (100). Similarly other critic M.K. Naik passes a comment upon the novel in the following way:

The Sword and to Sickle in an extremely confused book. It shows Lal

Singh's returning home from a German prison, hobnobbing with communist and end in prison again. In his picture of both communism and Gandhism Anand resorts to cheap irony (the communist especially are shown to be a crowd of clown) thus depriving Lai Singh's guest of any possible seriousness. (157)

Another famous critic of Gandhi, Saros Cowasjee claims the hint of title of the novel. According to him:

The model of the title is expressed likewise *The Sickle* represents India's vast labour force especially the down-trodden peasantry which constitutes over eighty percent of India's population in 1920's. The sword is of course the all too familiar brute force [...] which need the poor in perpetual serfdom (113).

Regarding its style Cowasjee further points out that "Anand's achievement lies in using historical materials in fiction to the remarkable effect infusing literature and politics in a work of art" (115).

D. Riemenschneider analyzes this novel through the respective of its main character, Lalu and his development. He claims that Lalu's action is guided by his violent impulse as he says: "Lalu nothing can be achieved if one does not take risk" (Sahitya 40). He further adds "He (Lalu) organizes demonstrations, appears on the platforms as a speaker and adopts in general the militant way to infuse a feeling of light of 20's political situation of India. His main concern is its main character Lalu and his action. He says:

He (Lalu) involves in the politics in the 20's for with his temperament he can not be irresponsible to the challenges of the times he engaged in

political action and reaps the consequences. Government against the people themselves cut into divisions, the ply of political and personal realities in the clash of ideologies the pull off selfish, greed and pull of idealism and need for sacrifice these ingredients of a revolution situation are the content of *The Sword and the Sickle*. (349)

The famous critic Sinha who frequently shows the political vision of Anand. It neglects the ideological variations that can be known as:

He (Lalu) holds radical views about revolution, rejecting the Gandhian creed of non-violent struggle. Even Gandhi and Nehru, who figure in the novel and talk with him fail to convince him. His real enemy however is his own divided self. He alters painfully between revolution and the women he loves. (51)

1.2 Anand's Works

Anand has dynamic personality who has gained many academic awards. He flourished art and literature till he remained in this world. He fought for the sake of poor, suppressed and suffering ones.

From the novel *Untouchable* Anand started his literary career. *Untouchable* was published in 1935. He got an important popularity due to his protest against caste discrimination. After its publication, the story deals with the suffering of an untouchable in the Indian Hindu orthodox society. Secondly, *The Coolies* which was published in 1936. This novel shows the panic situation of the poor Kshatria boy, Munoo. It shows how poverty-stricken people are behaved by the Indian capitalistic society. His third novel is *Two Leaves and a Bud* that was published in 1937. This novel deals with the misery of Indian workers in the hand of the imperialistic ruler. Anand has written many

novels that were published in various times such as: *Lament on the Death of a Master of Art* (1938), *The Village* (1939), *Across the Black Water* (1940), *The Sword and the Sickle* (1942), *The Big Heart* (1945), *The Private Life of an Indian Prince* (1953), *The Old Woman and the Cow* (1960), *The Road* (1961), *The Death of a Hero* (1963), *Morning Face* (1968), *Confession of a Lover* (1976), *The Bubble* (1984) and *Autobiographic Part -1* (1981). Anand wrote not only novels, he is equally famous for his short stories published in various literary magazines. In addition, he has written several books of non-fiction and hundreds of articles on diverse subject matters.

In the following chapter, I will mention district sorts of Marxism as well as the details of the lower strata in different aspects of society. Furthermore my attempt will centralize on the position of Indian poor people basically who live in the rural area and undergo diverse economic challenges. The reflection on numerous hindrances in the path of poor people's progress, prosperity, fame and dignity will be vitalized as well.

Similarly, the third chapter will focus on the analytical approach to the text. Besides this, the hypothetical statement will be elaborated with textual evidences in order to strengthen and enhance the thesis promulgation itself. In this way the fourth chapter will be conclusion and works cited respectively. In fact the deducing chapter will have glance at all previous chapters.

Chapter - II

Theoretical Tools

Twentieth century has been a revolutionary era from the point of view of development of new critical trends. These new critical trends include Marxism, Feminism, existentialism, psychoanalytic, linguistics and stylistics formalism etc. As this researcher applies the Marxist approach to deal with the text, *The Sword and the Sickle*, it would be relevant to examine historical development of the very approach.

The Marxist literary criticism is best expressed in Karl Marx's works like *The German Ideology* and *The communist manifesto*. Marx proposes a model of history in which economic and political conditions determine social conditions. Marx and Engels respond to social hardships stemming from the rise of capitalism. Borrowing the dialectic theory of Engels, Marx and Engels posit a materialistic account of history that focuses upon the struggles and tensions within society. As society forms more complex modes of production, it becomes increasingly stratified; and the resulting tensions necessitate changing in society. For example, the introduction of heavy machinery into the feudal economic system fragmented existing social structures and necessitates a move towards capitalism.

Though the Marxist philosophy is devoted to social, economic and political revolutionary activities, it treats literature and art with attention. Marxism values literature and art on the basis of how far it has carried up the functions of expressing socio-economic life of a society. The Marxist literary theoreticians believe that literature must have social and political theme which should be committed to lead human beings in the progressive path for the advancement of society. Literature should be interpreted in the socio-economic context. Thomas Babington Macaulay also sees utilitarian value

of art as:

Thomas Babington Macaulay represents a more significant movement of the whig spirit as it developed under the influence of Adam Smith's economic doctrine of laissez faire, utilitarian philosophy and middle class Victorian liberalism." (Daiches 944)

Marx and Engles do not, in fact speak more in the *Communist Manifesto* but they of course discuss the concept of base and superstructure. Marxist literary theoreticians claim that base is primary and the superstructure is secondary. And the latter automatically changes as the base changes i.e. the socio-economic relations bring changes in ideology, religion, politics and art as well. Each economic and political structure; e.g. socialism, capitalism and feudalism give birth to its own type of mode of production and social organization that produce its own reflection in literature, art, culture, religion and politics. Some Marxists view that fame or defame and success or failure of a work of art and author has to be judged according to the extent of its relation and portrayal of socio-economic life of the contemporary society. There is difference between Marxist criticism and the other criticism. Others emphasize only on the interpretive function and whether work of art is successful in interpreting life and world subjectively but Marxist criticism examines how far a work of art embodies ability in altering human existence and leads human beings, in a progressive path and emancipation. Marxism aims at revolutionizing the whole socio-economic life by establishing a new system of politics governed by proletariats. It wants authors to portray the socio-economic situation of an epoch and produce reality with attention centered to class division and the exploitation of the lower class by the upper. Authors should have profound understanding of the wretched human condition rather than

subjective experience and aestheticism. Thus literature to Marxist critics should be a device to spread the voices of the working class. Thus O. Yakhot avers:

That root of Marxist philosophy extends into life, reality, practice. It is well tried compass, a guide in everyday life and activity. Bound up with the study of Marxist philosophy, with mastery of the scientific world outlook, is the optimism of the working people, their unshakable confidence in a happy life for all people throughout the world. And this faith is not thoughtless or passive. (Yakhot 223)

After V.I. Lenin implemented raw theory propounded by Karl Marx for the first time in Russia in 1917 through October revolution. It encouraged necessitated revolution in every aspects of the social life to continue the journey towards the complete socialism. They hoped literature could play an influential role to develop human understanding and spread socialism. Thus the communist rulers like V.I Lenin, Stalin and Trotsky interpreted literature through Marxist Perspective.

Russian Formalism has a tremendous impact over the Russian intellectual world slightly before and after the Bolchevic resolution. After the success of Bolshevik revolution in Russia, Marxism became the central stream of thought not only in political but also in literary area throughout the world. After the Second World War's victory by capitalistic countries, the Marxist political, intellectual and literary activities were gradually discouraged.

George Lukacs: Reflection Theory of Literature

Lukacs was an influential Marxist literary critic of the 20th century. His involvement as a student in a club named 'Revolutionary Social Students of Budapest' opened his Marxist intellectual and political career. 'Das Capital' and 'The Communist

Manifesto' of Karl Marx aroused him an unquenchable thirst of economic and political principles, inspiring him a strong dislike to capitalism and inclination towards communism. His rejection of his father's appeal to continue his business shows Lukacs¹ strong tendency to involve himself in the political and intellectual world.

The successful Bolchevic revolution in October 1917 in Russia and the establishment of the rule of proletariats for the first time in the world, inspired Lucacs towards communism and joined the Communist Party of Hungary' to drive himself in revolutionary activities. The unification of (communist party of Hungary' representing revolutionaries and Social Democratic Party' representing aristocrats failed and the failure gave birth to 'Hungarian socialist party. With the prohibition on the communist party in 1919 due to their revolutionary activates, he left Hungary for Vienna where he worked as the editor of "Kommunismus" and published communistic ideas. He came back in 1945 and served the nation as the professor of aestheticism and philosophy at the university of Budapest. He was also involved in the political arena being a member of presidium of Hungarian Academy and the member of Hungarian National Assembly.

Lukacs is best known as a Marxist literary theoretician despite his significant contribution in politics. Reflection of the outer reality is the central idea of Lukacs literary criticism. Art is a certain socio-historical context therefore art and literature must reflect the dialect' of history, but it does not mean the necessity of the correspondence of actual reality. Lukacs, however accepts the failure of the expression of actual reality because artist's emotions and experiences may lose something in reality while penetrating through artist's sensitive mind unlike the photographic representation. Perception and interpretation of the world varies subjectively from person to person, previous experiences, moods and personal liking and disliking. Some degree of

objective reality is mixed up with artists subjective feelings and emotions, therefore, ironical representation of truth is never possible. For Lukacs, an artist selects and combines the required raw materials from the chaos. Devid Forgacs in his *Marxist Literary Theories* observes Lukacs: "To be reflected in literature, reality has to pass through the creative form giving work of the writer. The result, in the case of correctly formed work, will be that the form of the literary work reflects the form of real word" (Forgace 171).

Forgacs says about Lukacs View: "form is the aesthetic shape given to content, a shape manifested through technical features such as time and inter relationship of character and situation in work" (Forgacs 171).

Lukacs is not the first critic to discuss literature as reflection of objective reality. The idea of reflection roots back to Plato (428-347 B.C.), classical Greek Philosopher. In his *The Republic* denounces, the notion that art can reflect reality. His opinion is that this world in which we lives is not real itself, but only an illusion of the ideal world (qtd. in SPL, RPA, ANS, 3). Therefore, art created on the worldly subject matter is thrice removed from the actual reality; the imitation of illusion. This theory foundation for all kinds of critical discussions about art and literature. The critics to follow have only either supported, negated or modified the foundation. Plato's disciple Aristotle refuted Plato's notion in his *The Poetics*' and argued that the source of all arts is imitation. Reflection theory of Lukacs remained dominant until the emergence of structuralism, the language centered theory of literature.

Lukacs strongly denounces romanticism and naturalism with equal vigor. The romanticists have no more intention than the expression of creators' feelings and emotions. Willian Blake opposes entire mimetic and pragmatic functions of art. He

quotes: "Empirical reason and empirical science are enemies of true visionary understanding" (Daiches 874). For William Wordsworth "Poetry is the spontaneous overflow of powerful feelings and emotions recollected in tranquility." (qtd. in Daiches 879). Poetry for him is "Primarily the record of a certain kind of state of mind, and the value of poetry for him lay in the value of the state of mind which the poem recorded" (qtd. in Daiches 879). Poet is a nightingale who sits in darkness and sings to cheer its own solitude with sweet sounds. Therefore, the romanticists tend to be rather reactionary. The naturalists try to create a photographic representation of life:

Keeping strictly to an exact tendering of immediate reality ... their exclusion of historical determinants (meditations) which in the every day life of the average persons are not, as a rule, reality perceptible, but which interacting in their totality with every day existence from the concrete, essential features of a historical situation, transformed naturalists authenticity into abstractions. (Lukacs 215)

For Lukacs, the most outstanding Marxist critic of the 20th century, an artist is the person who successfully depicts social and historical reality objectively in his literary works as they are inseparable phenomenon. Therefore, art is reflecting socio-historical realities. He rejects emotive theory that the creation and appreciation is not unique and mysterious kind of knowledge.

The art is related to the external reality; the socio historical situation of a specific period, and it is not complete reality only the knowledge of reality.

According to Lukacs " The novel must be faithful to history despite its invented hero and imagined plot" (Lukacs 152). He emphasizes the thematic reality no matter what reality is. "The novels aim is to represent a particular social reality at a particular

time, with all the colour and specific atmosphere of that time" (Lukacs 150). He intends an artist to portray reality. At the same time he is aware of the fact that imitation of reality as it exists is never possible for him: "Reality as a whole is always richest and more varied than even the richest work of arts, no detail, episode etc. however exactly copied, however biographically authentic, however factual and possibly compete with reality" (Lukacs 302).

Summing up Lukacs' idea of reflection, he has scaled art from Marxist realistic perspective in a radical way. He disagrees with Wordsworthian Romantic principle that "The materials of poetry can be found in every subject which can interest the human mind" (Daiches 877) and opines that every interesting thing can not be subject of art or art itself. Literature must be straight forward in its imitation of immediate truth along with literary characteristics. He does not list literature as a work of art if it does not have a 'touch of reality' no matter whatever the language, style, images, plot etc. be. Literature belongs to the superstructure as politics, religion and philosophy which are based on socio-economic reality. Therefore, there should be a formal correspondence between the literary work and dialectical totality. Thus through Marxist point of view an art has to have social significance as it is organized in society.

Raymond Williams

Raymond Williams, distinguished among Marxist responds positively to the development trend of 20th century literature. Williams does not believe that literature has to start from reality and the realists have ceased to exist. He examines various aspects of art and literature in his *The Long Revolution*.

Artists explore the question of autonomy of their creativity by tracing back the discussion made by their predecessors like how Plato and Aristotle treated art as

imitation. All the critical theories existing hitherto are either development, modification or Trans evaluation of the theories propounded by the classical philosopher. The mimetic theories have been brought forward to examine the relationship of art with reality. The opinions on the relationship of art with reality have been different according to people and time. Some have considered art as false, illusive, fictitious, irrational expression of raw emotions whereas some claim art as super reality. The former take fantasy that inspires art whereas the latter take reality as the material of art.

Williams, while interpreting literature from Marxist approach, sees art and experience as inseparable because the latter is the subject matter of the former in a particular 'dialectical' context, and that there lies similarity between art and literature. Everyone earns by perceiving and interpreting experience but the artist needs efforts to describe the new experiences after the procession of internalized sensory information with his previous knowledge in his mind. His remark "... the arts are certain intense forms of general communication" (Williams 25) show how closely general communication and literature are associated. In his view art is the powerful expression of human experience and creative imagination is "the capacity to find and organize new description of experience" (Williams 26) thus an artists' work becomes creative only by his extraordinary skill in transmission of his experience. Williams remarks: "The creative act, of any artist is in any case the process of marking a meaning active, by communication an organized experience to others" (Williams 32). According to him it is wrong to:

Assume that political institutions and conventions are of a different and separate order from realistic institutions and conventions. Politics and art together with science, religion, family life and the other categories we

speak of as absolute, belong in a whole world of active and interacting relationships, which is our common associative life. (Williams 39)

Williams' *The Long Revolution* is a live manifesto of discussion on the contemporary novels in which he demarcates the phases of the whole literary tradition. Literature with concentration on heroic, romantic and legendary subjects related to invisible supernatural power developed with upper class comes in the first phase. During the second phase, it shifts to ordinary and everyday activities with the rise of the middle class, and in the third phase the attention shifts to the ugly and poor aspects of 'simple reality' which gave birth to naturalism.

Williams protests the notion that the realist novels have ceased to appear but hold the views that the contemporary novels still hold reality. As he says: "It is not only that there is still a concentration on contemporary themes; in many ways elements of everyday experience are more evident in the modern novel than in 19th century novel through the disappearance of certain taboos"(Williams 277).

Illustrating the feature of contemporary novels he opines that realistic novels are replaced by psychological novels, and the apprehension of psychological states, the consciousness of the character, it has rather established the psychological association to reality. He observes that "realism as an intention in the description of these states (i.e. psychological states) had not been widely abandoned" (Williams 277).

For Williams realistic trend has not disappeared in the modern fiction rather the integration between society and individual has disappeared. The earlier novels were object realistic and the modern are subject-impressionistic, i.e. the social and personal novels. Social novels portray the accurate observation and description of the general life, the aggregation and in contrary to that the personal novel offers the "Accurate

observation and description of persons, the units. However none of them is a perfect portrayal of reality i.e. life as the way of life is neither aggregation nor unit but a whole invisible process" (Williams 280). According to him the traditional society comprising genuine relationships of people in communities have ceased to exist and contemporary society has turned into tiny units of individuals the holy relations are violated and are often discontinued. Twentieth century is marked by the characteristic of personal freedom and individualism. This change in socio-economic life has resulted change both in literary technique and content.

The new trend has threatened the old and it is difficult to be glued to the old and neglect the emergence of the new. Therefore it is the time to "explore the new definition of realism" in order to "break out of the deadlock and find a creative direction" (Williams 287). Thus Williams positively responds the change and observes that "The contemporary novel has both reflected and illuminated the crisis of our society ..." (Williams 287).

Theodore Adorno

Theodore Adorno, another prominent Marxist philosopher who belongs to the Frankfurt school, rejects the realistic theoreticians like Lukacs and naturalistic trend as well. He denounces Lukacs's reflection theory of literature, and sets different opinions in literary criticism. Frankfurt school of criticism which Adorno belongs to criticizes the formal rules and laws because the reality in this objective world is systematic formless. Lukacs criticizes the works of modern authors like James Joyce, Samuel Beckett etc. and their technique of stream of consciousness and interior monologue but Adorno advocates that "the interior monologue, far from cutting the literary work off from reality, can expose the way reality actually is" (Forgacs 188). However this reality is not

photographic but implied. According to Adorno "Art is the negative knowledge of the actual world" (Forgacs 189). Thus according to David Forgacs by negative knowledge Adorno "doesn't mean knowledge, it means knowledge which can undermine and negate false or reified condition" (Forgacs 189).

Thus, he supports the role played by the literary works of modernist writers like Beckett, Joyce, Proust and Kafka etc. As contextualized by Forgacs, Adorno "opens up modernist writing to Marxist theory by showing that a different kind of relationship between the text and reality is possible" (Forgacs 190).

Walter Benjamin

Walter Benjamin, a German scholar was not pre-occupied by Marxist political philosophy, social and economic theories. He was rather a literary critic of Marxist trend. Walter Benjamin according to Cliff Slaughter "convinced that the proletarian revolution was the only solution to humanity's crisis, and yet he found the communist parties' prescriptions to writers and artists to be the very opposite of revolutionary and thus destructive of any development in literature and art" (Slaughter 170). Because of such radical views Benjamin was treated with hostility by both the Nazis and the communists and lived a melancholic and isolated life until he committed suicide in 1940.

Discussing the literary theory of Walter Benjamin Cliff Slaughter titles him as "Against the stream: Walter Benjamin" in his *Marxism, Ideology and literature*. He states:

Benjamin directed his polemical writings against all those who drew from Marx's prognoses only the conclusion that the writers should 'take the side' working class in conceiving their subject matter, demonstrating

some automatic progressiveness of the productive forces which must be victorious against the production relations ... To imagine that a commonsense adoption of 'progressive' themes within existing literary forms constitutes a revolutionary line in art and literature was considered by Benjamin to be pure nonsense. (Slaughter 147)

Lucien Goldman

Lucien Goldman was born in Romania and spent his life in France. He is best recognized as a sociologist and an influential critic. His views are closer to George Lukacs than any of his contemporary writers and theoreticians as both concentrate on 'social contents'. However, Goldmann tries to co-relate literary works not with the ideology of an individual author but with the "Mental structure of the author's social group" (Forgacs 183), which marks the originality of his theory. According to him the social group may be both revolutionary or reactionary. By mental structure he means the patterns of ideas and concepts possessed by certain social group.

Cliff Slaughter's *Marxism, Ideology and Literature* is a precious work of art for those wishing to study Marxist Literary Theories, which presents Goldmann's literary theory vividly. Slaughter argues in his essay entitled "The Hidden Structure" "That Goldmann shares nearly similar ideas to Lukacs on certain fundamental questions about literature. According to him they came to the same conclusion about the questions of the social, economic and political characterization of the post 1945 capitalistic world" (Slaughter 151). Slaughter further states that in Goldmann's opinion:

... The structure of the world vision of a social group was postulated as homologous with the structure of the universe of given literary works. The social groups whose life-situation and historical role necessitated a

comprehensive vision would normally be structured on a manner congruent with the relations between whole and part, history and function, etc. in the class. However, the structures of world vision of classes were not conceived as fixed, but rather in a constant process of deconstruction and restructuration as the social group found in it necessary to confront and adopt to or overcome the new problems constantly thrown up by social life. (Slaughter 154)

In Goldmann's view the creator of a work of art is a social class itself. Goldmann in *The Hidden God* observes that: "... In the modern world from the 17th century onwards- artistic, literary and philosophical works have been associated with social classes and closely inked with the consciousness which each class has of itself' (Slaughter 155).

Therefore a clear understanding of the class and class-consciousness is highly essential for the proper interpretation of literary works written in the 17th century and thereafter.

David Forgacs discusses Goldmann's theory under genetic model as " it is centered on the origins, causes and determinants" (Forgacs 183) of literary production. According to Forgacs Goldman is of the opinion that" literary works arise out of social consciousness and behaviour and it is the way they are linked to society that he sought establish" (Forgacs 184). Therefore the literary works for him are not the personal expression of "The author's self but the social class of while the author remembers" (Forgacs 184). Unlike Russia formalism, in Goldman's theory, the language is simply the medium of expressing worldview of his class which already exists. The success of a work of art depends on how much it expresses the worldview of author's class in the same way the greatness of the writer depends his ability to manifest the worldview of his class coherently which for

ordinary is chaotic. Thus the creator of a work of art is not an individual writer but a representative of his class.

Goldmann doesn't go more dogmatically regarding the fundamental problems of modern capitalistic bourgeois society. Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels opine that the economic discrimination i.e. centralization of means of production in the hands of tiny minority of capitalists and destitution of majority of people is the principal question to be solved in the modern capitalist world whereas Goldmann thinks:

The fundamental problematic of modern capitalist societies is no longer located at the level of poverty-although, I repeat, poverty remains even in the most advanced industrial countries or even at the level of freedom directly limited by an external constraint. Instead it lies entirely in the contraction of the level of consciousness and in the concomitant tendency to educe the fundamental human dimension of the possible (Slaughter 151).

As the matter of fact, class consciousness pervades throughout the novel, *The Sword and the Sickle*. It portrays two classes: the working class (peasants) and the feudal lord represented by the oppressive land baron, the Nawab of Nasirabad. Lalu is the person who really raises the voice of all the oppressed peasants. This kind of class conflict can be studied through the theoretical perspective of the renowned Marxist, Raymond Williams who copes with how there is domination of oppressors on the peasants in the countryside. Speaking truly the feudal lords exploit even the fundamental rights of the peasantry class in the agrarian society. Hence the Nawab of Nasirabad who is shrewd, courteous, humorous & warm-blooded, exercises his villainy chiefly in delegating to others the planning and execution of methods for maintaining power.

Further more it is pretty clear that Mulk Raj Anand has tried his level best to deal with the deep-rooted problems of peasants in the hierarchical society. George Lukacs' reflection model suits Anand's attempt for the reflection of the realistic social problems especially difficulties created by the middle class, landlords in the peaceful and normal lives of peasants.

Chapter - III

Textual Analysis

Anand reveals the political issues of Indian history of during 1930s.

Thematically, *The Sword and the Sickle* captures the physical force of communist leaders and their failure to achieve the goal due to the ideological contradiction with other leaders who are against communism. The novel is about the miserable condition of an ex-soldier, Lalu who expects a piece of land as a reward of his labour after returning home land from the war camp of Germany as a war prisoner. But he faces accusation of sedition to government instead of any reward. He is disillusioned and infuriated with the government and decides to combat against the capitalism in order to establish socialism in India. In fact he finds lack of unity among leaders when he organizes peasant assembly in Rajgarh. He addresses violence and physical force as the comrade Sarshar focuses the model of Russian revolution. The rightist leader Mahatma Gandhi and his followers follow the tract of spiritual struggle with non-violence expecting conservative model of Sworaj (Home rule) instead of Russian rule. He revolutionizes the Hindu people to protest against Muslims by worshiping the cow. His follower Srijut Ladly Prasad blindly follows the method of Gandhism.

Some moderate leaders like the Count Rampal Singh and his followers leave the track of leftist and follow the way of Gandhi that is of the non-violence and spiritual struggle. Razwi also leaves his revolution as he sees the government's oppression. Similarly, due to the communal interest the Muslim leaders do not support the revolution as well. The revolution does not get strong support form Muslims due to their intolerance. In the name of religion, most of the Muslim leaders leave the mainstream.

Maya always distrusts Lalu's profession of revolution. She does not support her

husband which becomes another cause of failure of Lalu's revolution.

Lalu convinces the peasants to help his country and people instead of cooperating the foreign rule. He reveals his intention of returning home land to have his labour wage and promotion complaining against the capitalistic system. He protests: "I am with you, brothers, he said, 'only I have eaten the salt of the Sarkar, bad as it is I have been a war prisoner in Germany and I am going to the depot to get a rise in pay and rank for my war services" (10).

The expectation of getting reward from the government is ruined. Instead he is blamed of helping the rebels in his service. So Lalu says: "I don't want the dirty money of the Sarkar, he said to himself as if he were turning to decide a conflict" (25).

Lalu wants to fight against the government when he does not get a piece of land as the reward. Then he protests and expresses: "My path is clear. I will go home as if this was some kind of revelation, he smiled proudly, though, as he advanced a few steps, he felt foolish to be so absorbed in himself" (26). The members of rebel club want to disturb by bombing the house of the land lord. Thus they expresses:

He (Lalu) will join our club, 'said Gughu, As a first measure of revolt, we have renamed the bay of old Herman Singh. "Silly" Lalu will come with us and we shall throw a stink bomb in that house there. I am not so sure about that Herbans Singh said. 'No' nothing can be done, according to Chacha Harnam Singh, 'said Santokh ambiguously. 'We must just get hold of our brother, the thieves, the robbers and the cattle lifters and send their out to Manabad in bundles to be beaten up by the police philosophy of Gandhi (51).

In the secret environment among the peasants Siddhu, a revolting poet recites his

poem intentionally to protest against the feudal lord. Furthermore he revolutionizes the peasants against the government. His words of persuasion are as follows:

'The world is full of liberty, brother,

It is the fault of peasants and worker

if we don't catch in their sacks

bundle it and bring it home.

For liberty is just lying around in the air'. [...]

'But, brothers, the peasant still have the Greatest liberty of all to them. The freedom which they are new learning to enjoy, the freedom to starve!'. (50)

The higher class passenger makes the strong disgusted against Lalu's attempt for a small space placing some thing from its place because there was not any seat for poorer people like Lalu and his wife Maya. The class conflict is seen between higher and lower ones. The man who is the owner of things protests in this way:

Where upon Lalu stood back, deliberate for a movement and through of storming the citadel. Having chosen a snoring an adversary, who has not only stretched himself on a bunk but enthroned his trunks and various bags on it, Lalu took the law into his own hands and dug into his ribs. This put an end to the snoring. The man rose uttering abusive threats if, anyone dares to touch a thing he will be courting arrest for jail left. Lalu forthwith removed the luggage from the bank and made room for the tired Maya to sit on. (81)

The division of people by birth is marked in the names of religion, nationality and class inequality. This type of system is created by the capitalists. The protesters like Kirpu and other peasants aver:

Every where it the same in fact, it seemed to him, there were no black or white people, no yellow or brown people not even Francis and German, English and Hindustanis and Chinese and Japanese, but there were only two races and two religions in the world, the rich and the poor. (83)

It gets pretty clear that caste system is an ideology constructed to oppress and limit people to the traditional framework of society. He talks about the so-called constructed caste which is for the sake of praising the higher ancestor so-called people of high and pure blood. Rampal Singh protests and further avers:

Rajput and a few Brahmins and of course, such manial castes as sweepers, cobblers, weavers, potters and others who are necessary for serving the exalted. Further more, there used to be a popular tradition that the village lies at the center of the sacred region where a hundred, thousand sages assembled to attend the sacrificial ceremony of an ancestor. (91)

Abdul, a servant of Nawab's palace faces the identity crisis. It shows the class debate between the feudal lord and peasants. Nawab shows his superiority causing identity crisis to the poor. Thus, he scolds:

'You (Abdul) blind ass' roared the Nawab 'Get out of here. fool!' 'Oh, where is sugar?', said Shikh Hadayat Ullah 'No sugar! O Abdul, son of donkey by a mule... seed of an owl! Core here... hook, Mawab sahib, how many times this illegally begotten told to stand by in ease we want something! For if he brings milk he forgets the sugar! I don't know why you won't dismiss him. [...] 'I want to break the head of that swine Abdul!' not only is there no sugar, the milk full of cream but the tea is cold and he has

not brought any hot water. And I have voiced never to take wine ever since
I had a Devine grace! (122)

The manager of Nawab's state, Sheikh Hadayat Ullah becomes angry at the Count Rampal Singh as well. Ullah threatens Sukhua after becoming his position strength and bold. Furthermore he scolds Sukhua in this way:

They [tenants] will come back after eating dung! the rogues! they will soon have cultivated a taste for food. They will come bending low in entreaty and them and the lands which they are neglected. And, Rampal, let me warn you against that one eyed Sukhua, who is causing all this trouble.
(124)

Kanwar Rampal Singh opposes the landlords' associations led by the manager of Nawab. He supports the ongoing revolution against Nawab's manager. Ullah convinces him to join the association of landlords instead of the peasants'. Ullah further says:

May I say to you, Rampal, on behalf of the Nawab Sahib, that we are starting a landlords association and we would like you to join us. Brother Rampal, our peasants used to be a peaceable lot,' said the Nawab gently, dolefully, almost in a singsong. There are bad influences at work, 'Rampal' 'said Hadayat Ullah vaguely though pointedly enough to be insinuating. And I am making every tenant who stirs up trouble on example to others. What would you do with a rebellion?' Of course, I would help a rebellion, said the Count casually. 'Oh, Don't be fool!' said Hadayat Ullah vaguely with a nervous laugh. Try and be serious come to dinner with me one day and let us talk about this association.(125).

Kanwar Rampal Singh despises the fanatic people. He also convinces others about

the cause of sorrow. Everything is caused by man himself not to blame God. The cause of peasants' property is the ruler's intensity to rule them. He addresses the peasants to involve in fight and addresses:

'My faith in human nature has received a severe blow', Rampal Singh said.

'I have heard that if the ryot is evicted or beaten up by the landlords or his but burns down, or he falls ill, he sits patiently with never a word to say for himself, thinking it is will of God! And here, you peasants seem quite different from what I was told you were like you never mention the word God or care a fig for those priest! (135)

The revolutionary figure like Comrade Sarshar is a radical Marxist who believes in action. He opines action is very much useful to break the Feudal system. The word and action are not the same. Sarshar convinces Lalu not to believe in slippery word or pattern. Lalu remembers:

You must understand that though our ultimate aim is revolution we cannot bring it about by saying the words, revolution thousand times a day on the rosary of our hearts. You must understand the materials you are dealing with from day to day ... with a peculiar impulse to be impressive, which comes over some of us [...] the bourgeois folk tend to use big sonorous pompous words in order to show off. (151)

Comrade Sarshar attacks upon the Kanwar Rampal Singh as a dual personality commenting him as a leader of not having any political commitment. When Rampal Singh shows equal sympathy to Gandhi and Sarshar, the Comrade Sarshar blames him not to be changeable rather be rigid in his commitment. Thus, he advocates on behalf of communist's policies regarding his personal stands:

I do not doubt the integrity of your ideals, Kanwar Rampal Sahib, said comrade Sarshaar. But there is a question of your methods' Anti-Government, anti-landlords anti-religion, anti-money-lender anti-religion, anti-working class, anti-anything-I know that the circle of Kanwar Rampal Singh is out for a title fan. (152)

Srijut Tiwari, the Congress leader of Uttar Pradesh opposes the relation of Kanwar Rampal Singh with the Comrade Sarshaar, the organizer of the party of Uttar Pradesh. By knowing the double relation of Kanwar Rampal Singh, the Congress leader, Tiwari comments; "It is a dangerous game, Kanwar Singh, which you are playing, Tiwari began as they entered the room.. That Sarshaar is a rogue of the first order..."(153).

Srijut Tiwari wants to utilize taboo. He does not like communism as it does not favour any religion. Rampal Singh's opposition of religion and its taboo are necessary for him and thus he reacts:

I must say, Kanwar Sahib [...] that will never succeed in your work if mock at people's taboos ... I have no doubt in my mind that our Hindu philosophy tells the truth about God better than your communism He seemed to be always waiting for an argument, as if his coarse body board was just waiting for a pin prick or menacing thrust of a dagger. (163)

Prof. Verma, Marx theoretician reacts against the religious philosophy of Hindus. He claims that there is not any kind of philosophy of religion. It is the way of earning money. He further questions:

Which Hindu philosophy do you mean Tiwari Jii? Verma came to the charge with his peculiar love of precision. There have been so many schools of thought. And, anyhow, Hinduism is no religion, part from the

social organism of caste! Anyone professing the any belief is a Hindu, so long as he is born to one of the castes. And all this ritual is a good Bramin trick to keep people where they are and to coin money through conducting ceremonials. (163)

Kanwar Rampal Singh rejects the Hindu religion through his strong discussion. He says religion is an artificial discourse to cheat the people. He compares the religion with drug. He opposes and further attacks:

Nothing of the kind [...] they (communists) merely explain how and why religion came to be they deny God, because they understand history. They don't need the drug of religion, because they can discover the capacity to live intensely in the new world which they wish to one etc, to live as a part of the whole of things. (163)

Lalu is irritated with the speech of Mahatma Gandhi which was against the communist method of revolution. The lover of war like Lalu does not like non-violence. Lalu expresses his radical views and protests against Gandhi:

He (Lalu) himself had suffered in all conscience, but he had never welcomed suffering. He had wanted to be happy, and he had suffered in his search of happiness, because all the people around him did not believe in happiness.. .the great man's teaching was not different from the teaching all of his father's saints, who enjoyed people to purity themselves through asceticism. All those priests, Yogis, Shadhus and beggars who tortured the selves what was difference between them and this enlightened man? (200)

The voices of suppressing anger expressed by Gandhi are not possible. He responds: "Mahatma Gandhi's excessive love upon God is different from him. He is not

ready to praise God. Gandhi protests against the untouchable which he reacts in this way:

Brothers, before you begin to eat I would like you to join with me and pray to God to purify our hearts of the sin of untouchability for, even as to-night you are seated together, members of all castes, high and low, your souls are united and your hearts throb with one idea: that you will never think of any untouchable as an outcaste, but as a son of God ... Now close your eyes for a moment and pray to God with me that our hearts be purified. (208)

Lalu gets angry when he sees the complete blindness of Sukhu due to the attack of policemen led by Chaprasi. When Lalu gets injured due to policemen's attack he reacts in this way:

The protest of younger Kanwar Singh with Rampal Singh. The support of Rampal Singh's to the peasant what made him difficult to set up the Landlords association. It is a question of life and death for us landlords [...] you are laughing we must put an end to this tomfoolery.. the count looked away from him in disgust (270).

Blind Sukhua is angry at Kanwar Birpal Singh. So he attacks being fired and scolds Kanwar Birpal Singh. Sukuwa is very angry with the behaviour of teasing Maya and angers: "The old days have gone he kept saying, waving his hand as if the world had dissolved into insubstantial nothingness. The old days have gone! ... lecher! If you go teasing other people's wives I will teach you a lesson !" (325).

Prof. Verma does not accept the attack of Sukha against Kanwar Rampal Singh. He hates the Count Rampal Singh, the elder brother of Birpal Singh. Prof. Verma convinces Rampal Singh to control the physical attack:

Do you (Rampal Singh) realize where all this leading to? [...] into which

he has fallen since he saw the undignified tussle between the manager and the blind man the whole countryside is becoming hysterical. Those peasants! ... You should at least try to be serious when they attack your own brother! I could understand the man's enthusiasm after the trial, but... (325)

Prof. Verma opposes violence against Kanwar Birpal Singh. So, he argues with Rampal Singh not to support the hooliganism and protests against Rampal Singh and his Supporter like Sakhua, Comrade Sarshar's leadership and Verma reacts; "I do not believe in hooliganism exploded Professor Verma, after all they must be some consideration of sentiment and respect for own relation" (326).

Razwi, the students' leader sees the natural protest of a dominated peasant, one-eyed Sukhua. He is not ready to accept Prof. Verma's blame of hooliganism. Instead of peasants like Sukhua, the government is more responsible for the mischiefs:

It only "hooliganism" when the peasants lift their hands? It is not "hooliganism" when landlords or police beat them up. When the landlords, using the machinery University rules, rusticate me for no other crime than organizing a Socialist Club in the College? It is not the government of India committing "hooliganism" daily on the people. Why not protest organized that "hooliganism" a little? It seems to me that it is nothing else but organizes "hooliganism" for those Viceroys and Governors to hold their wonderful garden parties with in the walled compounds of Government Houses, with the Indian money. While our Kisan sale; go triaging barefoot on the roads as it in visible starve of poverty was goading them on from behind ... it is a mockery. (328)

Lalu shows the anger by using the language of tit for tat. He wants violence for the freedom of India. He can't tolerate any sort of oppression. As he is radical in the way of approaching communism, he does not hesitate to advocate for the use of violent means to fight against the capitalist system:

"Why is violence unthinkable and undesirable against those who do violence to us? If the English declare that they own India by sword by the sword shall they hold it, why can't we say that we shall win India back by the sword and by the sword shall we keep it? ..." (328).

Professor Verma shows the strong disagreement against violence supported by Rampal Singh to overthrow the present government. He opposes violence saying it is an inhuman act with strong disgust and expresses:

Oh, it is no use telling to you [...], toying in patiently with the cord of his dressing gown. If you won't see that it is a question of values ... violence brings with it the dead weight of selfishness and animality, parts of our human inheritance which we should try to outgrow. (328)

Razwi regards the war rather than peace. To establish peasants' life Razwi believes in the radical view with Prof. Verma to dislodge the British government. Hence Razwi responds: "The peasantry have no patience with theories ... set the land lords house on fire lout the dectroi post as an example and you will have impressed them with the will to do something and given them heart. Don't let us be cowards" (329).

Razwi does not trust with Gandhian theory. He dislikes Gandhism since it is a very slow process to establish the rule of the have-nots'. He shows his father's war experience and the theory of patience believing in non-violence. He evaluates his father's plight in this way:

My father is doctor in government service. He was shocked by the atrocities at Amritsar. But he would not resign from service. He rationalized his role in life by an extra ordinary doctrine. 'I know things are bad' he said, "But we must be patience and suffer all the insults and humiliations at the hand of Sarkar, because soon Gandhiji will set things right. And then he will enter upon a new age ... Meanwhile, my respected father lives suspended somewhere between the old life and the new life in life which is no life at all, because he is fifty-five and is getting ready to die. And the real life he has vaguely hoped for will never begin for him [...] I have no future before me until India is free ... And I don't thing those other have-nots, the peasantry can wait either ... So I can dispense with compromises. (329)

Razwi challenges Rampal Singh. He asks him (Rampal Singh) to organize the Kisan Sabha without fear but not to accept the cowardice nature of Gandhi, Verma etc. Thus he opposes:

'You are afraid Kanwar Sahib!' Razwi challenged the Count. You have got this idea of the Kisan Sabha so firmly rooted. In your head that you will not open your mind to look anything else. Well of course, there are many laws in our country, but not so far which prevents you from calling yourself and your best friend, the all-India Kisan Sabha! ...(330)

Lalu does not like the inheritance that the landlord's land goes to his son after death the landlord hands the land to his son at death. Thus, Lalu opposes it and convinces Sukhua and Mithu; "We certainly don't seem to be content with a state of affairs in which if the landlords hands the land to his son at death, only the name of the landlord changes and

everything remains the same! Said Lalu ironically affecting Mithu's vehemence" (345).

Mithu, the hero of the trial of court wants to provide the land grasping from landlords. Mithu, a strong supporter of Lalu to struggle shows the hopes and says: "But there will be soon a change. It is about time that a direct blow of the lathi was struck against our enemies, so that innocent men can plough their lands and provide for their woman and children... Isn't that so, combined Lal Singh" (345).

Lalu opposes the political leaders stating the fact that they have also been busy in expanding the network of feudals which has become as a barrier in overthrowing the British government from India:

He (Lalu) vaguely felt the need for uniting the men around him for some kind of action, because if their individual voices and deeds were allowed to become too shrill then there would only be a few more hand-to-hand tussle the oppressors and oppressed in the villages, a violent scuffle, bloodshed or murder and everything would end in smoke (346).

Mithu is unknown about revolution because the leaders are quarrelling themselves. Due to the lack of adequate convincing, the revolution is uncertain to bring any favourable consequences. Mithu questions Lalu as:

To be sure, you leader Sahibs have been calling for "Revolution" [...] Now, I do not understand what revolution will bring but I do not know that I will bring the day of reckoning with our enemies and any how, we are prepared to follow such good sons of the earth as the comrade, Rampal Singh and you, anywhere, we are determined to do something. (347)

Mithu, being a revolutionary figure encourages his other friends to unite. He likes grappling wealth from rich people. Therefore he motivates them to get united and attempt

for the same:

There are two races and two religions in the world, the rich and the poor.

That is so all over the world, for all the folk who have gone to Vilayat tell

the same tale: There are gora coolies and sweepers and there are rich

Sahibs. To be sure, there is not a place where it is other wise accepted Roos

were the peasants and laborers killed the Badshah and the rich folk in a fit of

temper and where the people are ruling the country now of course they have

kept some of the rich who own their riches (347)

Mithu convinces peasantry class about communism of Roos and the money which is not in the hand of peasant. He encourages peasants for revolution to grapple money from money lenders and landlords. Among unconscious peasants, one questions:

'But how can poor people rule themselves said the third peasant, because

money is needed for rule and only the rich folk the Rajah Maharajas and

the Sahibs have money. None of you folk have any notion of what

happened in Roos. Said Mithu superiorly, but if Comrade Lai Singh says

that they have made a revolution there then we too shall roll up our sleeves

and tie our loin cloths to our waist and kill the money lenders and the lords

at the given word! To be sure, the leaders have only to give the word. (348)

Comrade Surshar protests against the activity of the Count Rampal Singh who led some revolutionary people when Sarshar knows the surrendering to the police of the Count Kanwar Rampal Singh without proper tricks. He shows his anger and comments:

That can only give us cause for disgust-at the monstrous exhibition of

weak-kneed nationalism of people like Kanwar Rampal Sigh. He wants to

lead the peasant movement and yet he runs away from his work among the

Kisans to the waiting rooms of the deputy Commissioner, begging, imploring, rubbing his nose to be allowed to stay in his ancestral palace.

(350)

According to Marxist theory there should be the commitment of fighting instead of getting afraid. Lalu admires Sarshar's war loving thought for dislodging. He remembers the situation and his commitment. Lalu talks himself about Kanwar Rampal Singh and comments: "I came to Kisan Nagar this morning and waited for Kanwar Rampal Singh because he had an appointment with me. He did not turn up...Now I have an important meeting to attend in Allahabad, so will you walk up to the station with me?" (351).

Lalu's evaluation of Kanwar Rampal Singh is different when Comrade Sarshar shows strong anger. The sense of betrayal to the peasant's assemblies is known due to these words which Lalu remembers:

I know all out the urgency of Kanwar Sahib's departure. Sarshar exploded, so that his long hair seemed to shake like black wasp darting in different directions after someone after someone disturbed their nest. He thinks that if he goes and licks the boots of the Sarkar they will reinstitution him in his wing of the palace and every thing will be all right... Wah, my revolutionary? (351).

The statement trained by the communist leader Sarshar which is the realization in the mind of Lalu. Sarshar comments the Count Kanwar Rampal Singh as a bourgeois as well as a pseudo-revolutionary. Lalu repeats Sarshar's words and states the same fact in this way:

What a fool, when he knew that months ago the peasants were throwing over their age-longed faith in the performance of which oppressed them!

For what did the riots show in Nasirabad, on the ellipse festival and at Kishan Nagar? I have no patience with such great men who can't even deign to begin loach with other. Workers in the cities and imagine they can load a "Revolution" all their own! ... Khon Khon ... Khon... (351)

Lalu remembers the attack against Razwi by Sarshar who blames Razwis's lack of commitment to organize The Student Socialist Club. He disgusts the duel behaviour of Razwi. Comrade Sarshar trains the fighting policy against the feudal lord. He expresses the lack of secrecy of strategies to run the Communist Party. Lulu supports the blame on Kanwar Rampal Singh and his other groups as well as Razwi, the leader of University Students Socialist Club and criticizes:

'Brother, don't think,' Sarshar said, turning indulgently towards Lulu for a movement, 'that I want to argue with you for the sake of argument. Forgive my anger but have had to run about playing hide and seek with the police ever since I came out jail after the 1992 campaign, and I haven't much wind ... But, you see we have to use words to explain ourselves. And words are a very inadequate medium, for they are slippery and have to colour and light and shade and traditional meaning which prevent their being in a scientific scene. Besides, our language is yet immature, and we shall have a great many difficulties in conducting our struggle. (353)

Comrade Sarshar talks about the leaders of Congress and their methodology of non-violence. According to him, Gandhism is not an effective way of revolution. Sarshar's words and his anger are broken down comparing the policy of Gandhi as terrorist. He infuriates and reacts:

Without trying to understand and apply the lessons of previous experiences

to your struggle, without making any effort to unite the peasants by explaining to them the true nature of their position in relation to the factory workers who are the vanguard of our movement-if you become what Comrade Lenin has called "pure and simple" labourites, believing in the spontaneous recognition by the presents of their plight, then what will actually happen will be that the leadership will remain on one level of awareness, while Kisan will be another level. And heroism of individual great men will be increasingly substituted for the struggle of the people. That would lead to the kind of impression making which Gandhiji resorts to when he talks of offering individual non-violence! No different from the impression making of Bengal terrors! ... (353)

Comrade Sarshar instructs Lalu to fight against the existing British Indian government with good policy knowing the problem of peasants. Words are out but action is needed for revolution as Lenin in Russia further says:

If you are convinced that I have not been looking under the bed for fancied anarchists or trying to fight you for belonging to a society given to religious incoherence, then please believe me that first thing to do is to think out the significance of revolution for the peasants.[...] You can't open hostilities against the most organized and deeply entrenched imperialism with the resources of Kanwar Rampla Singh's gangs; having no contact with other districts without any systematic and carefully considered plan organizing instructing and settling of workers for prolonged and stubborn struggle! Comrade Lenin called such and primitivism in Russia a "disease" in our country it is an epidemic (355).

Lalu trusts the Comrade Sarshar that there is lack of method to dislodge-the British-Indian government. He confesses and it wants to apply serious one. The Comrade, being careless about the ongoing situation remembers and further expresses:

And they had all lacked knowledge of conspiratorial methods and had been to open ... to be sure, they should have organized shoot for educating Kisan, devoted a lot more attention to their paper Naya Hind, and contracted other Comrades. For there were many things he himself would have liked to have known about the Revolution, and perhaps they would have been able to form a loyal group of Revolutionaries less affected with their own fears, hopes and anxieties. (357)

Mulk Raj Anand has been concerned about the exploitation of the British Indian Government. Lalu and his ruined life is a burning example of peasants. So Anand shows the pathetic situation of peasant in India and reminds:

But even since he had been demobilized from the Army, he had been increasingly on the defensive against the other people's words and opinion more and more on guard against being taken in, listening considering very matter. [...] All his young life had been an attempted achieving this liberty, but he knew the dangers of relapsing into the state of unconsciousness from the movements in which he had accepted the taboo of religion in the village and the ideas of the Sarkar in the Army code, out of sheer laziness ... During such movements, thinking had become a strange and unpleasant business. (359)

Ananda exposed the rebellious heroic character, Lalu, who speaks alone due to anger created by the British-Indian government. He mutters the words from the past. The

novel reads the situation of Lalu given by a passenger. The novel observes:

The thought of the light in the contortion of Sarshar's face, of the Comrade's magnetic power which had seemed to rise about the indecorous, little consumptive frame, and he shook his head as if to cast of all the doubts and fears that assailed him, and began to mutter to himself, naively. I suppose, some men have always tried to struggle, to understand life. Are you taking to yourself and disturbing others? said a small, thin moustache passenger who was trying to sleep on the next bunk. And he continued suspiciously, 'Conscience is active only when the prison doors are open'.
(360)

Lalu has become out of aim though he was good at every step of life. He remembers the condition of the past and present life two-time jail. He has a lot of unsolved questions about his ongoing life and analyzes:

'Why were there foods riots in Germany? What had happened to the squire of the land I was promised by the Sarkar? And why was I demobilized? Why the money famine? [...] On guard against being taken in listening and considering every matter and doing only what I was sure about in the light of my experience after seeking to grapple with my own testing and that of others with a devotion even like that of the religious devotee Dayal Singh. Why is it that I have ended up in this reeking hell, scratching my head, tossing restlessly from side to side? ... (381)

Lalu addresses the physical revolution criticized by Mahatma Gandhi. Gandhism advocates for nonviolence to establish the peasant government. Gandhi protested against revolutionary leaders who were in the favour of war which he hated:

Strength dare not come from physical force. It comes from the will. Non-violence does not mean submission to the will of the evildoer, but of spitting one's whole soul against the will of the tyrant. Working under the law of our being, it is possible for a single individual to duty the whole might of an unjust empire and lay the foundation for that empire's downfall or its regeneration. (201)

Gandhi is in the favour of peace and non-violence. He opposes disagreement against Lalu who is in the favour of physical force and violence. Gandhi protests against war and admires his non-violence methodology and criticizes:

Suffering is the mark of human tribe. It is an eternal law. The mother suffers so the child may live life out of death. The condition of a heat growing is that the seed grain should garish. No country has ever risen with out being purified through the fire of suffering [...] progress is to measured by the amount of the amount of suffering undergone the purer is the suffering is the greater is the progress ... Non-violence in its dynamic condition means conscious suffering(200)

Gandhi admires only Hindu religion which is another disturbance for organizing Muslims into one because of Muslims' cattle killing culture. Lalu's attempt is to equalize everything for unification but fails at last what Gandhi gives and further speaks:

... I am lover of cattle. I have tried to study the cattle question. Very few people realized that conservation of the cattle wealth of India is a major economic problem, be set with many complexities ... Adulteration of ghee has always been one of there. During the last few years it has become a growing menace owing to import of cheap vegetable oil miscalled, because

of its having been congealed and other wise made to look like ghee ... the protection of the cow ... I call myself a Sanatani Hindu and therefore pledged to the protection of the cow. (199)

The communist theoretician Prof. Verma does not like the opposite aspect which are against modern technology of running factory. The communist admirer like Lalu is against it. Prof. Verma favours the modern technology. The support by the factory owner is not Lalu's desire to keep them up. It is against proletariats. Gandhi's way of running factory is criticized by Verma and he further avers:

The Mahatma knows that the spinning wheel is a good slogan, though he knows that all the yarn necessary for the needs of country cannot be provided by hand spinning. So he shuts a corner of his left eye behind his glasses and winks at the factory wallahs to go ahead with their plans. All that is necessary to cover up the double dealing is a mystical phrase So to speak his right and, the giver of blessings does not see what his left hand, with the bags of gold is doing. (212)

Lalu does not unite the Muslim people into one force along with Hindu leaders to fight against The British Indian government. The Muslim leader, Fazlu and his Muslim protesters protest among the throng showing the strong disgust against Hindusm with the intention of equal space and protest: "Some or are Muhammadans! And it is an insult to our religion to say long live Ram Chanderji" (134).

Lalu remembers his wife's protest against his revolutionary nature. Her desire of living in a house together what is not bearable for him at that time. From the jail he remembers his wife's requests realizing uneasiness and speaks himself addressing Maya's protest. What he reminds:

'Do not go my love, don't go,
The nights are dark and long,
And I am shivering with the cold
Do not go, my love,
Hold my hands in their and make them warm, my love
We them warm, my love,
Do not go in the month of poh ... (383)

Lalu complains against his wife, Maya and his other leaders that he has been suffered by the government. To dislodge the government, it is necessary to revolt again being conscious when he is kept in jail. He addresses the convicts to do another struggle for the sake of dislodging the British Indian government. Thus he expresses these addressings indicating the convicts as himself. He convinces the peasants for unified organization. He further says:

Come let us make another effort to destroy there who don't love us. We failed because our habits, ideas, opinions, were narrow and contained with in the circle of Kisan Nagar. Because neither our leaders nor we ourselves now what all our the brothers were doing those brothers who have ended up from the four corners of India in the mills and the factories, escaping from hunger, pestilence and cold into long hours, dirt and disease! We followed the shadow and forget the substance.. .come, worthy little people, come, we will now make a real revolution come, we shall work day and night and learn how to make a revolution.... But this romantic gestures seemed absurd in the case... So he sat up suddenly coughed and cleared his treat of the phlegm, and tried to catch himself. (384)

The writer is very much serious about the exploitation done in the name of religion and class struggle. Lalu as a hero loves Maya, the daughter of a landlord who wants the rule of poor and rejects yellow clothes but offers red clothes that symbolically refer to the socialistic system. Furthermore, he proves him a hero who represents the exploited through his frequent revolts against the feudalism extant in the society he lives in:

On the top of the landlords hay cart, Maya had appeared to him as a beloved. And he had sought to build his love in hear eyes, reaching out to happiness with all the enthusiasm of his nature. But after the brief joys of the fair, among the strong of the peasants. The rattling carts, the roving beggars, the moving cattle, the bargaining banias and the clouds of dust, after the exhilaration of having his ritualistic hair shorn in defiance of his family and the teaching of the tenth Gurus, after the brief twilight decorated with burning lamps had come disillusionment. This violence of the taboo has started him on the road of grim experience. This is the love of Maya. 'No red clothes,' said the villagers, 'only yellowness' And they had blacked his face and put him on the donkey when he got home ... They were all clipping the wings of the young. And they bickered wth each other, while the landlord was looting their land and that flea Chaman Lal was defrauding them of their hoarded gold ... perhaps he had been in too great a hurry and also perhaps he had cared more about his wooded vanity than anything else going about like a long faced boor when he might have passes the donkey ride off as a joke[...] Then the landlord had brought a false change of theft against him and he had run away and joined the army.(378)

Thus, the novel, *The Sword and the Sickle* ends with the birth of new seeds that sprout later

to linger revolution begun earlier by Lalu. After the arrival of Lalu's son in the world of class struggle from the womb of mother- he conveys some special message to the exploiters against whom his father has constantly fought against till being put into prison. Hence it get pretty clear that Lalu's diverse efforts in various forms to bring about drastic change in feudal society do not go useless despite the fact that he is inside the four walls. His revolutionary vision genetically transfers to his newly born son which can evidently be stated that his son keeps on kicking and fighting which symbolize his parental responsibility left to be accomplished.

Chapter–IV

Conclusion

In *The Sword and the Sickle*, Anand portrays the socio-political history of India under the capitalistic rule of the British Indian Government in the 1920s and 1930s. The novel exposes the peasants' protest against the deeply rooted capitalism handled by imperialistic foreign rule. *The* ideological conflict among the ideologues of the peasant revolution as represented by Anand is the main reason behind its failure.

The novel narrates the suppressed protagonist, Lalu, who returns from the war Camp spending several years as a war prisoner, but the government blames Lalu as a seditionist and then he is unceremoniously demobilized.

It infuriates him against the policy of government. He comes to the conclusion and gradually makes up design against the rule of the British government. He observes and finds ideological fractions in his spirit of revolution. He becomes the organizer of Kisan Sabha in Rajgarh.

Finally, he finds his favorite communist leader, comrade Sarshar, who inspires him. Later, according to Sarshar's counseling, he follows the leftist thought of social revolution instead of spiritual struggle. He admires the revolution of Russia under the leadership of comrade Lenin. He follows violence and physical force to overthrow the British rule from India for establishing the classless society.

On the other hand, the rightist leader, Mahatma Gandhi and his follower, Srijut

Tiwari stand against the spirit of Lalu's addressing of physical force and Russian model of communism. Gandhi follows the method of non-violence and spiritual struggle. He (Gandhi) does not become ready to import the foreign model of transformation and re-structure instead he admires the home rule of native model following the conservative culture of the Hinduism. He becomes the great lover of cattle, the cow. He follows the method of the cow protection. He addresses the peasant of India to promote small industries like hand-spinning dress woven from native land.

Some moderate leaders, like the Count Kanwar Rampal Singh and his followers Prof.Vema, Razwi, the leader of Student Socialist Club of university become imposters in the campaign. They become very much impressive for the sake of classless society and exercises on it according to the Marxist theory but leave all the spirit of physical force and violence due to the government's oppression of the peasant in Rajgarh peasants' assembly. Towards the end, all of them surrender to the government that has supported the capitalism instead of peasants' revolution. The mentality of dual perspectives creates a kind of problem for strong force to over throw the capitalism and replace the progressivism.

The protest for the sake of communal interest creates a kind of religious intolerance. They create their own grouping against the Gandhian philosophy of the Hinduism. They do not accept the powerful union of the Hindu leadership. They create problems to drive the revolution into a single organization. The Muslim leaders and the protesters go with their own separate organization and protest against Hinduism. Finally, Lalu stands in confused mode due to the protest of his own wife Maya who does not like the revolution and demands for her company. The protest of wife is another part of failure of Lalu.

Thus, Lalu fails due to the contradictory relation to one another among the

rebellions. Lalu's life ends in prison after the failure of his efforts to transform the Indian society.

Work Cited

- Abrams, M.H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. 7th Ed. Noida: Harcourt, 1999.
- Anand, Mulk Raj. *Apology for Heroism*. New Delhi: Arnold Heinmann, 1946.
- - -. *The Sword and the Sickle*. New Delhi: Arnold, 1984.
- Bery, Margaret. *Mulk Raj Anand: the Man and the Novelist*. Amsterdam: Oriental Press, 1971.
- Cowasjee, Saros. *So Many Freedoms: A Study of Major Fiction of Mulk Raj Anand*. Delhi: Oxford University, 1977.
- Daiches. David. *A Critical History of English Literature*. 4 Vols. Vol. IV. London: Allied Publisher Ltd., 1991.
- Forgacs, David. *Marxist Literary Theory: Modern Literary Theory*. Edann Jefferson and David Robery. London: Bastford Ltd, 1986.
- Gupta, G.S. Balram. *Mulk Raj Anand: A Study of His fiction in Humanistic Perspectives*. Bareilly: PrakashBook, 1974.
- Iyenger, K.R. Srinivas. *Indian Writing in English*. Delhi: Asia Publishing House, 1973.
- Kaushik, P.D. *The Congress Ideology and Programme 1920-47*. New Delhi: Allied, 1964.
- Lukacs, George. *The Historical Novel Trans*. Hannah and Stanley Mitchell 2nd Ed. London: Merlin, 1965.
- Machewe, Prabhakar. *The Moderninty and Contemporary Indian Literature*. New Delhi: Chetana Publications, 1976.
- Marx, Karl. "The Communist Menifesto", Shreedhar Lohani et. al. eds. *The Essays on*

- the Creation of Knowledge*. Ratna Publishers Bahadar: Kathmandu, 1999.
21-33.
- - -. "Letter on India" Margaret Berry. *Mulk Raj Anand: The Man and the Novelist*,
London: Labour Book Service, 1943.
- Naik, M.K. *A History of History of Indian English Literature*. New Delhi: Sahitya
Academy, 1982.
- Riemenschneider, D. "An Ideal of Man in Mulk Raj Anand's Novels" *Indian
Literature*. Vol. X. No. 1. New Delhi: Sahitya Academy, 1967.
- Sinha, K.N. *Mulk Raj Anand*. New Delhi: Kalynani, 1995.
- Slaughter, Cliff. *Marxism Ideology and Literature*. London: Macmillan, 1980.
- Willians, Raymond. *The Long Revolution*. London: Chatto and Windus 1961.
- Yakhot, O. *What is Dialectical Materialism*. Mascow: Progress Publishers, 1965.