

Chapter I. Introduction to Influence of Marxist Ideas in the Nineteenth Century

Short Story Writing

The focus of this research paper lies on the short stories by the world famous short story writers: Anton Chekhov and Guy de Maupassant. The research will be based on the analysis of five short stories from each writer between 1885 to 1895, and in the 1880s respectively.

The objective of this detailed study is to analyze the stories from the Marxist point of view. It will look upon the nature of exploitation, the class struggle between the two opposing classes: masters and workers and the out-come of the class struggle. In this research paper, the word 'master' refers to the 'people of power', whereas the word 'worker' refers to the 'powerless people' or 'lower class people'.

Both the writers present their characters from both the classes. The workers are cruelly exploited by their masters. So, the workers struggle for their social and economic upliftment. To this point, there is similarity between Chekhov and Maupassant. Further analysis shows that there lies significant difference between two writers in the analysis of the nature of exploitation, degree of exploitation and the outcome of worker's struggle for their emancipation.

Chekhov depicts the capitalist society where there is clash between the masters and workers. The workers are directly exploited by their masters. The exploitation of masters upon their workers is extreme. Such harsh exploitation leads to the latter's frustration. So, they do their best to come out of their grim situation, but all is in vain. What becomes obvious from this is that Chekhov presents a very static society and he does not expect the society to be free from the grip of upper class people. He does not anticipate any social change.

But, regarding his plays, he is revolutionary. He is aware of social change in his plays. He is influenced by the contemporary society. In the Russian Revolution,

the aristocracy had fallen down and proletariats were rising in power. Chekhov presents this social change in his plays. It becomes clear as Jacobus writes:

Chekhov's genius was in showing characters' ambition, pain and success. He was quite aware of important social change taking place in Russia; the old aristocratic classes, who once owned serfs, were being reduced to a genteel impoverishment, while the children of former slaves were being to succeed in business and real state ventures. Since Chekhov's grandfather had been a serf who bought his freedom in 1846, it is likely that Chekhov was especially supportive of such changes; we see evidences in his best plays. (539)

But, such type of social change does not take place in his short stories. His characters undergo painful life and have ambition to be free from that grim situation but do not get success as in his plays. Whatever Jacobus says about him, it is only in case of his plays. But, he is better remembered as a story writer than as a playwright. It shows that Chekhov does not anticipate any social change in his stories. In being so, Chekhov is against Marxist perspective of the world.

To talk about Maupassant, he also depicts the capitalist society. His stories show the miseries of the lower strata of humanity in the capitalist society. He is said to have depicted the lower strata of humanity. Moore writes, "Furthermore, so far as the question of studying the lower strata of humanity was concerned, we find Maupassant and Taine absolutely at variance" (150). It is said so because of his portrait of the lower life and their suffering in his stories. But there underlies capitalist society behind the miseries of the lower class people in the society. The exploitation by the rich people is indirect. They exploit the lower class people in the name of religion, friendship, morality and marital relationship. Besides these, they are also

exploited because of their own ignorance as well. Workers' ignorance is a motivating factor for the masters.

Maupassant's stories show not only the miseries of the lower class people but also the tragic to comic aspects of life. Towards the end of the stories, quite surprisingly, the workers succeed in their struggle and come out of the oppressed life and start living a normal and happy life. They move towards a subjective life after having led the oppressed life. What becomes obvious from this is that Maupassant anticipates that workers come out of the exploitation of capitalists and lead their own life in their own way to make a harmonious society where masters and workers work together. In being so, Maupassant believes in the Marxist perspective of the society.

Chekhov's works are excellent artistic works. His technical innovations in the shorter form of fiction have become standard practice. Rabonowitz writes, "They demonstrate the artistic balance, the refinement, precision and beauty which Chekhov brought to the short stories. These are qualities which later practitioners of this genre have never really surpassed" (67). Similarly, Maupassant is also a great story writer. So, to derive a conclusion on the basis of analysis of five short stories from each writer seems farcical. Nevertheless, the claim is that the conclusion derived on the basis of the analysis of five stories from each writer will apply to the whole body of short stories that Chekhov wrote in between 1885 to 1895 and that Maupassant wrote in the 1880s and will be convincing as well.

This research work will present the Marxist Reading of the stories of both the writers. It will present nature of exploitation, the class struggle and the outcome of it. In addition to this, it deals with those theories and critical works that are directly related with the objective of this research work. It will be limited within the periphery of "Delineation of Workers in the short stories by Chekhov and Maupassant."

Chapter II. Marxism and Class Struggle

Marxism is the political philosophy and practice derived from the work of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. The propounder of Marxism is Karl Marx. But in the course of time many others contributed to it. So, there lie many theoretical and practical differences among the various Marxists. However, most of Marxists state that the evolving history of humanity, of its social relations of its institutions, and of its ways of thinking are largely determined by the changing mode of its material production. Historical change in the fundamental mode of production brings changes in the social class structure which establishes dominant and subordinate classes that engage in a class struggle for economic, political and social advantage. The beliefs, values and ways of thinking and feeling through which human beings perceive which can be termed as ideology constitutes human consciousness. These are the common principles that most of Marxists share. M.H. Abrams also states the same:

1. 'In the last analysis', the evolving history of humanity, of its social relations, of its institutions, and of its ways of thinking are largely determined by the changing mode of its 'material production' that is, of its overall economic organization.
2. Historical changes in the fundamental mode of production affect changes in the social class structure, establishing in each area dominant and subordinate classes that engage in a class struggle for economic, political and social advantage.
3. Human consciousness is constituted by an ideology that is the beliefs, values and ways of thinking and feeling through which human beings perceive, and by recourse to which they explain, what they take to be reality. An ideology is, in complex ways, the product of the position and interest of a particular class. In any historical era, the

dominant ideology embodies, and serves to legitimize and perpetuate, the interests of the dominant economic and social class. (241)

Marx was more concerned with the forces of history and his view of history was that it is progressive, and to an extent inevitable. In his essay entitled "The communist Manifesto" he gives the review of overthrow of the feudal forms of government by the bourgeoisie. It is clear as Lohani writes:

Marx was concerned with the forces of history, and his view of history was that it is progressive and to an extent, inevitable. This view is very prominent in "The Communist Manifesto", particularly in his review of the overthrow of feudal forms of government by the bourgeoisie. He thought that it was inevitable that the bourgeoisie and the proletariat would engage in a class struggle from which the proletariat would emerge victorious. (21)

Marx is more concerned to clarify such view in his 'manifesto'. He states that the modern society emerged out of the ruins of the feudal society. It has not done away with class antagonisms. But it has established new classes, new conditions of oppression, and new forms of struggle in the place of the old ones. The society as a whole is more and more splitting up into two great hostile camps: bourgeoisie and proletariat.

The proletariats are exploited by the bourgeoisie. Bourgeoisie have captured the means of production. The property has been concentrated in a few hands. The proletariats are enslaved by the bourgeoisie. But, the proletariats go through various stages of development. With its birth begins its struggle with the bourgeoisie. At first, the contest is carried on by individual laborers, then by the work people of a factory, then by the operatives of the trade, in one locality, against the individual bourgeoisie who directly exploits them. The workers direct their attacks not against the

bourgeoisie conditions of productions, but against the instruments of production themselves. The workers become victorious. Thus, he is most famous for his analysis of history in terms of class struggle as summed up in the opening line of the introduction to "The Communist Manifesto", "The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggle" (qtd. in Lohani 20).

Marx is not in favor of the private property. For him, wage labor creates fresh exploitation. It is clear as he writes in his manifesto, "Or do you mean modern bourgeoisie private property? But does wage labour create any property for the labors? Not a bit. It creates capital, i.e. that kind of property which exploits wage labour, and which cannot increase except condition of getting a new supply of wage labour for fresh exploitation" (29). In saying so, Marx anticipates a harmonious society free from exploitation.

Marxism focuses on worker's revolution as the means of achieving human emancipation and enlightenments as Ralf Dahrendorf writes, "The main points of contention among Marxists are the degree to which they are committed to a worker's revolution as the means of achieving human emancipation and enlightenments and the actual mechanism through which such a revolution might occur and succeed" (4).

Marx sees exploitation and alienation of the labors as being the inherent features and key elements of capitalism and free market. The capitalists get enriched. The profit gained by the capitalists is the difference between the value of product made by the worker and the actual wage that the worker receives. In fact, the profit belongs to the labor, but under capitalism the fruits of the production belong to the employers who expropriate the surplus created by the workers and in so doing generate alienated labor. Thus, labourers are treated like the commodity. So, Marx writes in his 'Manifesto':

In the proportion as the bourgeoisie, i.e. capital is developed, in the same proportion is the proletariat, the modern working class, developed a class of labours who live only so long as they find work, and who find work only so long as their labor increases capital. These laborers, who must sell themselves piecemeal, are a commodity like every other article of commerce, and are consequently exposed to all the vicissitudes of competition, to all the fluctuations of the market.

(25)

Marx and Engels discuss about ideology in their 'The German Ideology' which they authored jointly in 1845-46. It has become a key concept in Marxist criticism of literature and the other arts. Marx brought the term 'Ideology' from French philosopher of the late eighteenth century. They had used it to designate the study of the way that concepts develop from sense-perceptions. But, now a days, ideology is used in a variety of non-Marxist ways. It means a set of political ideas as well as a neutral name for any ways of perceiving and thinking. For Marxist use the ideology that is dominant in any particular era is the product of its economic structure and the resulting class-relation and class interests. It becomes clear, as Abrams writes:

But in the present time, ideology is used in a variety of non-Marxist ways, ranging from a derogatory name for any set of political ideas, that are held dogmatically and applied rigorously, to a neutral name for any ways of perceiving and thinking that are specific to an individual's race, or sex, or education, or ethnic group. In its distinctively Marxist use, the ideology that is dominant in any era is conceived to be, ultimately, the product of its economic structure and the resulting class-relations and class interests. (242)

However, the term ideology is defined by various Marxists in various ways. Marx represented ideology as a 'superstructure' of which the contemporary socio-economic system is the 'base'. Friedrich Engels described ideology as 'a false consciousness' whereas many later Marxists are in opposition to the Engels' view of ideology. For them ideology is constituted by conscious prepossessions that are illusory. It becomes clear as Abrams writes, "Many later Marxists consider it to be constituted largely by unconscious prepossessions that are illusory, in contrast to the scientific knowledge of the economic determinants, historical evolution and present constitution of the social world" (242).

Anyway, Marxists claim that in the present era of capitalist organization, the major ideology includes the interests of the dominant and exploitative class, the 'bourgeoisie,' who are the owners of the material means of production and distributions, as opposed to the proletariats, or wage-earning working class. In fact, this ideology, to those who live in and with it, seems a natural and inevitable way of seeing, explaining and dealing with the enviroing world. But, actually, it has the hidden function of legitimizing and maintaining the position, power, and economic interests of the ruling class. Such type of ideology which legitimizes and maintains the position, power and economic interests of the bourgeoisie is the bourgeoisie ideology. It produces and permeates the social and cultural institutions and practices of the present era. It becomes clear as Abrams writes; "Bourgeoisie ideology is regarded as both producing and permeating the social and cultural institutions and practices of the present era-including religion, morality, philosophy, politics, and the legal system, as well as literature and the other arts" (242).

What is clear from the views expressed above is that a Marxist critic explains the literature in any historical era, not as works created in accordance with timeless artistic criteria, but as products of the economic and ideological determinants specific

to that era. The Marxist critic also examines the relation of a literary product to the actual economic and social reality of its time and place. A group of Marxists who call themselves as 'vulgar Marxists' treats a bourgeois literature directly correlated with the present stage of the class struggle. They say that such works should be replaced by a social realism representing the true reality and progressive forces of our time. It becomes clear as Abrams writes, "What some Marxist critics themselves decry as 'vulgar Marxists' treat a 'bourgeois literature' as in direct correlation with the present stage of the class struggle, and demands that such works, be replaced by a 'social realism' that will represent the true reality and progressive forces of our time" (242).

But the views of some other Marxists who are termed as more flexible Marxists differ to those of vulgar Marxists. They, on the basis of the scattered comments on literature in Marx and Engels themselves, state that traditional literary works possess autonomy. So, they represent the objective reality of their time. It becomes clear as Abrams Writes, "More flexible Marxists, on the other hand, building upon scattered comments on literature in Marx and Engels themselves, grant that traditional literary works possess a degree of autonomy that enables some of them to transcend their bourgeois ideology, sufficiently to represent the objective reality of their time" (242).

In the course of time, many other critics contributed a flexible view of the role of ideology. One of such Marxist critics is the Hungarian thinker George Lukacs. He influenced the mainstream of European communist thought during the first half of the twentieth century. He was regarded as the principal Marxist aesthician of his time. As Marx has said that the material world is reflected in the mind of man and translated into forms of thought, Lukacs views that art should reflect the dialectical totality of society. A realistic world must reveal the underlying patterns of contradiction in a society. For Lukacs, the art which presents dialectical totality is a

typical art. He never believes in the mirror reflection. He favors conflict or contradiction in society, but never favours superficial reality. Abrams also writes the same about Lukacs that "he proposed that each great work of literature creates 'its own world' which is unique and seemingly distinct from 'everyday reality' (242).

Lukacs, in his essay, "The Ideal of the Harmonious Man in the Bourgeois Aesthetics" sets the movements of the Enlightenment, Idealism and Realism in a Marxist version of history, in which the old harmony of the ancient Greeks is forever lost, though nostalgia for it remains. He calls both idealism and realism as failure because they were unfortunately one-sided. Enlightenment, Idealism, Realism and earlier aestheticians endeavored to seek the harmony under capitalism by keeping themselves aside from the society which he discards. Art cannot be the mirror image of reality but the combination of both form and content. There is always the nostalgia for beauty and harmony in Idealism and Realism but the harmony is lost forever. For him, bourgeois society is disharmonious as the art created in such society loses its aesthetic pleasure. To illustrate this, he refers back to Renaissance. In Renaissance, harmony was splitted because of capitalistic mode. Man was alienated due to labor division, as the social class had been divided into upper and lower. Bourgeois art emerged with the direct glorification of capitalistic mode because of which art lost its artistic aura as it failed to represent the lower class people. It failed to capture the dialectical totality. It can be further strengthened as Hazard Adams writes, "With the development of the productive forces of capitalism, the subjugation inherent in the capitalist division of labor became more pronounced" (904).

Similarly, in German Romanticism, the writers talked about the utopian world forgetting the society and without reflecting on contradiction as Adams writes, "The poets and thinkers of German classicism, whose major activity followed the French Revolution, seek various utopian solutions" (904). As regards Realism,

realists projected surface reality, like mirror reflection, but not the inner reality as Abrams writes;

"A master of Realism in the novel such as Balzac or Tolstoy, by bringing to life the greatest possible richness of objective condition of life, and by creating typical characters who manifest to an extreme the essential tendencies and determinants of their epoch, succeed, often in opposition to the author's own conscious ideology in producing a fictional world which is a reflection of life in the greatest concreteness and clarity and with all its motivating contradictions" (qtd. in Abrams 243).

In Naturalism, the writers focused on human psyche, instead of contradictions and conflicts. Thus what can be derived from the above analysis of Lukacs is, a great work of literature creates its own world which is unique and seemingly distinct from every day reality.

Lukacs also attacks the modernist experimental writers as decadent examples for their exclusive concern of the alienated individual in the fragmented world of our late capitalism. In so doing, Abrams says, "He thereby inaugurated a vigorous debate among Marxist critics about the political standing of formal innovations in twentieth century literature" (243). But the Frankfurt School of German Marxists, especially Theodore Adorno developed a Negative Knowledge in Marxist theories in opposition to Lukacs's dogmatism and a vulgar materialist view of literature. Negative knowledge means the reality that gets revealed when form of assumption and presumptive knowledge is broken. Adorno criticizes Lukacs for appreciating only the dialectical totality in a classical realist work and for rejecting the modernist writers. Against Lukacs' notion on the inferiority of modernist writers, Adorno assigns distinct value to

them. Lukacs could not delve into the space between actuality and reality and human consciousness. He sees art and reality standing at a distance from one another.

Adorno valorizes a work of art that manages to present the contradiction between the appearance and reality in contrast to Lukacs who wants to present photography of the society, i.e. appearance. For Lukacs, art has to reflect the dialectical totality of a society, whereas Adorno insists on the work's formal laws and the distance between art and reality. Adorno confirms that Proust and Joyce appear champions at showing the individual subject as alienated and at the same time they place the subject in a social context as Abrams writes;

In opposition to Lukas, the 'Frankfort School' of German Marxists, especially Theodore Adorno and Max Horkheimer, lauded modernist writers such as James Joyce, Proust and Samuel Beckett, proposing that their formal experiments, by the very fact that they fragment and disrupt the life they reflect, establish a distance and effect a detachment which serve as an implicit critique-or yield a negative knowledge of the dehumanizing institutions and processes of society under capitalism. (243)

Two German Marxists, Bertolt Brecht and Walter Benjamin also supported modernist and nonrealistic art. They have influenced both non-Marxist as well as Marxist criticism. Brecht, throughout most of his career felt that drama should inform and awaken sensibilities, not just entertain or anesthetize an audience. His materialistic attitude was influenced by his reading of Hegel and the doctrines of Marx's dialectical materialism. Brecht rejected Aristotelian concept of tragic play which is an imitation of reality that has a unified plot and a universal theme and establishes an identification of the audience with the hero which produces a catharsis of the spectator's emotions. He developed the concept of epic theater in which the

illusion of reality is shattered by the episodic plot and by the protagonists. Such protagonists do not draw the audiences' sympathy but produce estrangement effects within the audiences. Such estrangement effect jars the audiences out of their passive and complacent acceptance of modern capitalist society as a natural way of living. It develops an attitude of critical understanding of capitalist shortcomings and of active engagement with the forces of change within the audiences. It becomes clear as Abrams writes:

Brecht proposes instead that the illusion of reality should be deliberately shattered by the use of an episodic plot, by protagonists who do not attract the audience's sympathy, by emphasizing theatrically in staging and acting, and by other ways of barring the devices of drama so as to produce estrangement effects that will jar audiences out of their passive and complacent acceptance of modern capitalist society as a natural way of life, into an attitude not only of critical understanding of capitalist shortcomings, but of active engagement with the forces of change. (243)

Thus, Brecht develops a new way of approaching capitalist society through drama.

Walter Benjamin was another notable Marxist critic. He was an associate for Frankfurt School of Criticism. Benjamin focused his attention to the effects of changing material conditions in the production of arts. He says that the technical innovations have transformed the very concept and status of a work of art, as Abrams writes:

“In his essay ‘The work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction, Benjamin proposes that modern technical innovations such as, photography, the phonograph, the radio and especially the cinema have transformed the very concept and status of a work of art” (244).

In the earlier days, an artist or an author produced a work of art which was a single object. It was regarded as the special preserve of the bourgeois elite, around which enveloped a quasi-religious aura of uniqueness, autonomy and aesthetic value independent of any social functions. The new media has made the possibility of the infinitive and precise reproducibility of the objects of art. It has also effected the productions of works which, like motion pictures are specifically designed to be reproduced in multiple copies. Such reproduction destroys the mystique of unique work of art and art will play a radical role by opening the way to the formulations of revolutionary demands in the politics of art as Abrams writes: "Such modes of art, Benjamin argues, by destroying the mystique of the unique work of art as a subject for pure contemplation, make possible a radical role for works of art by opening the way to the formulations of revolutionary demands in the politics of art" (244).

As opposed to Adorno who opines art exploits people Benjamin politicizes art and says that such reproducibility of art helps the proletariats succeed in their revolution. Because of the reproducibility, art has become cheaper. It is in the access of the proletariat. Therefore, it is necessary for the proletariats to become the master of reproduction. When the proletariats communicate their ideology, it helps people to revolution. For Benjamin "mankind, which in Homer's time was an object of contemplation for the Olympian gods, now is one for itself. Its self alienation has reached such a degree that it can experience its own destruction as an aesthetic pleasure of the first order. This is the situation of politics which fascism is rendering aesthetic. Communism responds by politicizing art" (Pandey 250) makes the above explanation clear. Thus, Benjamin shifts art from religion to politics.

Another remarkable Marxist critic is George Bataille. His fundamental theory is "The Notion of Expenditure" which attempts to dissect the traditional capitalist notion of production. He is in contrast to Marx who claims that class struggle emerges

due to the mode of production. But, he opines that the rich people gather property on the basis of poor men's losses. Therefore, the poor have to capture the means of expenditure, not the means of production. For Bataille, the fundamental human drive is towards loss. Acquisition is the unwanted result of a process-oriented towards loss. He accuses Christianity and bourgeois culture of corrupt because they make the loss useful in some way. So, Adams writes about Bataille in the essay "The Notion of Expenditure"

He asserts that the fundamental human drive is towards loss.

Acquisition is the unwanted result of a process-oriented towards loss.

He finds corruption in Christianity and bourgeois culture, where all loss is made useful in some way, like the act of charity for one's soul or in the formalization of giving for some social purpose" (856).

Bataille also analyzes the nation of productive and non-productive things. Productive things are based on production, conservation and consumption as Abrams writes, "On the one hand, this material utility is limited to acquisition and to the conservation of goods; on the other, it is limited to reproduction and to the conservation of human life" (857). But the bourgeois society and the Christianity emphasize on non-productive things as the means to control over the poor people.

Bataille criticizes the bourgeois society which is based on the possession of individual property. The society emphasizes on the utility, pleasure seeking tendency and it never produced things essential for the poor. They spend a lot of money on useless things to enjoy as much as possible. The real need of the society has been excluded by non-productive expenditure. Since the poor people have become the victims of the principle of loss, they have got the tendency to buy expensive jewels which make the poor people poorer, as its Bataille writes: "The rich man consumes the poor man's losses, creating for him a category of degradation and objective that

leads to slavery" (Adams 862). Thus, the notion of expenditure has fragmented the society as rich and poor which ultimately results in class struggle.

Christianity has also become the center of his attack because it demands people to offer charity which is also nonsense expenditure. There occurs competition in offering charity due to which poor are made poorer. It becomes clear as Bastille writes:

The decline of paganism led to the decline of games and cults for which wealthy Romans were obliged to pay; thus it has been said that Christianity individualized property, giving its possession total control over his products and abrogating his social functions. It abrogated at least the obligation of his expenditure, for Christianity replaced Pagan expenditure prescribed by custom with voluntary alms, either in the form of distribution from the rich people to the poor, or in the form of extremely significant contributions to Churches and later to monasteries. (Adams 861)

Thus, for Bataille, religion is a means to maintain status quo situation to dominate the lower class people in the society. So, Bataille's appeal to the proletariat is to grasp not the means of productions but the means to expenditure.

Leon Trotsky was another influential Marxist of the early twentieth century. For him, a new artistic form is born as a reply to needs. Art is thus always a social servant and play a subsidiary role. He says that art should project society, history and environment. Production relation, class and caste should influence it. Art should present humankind and folklore in myth, song and culture. The points mentioned above become clear as Trotsky writes: "Materialistic dialects are above this; from the point of view of an objective historical process, art is always a social servant and historically utilitarian" (Adams 794).

Trotsky is famous for his essay, "Literature and Revolution" which is an attack on the Russian Formalists of criticism. Formalists believe that form determines the content. But, for Trotsky, formalists are the victims of the superstition of the word. He says that formalists have ignored the social man, who creates and consumes what has been created.

In contrast to many European Marxists who have been nostalgic for an idyllic rural earlier age that never existed for most people, yet has been endlessly eulogized in literature, Raymond Williams, a leading cultural critic of his time in England criticizes the tendency to glorify the rural spaces as more natural and empty of any exploitative mechanism. For him, there was never in old England a lack of brutal exploitations. What has been frequently identified with natural social order was never natural, usually not of as great an age as claimed, and always exploitative of the working poor at the bottom who supported the hierarchy of ownership and privilege. The growth that followed the feudalism was but the substitution of one form of domination for another. There existed no such world with all round equality and happiness. William's the very first line, " But there is still a crisis of perspective. When we moved back in time, consistently directed to an earlier and happier rural England, we could find no place, no period, in which we could seriously rest" (Adams 1156), of the essay "The Country and the City" clarifies that there remained no any period and place free from exploitation. Even the pre-capitalist settlement was under the power of sword. Workers were required to pay tribute to their feudal masters. So, Williams says that the nostalgia for a mythical Edenic society is futile. He believes that such nostalgia hinders the movements for change in dominating pattern instead of strengthening the resistance against exploitation.

Williams criticized other European Marxists for their glorification of country life disliking urban life, as the latter is the major place of capitalism. He says that

nostalgia for rural life exists in Marxist thinking due to the lack of historical understanding of the changing material reality. Among the Marxists, there lies nostalgia for the good, harmonious and serene past. Marxists worry about the loss of such an ordered world since the late capitalism has shattered them all as Williams writes:

In Britain, identifiably, there is a precarious but persistent rural intellectual radicalism: genuinely and actively hostile to industrialization and capitalism; attached to country ways and feelings, the literature and lore. (Adams 1156)

But, for Williams, these ideas are baseless and illusive. There is always brutal exploitation in all places: country or city, past or present. The muscular exploitation of the past has been changed into economy. The replacement of feudalism by capitalism is, but, only the substitution of one form of exploitation by another.

Williams is more optimistic to see the present world. Adams also calls him optimistic as he writes; "Nostalgia for a mythical Edenic Society or primitive communalism has been expressive of revolutionary desire, but Williams opts for an attitude that looks to the future rather than to the past" (1155). He believes in present that makes him hopeful of the future. He believes in present because in the present society, there is exploitation and fragmentation, however, there is frequent resistance that does not allow the upper class to exist as superman and lower class as subhuman.

In the last two decades, there has been resurgence of Marxist criticism to other current critical perspectives which acknowledge that Marxist critical theory is itself not a set of timeless truths but at least of some degree an evolving historical processes as Abrams writes: "In the last few decades, there has been a resurgence of Marxist criticism, marked by an openness, on some level of literary analysis, to other current critical perspectives, a flexibility which acknowledges that Marxist critical theory is

itself not a set of timeless truths but at least to some degree an evolving historical process" (244).

One of the influential Marxist critics in the 1960s was Louis Althusser. His view on ideology is different to Marx who had said ideology to be determined by material base. But, for Althusser, religious, legal, political and literary institutions determine ideology; and material base is the least affecting factor to the ideology, as Abrams writes:

Louis Althusser assimilated the structuralism then current into his view that the structure of society as a whole is constituted by diverse no synchronous social formations or ideological state apparatuses, including religious, legal, political and literary institutions. Each of these is interrelated with the other in complex ways, but possesses a relative autonomy; only in the last instance is the ideology of a particular institution determined by the material base in the contemporary mode of economic production (244).

Althusser also opposes Lukacs' definition of ideology as a false consciousness. Instead, he says that ideology varies according to the form and practices of each mode of state apparatus, and that the ideology of each mode operates by means of a type of discourse. Such type of ideology serves the ultimate interest of the ruling class as Abrams writes:

In an influential reconsideration of the nature of ideology, Althusser opposes its definition as false consciousness; he declares instead that ideologies vary according to the form and practices of each mode of state apparatus, and that the ideology of each mode operates by means of a type of discourse which interpellates the individual to take up a

pre-established subject position which in each instance serves the ultimate interests of the ruling class" (244).

Regarding literature, for Althusser, a great work of art is not a mere product of ideology, for its fiction establishes for the reader a distance from which to recognize, hence expose, the ideology from which it is born, from which it detaches itself as art and to which it alludes.

The most prominent American Marxist theorist, Fredric Jameson, is also the most eclectic of current Marxist critics. In "The political Unconscious: Narratives as a Socially Symbolic Art" Jameson expressly adapts to his synthetic critical enterprise such seemingly incompatible view points as the medieval theory of fourfold levels of meaning in the 'Allegorical Interpretations' of the Bible, the Archetypal Criticism of Northrop Frye, Structuralist Criticism, Lacan's reinterpretations of Freud, 'Semiotics' and 'Deconstruction'. For Jameson, these modes of criticism are applicable at various stages of the critical interpretative modes by retaining their positive findings within a political interpretation of a literary text which stands as the final interpretation as Abrams writes:

These modes of criticism, Jameson asserts, are applicable at various stages of the critical interpretation of a literary work; but Marxist criticism, he contends, subsumes all the other interpretative modes; by retaining their positive findings within a political interpretation of literary texts which stands as the final or absolute horizon of all reading and all interpretations. (244)

Jameson Claims that this last analysis of a literary text exposes the hidden role of the political unconscious. This political unconscious is a concept which Jameson describes as his collective is the political adaptation of the Freudian concept that each individual's unconscious is a repository of repressed desires. For Jameson, in this

capitalist era, the rifts and discontinuities in the text are symptoms of the repression by ideology of the contradictions of history into the depths of the political unconscious. The content of this repressed history is the revolutionary process of the collective struggle to wrest a realm of freedom from a realm of necessity, as Abrams writes:

In any literary product of our late capitalist era, the rifts and discontinuities in the text, and especially those elements which, in the French phrase, are 'nondit' (its not said), are symptoms of the repression by ideology of the contradictions of history into the depths of the political unconscious; and the content of this repressed history, Jameson asserts, is the revolutionary process of the collective struggle to wrest a realm of freedom from a realms of necessity. (244)

Jameson also says that the Marxist critics rewrite in the mode of allegory. So the text is seen like the reconstruction of a prior historical or ideological subtext. It is so because the political unconscious is determined not only by current ideology, but also by the long term process of the true history as Abrams writes:

In the final stage of an interpretation, Jameson holds, the Marxist critic rewrites in the mode of allegory, the literary text in such a way that the text may be seen as the reconstruction of a prior historical or ideological subtext that is of the text's unspoken, because repressed and unconscious, awareness of the ways it is determined not only by current ideology, but also by the long term process of true history. (246)

Thus, from Marx to the present time, many critics have contributed in the stream of Marxism. The view of one differs with that of the other; however most of the Marxists believe in those principles outlined in the beginning of this chapter.

Chapter III. Resistance to Capitalism in the Short Stories by Chekhov and Maupassant

The objective of this research work is to examine the short stories by Chekhov and Maupassant from Marxist point of view. To examine the entire stories by both the writers is not a possible task. So, this research work is limited within the analysis of five short stories from each of the writers written by the former between 1885 to 1895, and by the later in the 1980s. The stories that are selected for the study purpose are "Peasants", "Vanka", "Sleepy", "A Day in the Country" and "Chameleon" from Chekhov; and "The Necklace", "The Story of a Farm Girl", "Ghosts", "The Devil" and "Simson's Papa" from Maupassant. A comparative study of the stories by both writers from Marxist perspective is handled in the following sub-topics.

Nature of Exploitation

While analyzing the stories of Chekhov and Maupassant from the Marxist perspective, the stories center on the two dominant classes: the master and worker, or upper class and lower class, or people of power and powerless people. Both the writers show the workers as the victims of exploitation, however the nature of exploitation or the way the workers are exploited, differs from one writer to the other.

As regards Chekhov, he shows the direct exploitation of the workers by their masters. Workers are inhumanely treated as Vanka in "Vanka" writes his grandfather:

Last night, I got a thrashing my master dragged me by my hair into the yard, and belabored me with a shoemaker's stirrup, because while I was rocking his brat in its cradle, I unfortunately fell asleep. And During the week, my mistress told me to clean a herring and I began by its tail, so she took the hearing and struck its snout into my face. The assistants tease me... the master beats me whatever is handy. Food here is none; in the morning it's bread, at dinner gruel, and in the

evening bread again... They make me sleep in the Vestibule and when their brat cries, I don't sleep at all, but have to rock the cradle. (144)

These lines show how cruelly Vanka is exploited by his master. Vanka is a small boy to be sent to school for education, but he is kept as domestic worker. However, he is beaten in committing minor mistakes, he is not given proper food nor he gets time to sleep. It is the harsh exploitation upon the worker. Gleb Struve calls it as the "cruel exploitations of the child labor"(471).

Chekhov's another story "Peasants", if analyzed from the Marxist point of view, shows the exploitation of the workers by their masters. The victim of exploitation is Nikolay Tchikldyeev, a waiter in the Moscow hotel. He is directly exploited by his master. He has been treated as something to be used and thrown away by the hotel owner. He spent most of his life working at the hotel, but at his old age, as he is sick and falls down a tray, he is dismissed from his job, "Nikolay Tchikldyeev, a waiter in the Moscow hotel, Slavyansky Bazaar, was taken ill, his legs went numb and his gait was affected, so that on one occasion as he was going along the corridor, trembled and fell down with a tray full of ham and peas. He had left his job" (53). Since Nikoloy spent most of his life working at hotel, the hotel owner had to give him support when he fell sick. The owner had to provide him medical facilities, recover his disease and restore in this place. Rather he is dismissed from his job. This is actually a cruel exploitation of workers in the capitalist society.

Whatever Nikolay had collected in his life is spent in visiting doctors and buying medicine. He is helpless now. So he decides to return to his village to spend the rest of his life, together with his wife Olga and the Daughter Sasha, Nikolay was expecting to spend peaceful life in the village, but as Raymond Williams has said that there existed no such world with all round equality and happiness, it did not occur for the belonged to the peasant family prevailing poverty and quarrel. Moreover, the

peasants had to undergo the exploitation by those closer to the administrative authorities. Whenever the peasants fail to pay the tax, they loot whatever is available in the peasant's family:

Before he had gone three quarters of a mile, Antip was already carrying off the samovar from the Tchikldyeev cottage, followed by Granny, screaming shrilly and straining her throat: I won't let you haven't. I won't let you have it, damn you... Good Christians and believers in God! Neighbors, they have ill-treated me! Kind friends they have oppressed me! Oh, Oh! Dear people take my part.' ...

Granny screamed, Marya cried and the little girls, looking at her, cried, too. The old father, feeling guilty, sat in the corner with bowed head and said nothing. And Nikolay, too, was silent. Granny loved him and was sorry for him, but now, forgetting her pity, she fell upon him with abuse, with reproaches, shaking her fist right in his face. She shouted that it was his entire fault: why had he sent them so little when he boasted in his letters that he was getting fifty roubles a month at the Slavyansky Bazaar. Why had she come and with his family too? If he died, where was the money to come from for his funeral? And it was pitiful to look at Nikolay, Olga and Sasha. (78)

These lines show the miseries that Nikolay and his family had to undergo in the village. As Nikolay is sick, his mother and other members of the family worry about the money required for his funeral, but they do not worry about Nikolay. Even in the same family, there is the absence of love of one another. It is because of the poverty which is the result of the cruel exploitation of the low class people by the upper class people.

Furthermore, if we analyze Chekhov's "Sleepy" from the Marxist perspective, we find the similar type of exploitation: the workers being directly exploited by their masters. Varka in "Sleepy" is a housemaid who has been cruelly exploited by her master and mistress. Her condition is no different from Vanka in "Vanka" as Nathan Rosan writes:

The most famous of Chekhov's short stories about children, "Sleepy", is similar in theme and structure to "Vanka". There is the same situation of a friendless, exploited child, the same alternation between past and present in the child's mind, and a surprising action at the end by the child to resolve her unbearable situation. (451)

She is not allowed to sleep even at night for she has to rock the cradle in which the baby sleeps. In case Varka falls asleep and baby cries, the master and mistress beat her. While rocking the baby, Varka feels sleepy; however, she cannot sleep. She has to struggle against her natural desire, "Varka is sleepy. Her eyes are glued together, her head droops, and her neck aches. She cannot move her eyelids or her lips, and she feels as though her head has become as small as the head of a pin. 'Hush-a-bye, my baby wee', she hums, 'while I cook the goats for three" (80).

Thus, Varka should keep herself busy on rocking the baby. She hums to make the baby sleep. Because of continuous humming and head up her neck aches. But her master and mistress sleep snoring, "Through the door in the next room the masters and the apprentice Afantasy are snoring" (89). As she cannot go against her natural desire, she falls asleep. She sees dream which reminds her situation that brought her to this grim situation. She sees how her father died. In her dream, "Varka goes out into the road and cries there, but all at once someone hits her on the back of her head so hard that her forehead knocks against a birch tree. She raises her eyes and sees in

front, her master. He says, 'the child is crying and you are asleep!' He gave her a hard slap behind her ear"(91). These lines make it obvious how cruelly Varka is exploited.

Similar type of exploitation of the workers or low class people by the upper class people or people of power is seen in Chekhov's "Chameleon" if analyzed from the Marxist perspective. In it, Hryukin, a common man, especially, a craftsman is bitten by a dog, "So you bite, you damned brute'... 'Lads, don't let him get biting is prohibited now a days! Hold him! Ah...ah'" (13). When it is heard by Otchumyelov, a police superintendent, Hryukin is assured by him that the dog owner will be fined,

H'm, very well', says Otchumyelov sternly, laughing and raising his eyebrows. Very well, whose dog is it? I won't let this pass! I'll teach them to let their dogs run all over the place! It's time these gentry were looked after, if they won't obey the regulations! When he's fined, the blackguard, I'll teach him what it means to keep dogs and such stray cattle. (14)

But, when it is proved that the dog is General Zhigalov's, Otchumyelov calls Hryukin faulty and scolds him too: " It may be a valuable dog, and every swine goes striking a cigar in its mouth, it will soon be ruined. A dog is a delicate animal. And you put your hand down, you blockhead. It's no use your displaying your fool of a finger. It's your own fault" (16). These lines show how the common people are treated in the society and how the voice of such common people is suppressed. It shows the state of lawlessness against the people of power. It is the cruel exploitation of the common people by the people of power.

Furthermore, Otchumyelov threatens Hryukin, "I'll make you smart yet" (16) and walks away. The crowd laughs at Hryukin. There is no one to take his side, nor does he get any compensation. Rather, he becomes an object of laughter.

Finally, Chekhov's "A Day in the Country" also shows the direct exploitation of the low class people by the upper class people if analyzed from the Marxist point of view. In this story, Dyanika and Fyokla are homeless and helpless children. Their homelessness and helplessness are the results of the capitalist society. There is no one to help them. When Dyanika put his hand into a hole in a tree to get cuckoo's egg out for Fyokla, the tree broke because of the storm and his hand could not come out. Fyokla herself could not help him. So she needed the help of someone. Since they had none to help them except Terenty, another homeless man, she goes to seek for him. But no one helps her:

Between eight and nine o'clock in the morning, a dark laden-coloured mass is sweeping over the sky towards the sun. Red Zigzags of lightning gleam here and there. There is sound of a far away rumbling. ...Fyokla, a little beggar girl of six is running through the village, looking for the cobbler. The white-haired, barefoot child is pale. Her eyes are wide open and her lips are trembling. 'Uncle, where is Terenty?' She asks everyone she meets. No one answers. They are all preoccupied with the approaching storms and take refuge in the huts.

(17)

These lines show everyone's indifference to help Fyokla when she asks for help. This type of indifference towards one's voice also can be termed as the exploitation of the common people by the upper class people.

The analysis that has been made so far makes it obvious that Chekhov shows the lower class people or workers being directly exploited by their masters or the upper class people.

But, as regards Maupassant, we do not find such direct exploitation, rather the lower class people are exploited in the name of religion and morality. Ignorance of the

low class people as well as their compulsion to fulfill bare needs is also the motivating factor for the upper class people to exploit the lower class people. Besides these, pleasure seeking tendency of the lower class people is also a factor for the lower class people to be exploited by the rich people. Whether directly or indirectly, anyway, the low class people are the victims of the high class people as David Bryant writes: "Such a vision suits the short story, with its insistence on the role of chance in the events of the tale, rendering its protagonists helpless victims, as well as in the encounters that lead to its telling" (227). It can be clarified by analyzing his stories from the Marxist perspective.

Marxist analysis of Maupassant's "The Necklace" shows the exploitation of common people like Louisels by the rich people like Madame Forestier. As Bataille has said that the bourgeois society emphasizes on the utility, pleasure seeking tendency and it never produces things essential for the poor; they spend a lot of money on useless things to enjoy as much as possible; the real need of the society has been excluded by non-productive expenditure; since the poor people have become the victims of loss, they have got the tendency to buy expensive jewels which make the poor people poorer; Louisel is exploited by Madame Forestier because of her pleasure seeking tendency and her ignorance as well. Mrs. Louisel, the wife of a poor clerk wants to decorate herself while going to the party. So she borrows jewels from Madame Forestier. Madame Forester lends her the false gem which Louisels cannot identify. So, when the gem is lost, they give the original gem as the replace. Madame Louisel knows it as Forester says: "Oh, my poor Matilda! Mine were false. They were not worth over five hundred francs" (186). This type of cheating is anyway the exploitation of the Louisels by Forestier.

Similar type of exploitation is also seen in Maupassant's "The Story of a Farm Girl" if analyzed from the Marxist point of view. Rose, a farm girl, is exploited by the

owner of the farm where she works. Rose is a hard working farm girl. Working hard was her compulsion too for she had to earn for her baby by Jacques who deceived her, about which no one knows. Because of her hard work she falls the easy prey of her master who proposes her for marriage: “How is it Rose’, he said, ‘that you have never thought of settling in life” (21). Actually, the master wanted to marry her for she was hard working girl and he thought she would make his fortune, which is clear as he says, “you are a good, steady, active and economical girl, and a wife like you would make a man’s fortune” (22). In fact, to propose a farm girl for marriage for benefit is anyway exploitation of the girl by her master.

But Rose does not accept the proposal for she had already had a baby by Jacques. However, he forces her to marry him by courting her:

I cannot, master; she said with a sigh and he turned on his heel, she thought she had got rid of him altogether.... In the middle of the night, however, two hands touching the bed woke her. She trembled with fear, but she immediately recognized the farmer’s voice when he said to her; ‘Don’t be frightened. Rose, I have come to speak to you.’ She was surprised at first, but when he tried to take liberties with her, she understood what he wanted and began to tremble violently. She left quite alone in the darkness, still heavy from sleep and quite unprotected, by the side of the man who stood near her. She certainly did not consent but resisted carelessly, herself struggling against that instinct which is always strong in simple natures and very imperfectly protected by the undecided will of an exhausted body. She turned her head now toward the wall and now toward the room, in order to avoid the attentions which the farmer tried to press on her, and her body

writhed under the coverlets weakened as she was by the fatigue of the struggle, while he became brutal, intoxicated by desire. (26)

It is obvious now how Rose was treated by her master. She was sexually exploited. In such a situation, she had no choice except to marry him. So, she married him the next month. After the marriage, years passed, but they did not have child. The master wanted to have a child by her. This desire of the master led to the domestic violence and Rose becomes the victim of this very violence;

He began to shout and swear: 'What have I got against you? That I have no children, by God! When a man takes a wife he does not want to be left alone with her until the end of his days. That is what I have got against you. When a cow has no calves she is not worth anything, and when a woman has no children she is also not worth anything.'

(27)

Thus, master compares her with cow which is not worth anything if she has no calves. He treats her as a child producing machine. He began to punish her severely:

The war broke out between them; he called her names and beat her. They quarreled all day long, and when they were in bed together at night he flung insults and obscurities at her, panting with rage until one night, not being able to think of any means of making her suffer more, he ordered her to get up and go and stand out of doors in the rain until daylight. (27)

In fact to marry a farm girl by force without her interest and to treat her in such a way is anyway the exploitation upon her by the master.

For the further analysis, Maupassant's "Ghosts" can be taken which shows the exploitation of the common people by the Catholic Church. The church makes the mother of young Latitudinarian disinherit the young Latitudinarian for her does not

share his blind reverence for the Catholic Church. It is clear when he reports to the head of police:

My father threatens to disinherit me; the young man began to
‘Although I have never offended against the law of the state, of
morality or against his paternal authority, merely because I do not
share his blind reverence for the Catholic Church and her clergy. Or
the account he looks upon me, not merely as latitudinarian, but as a
perfect atheist, and a faithful manservant of ours, who is much attached
to me and who accidentally saw my father’s will told me in confidence
that he had left at his property to the Jesuits’ (92)

Thus, this story shows the exploitation of the common people by the church.

Furthermore, if we analyze “The Devil” from the Marxist perspective, we can see a farmer exploited by a doctor. The farmer represents common people, whereas the doctor represents the norms and values of the upper class people which he tries to impose upon the farmer.

The farmer takes his dying mother to the hospital, “She was going to die she did not rebel at it, for she was over. She was ninety four” (237), but he cannot stay with her at this last hour, for it is the harvesting time and if he does not work at this time then he will face difficulty for the rest of the year. It is obvious as the farmer says, “I must get in my wheat, for it has been lying on the ground a long time, and the weather is just right” (273). But the doctor does not allow him, “Honore, you cannot leave your mother in this state. She may die at any moment”(237). The doctor does not understand the farmer’s lowly life. In fact to be with the dying one and mourn for the dead are possible to practices for the upper class people for they are economically strong and they do not need to worry for the bare needs. The doctor wants to impose the same upon the farmer. But for the low class people like farmer, it is not possible.

Earning bread for the whole year is more important than attending the dying, for the farmer.

Now, the farmer is in difficult position, so he asks the dying mother who knows the farmer's situation well, for the permission. At this state, the doctor threatens the farmer that he would leave him in a difficult situation at the farmer's old age, "And if you do not obey me I will let you die like a dog when you are ill in your turn, do you hear me?" (237). In fact to impose his ideas upon the farmer without knowing anything about the farmer's lowly life is anyway exploitation.

Similar type of exploitation upon the helpless is seen even in Maupassant's "Simon's Papa" in which the helpless woman La Blanchotte and her son are discarded in the society. Her helplessness is also the exploitation of her. She was used as a means of entertainment and deceived by her lover which becomes obvious as the narrator writes, "A woman appeared, and the workman instantly left off smiling, for he at once perceived that there was no more fooling to be done with the tall pale girl who stood austere at her door as though to defend from one man the threshold of that house where she had already been betrayed by another" (34). Using someone and leaving off is anyway exploitation. La Blanchottle also faces the same in her life. Instead of helping her, the society discards her.

Helpless La Blanchottle and her son are alienated in the society. Even at school, Simon is ill treated by other school fellows calling him no papa. He is beaten by them; "A tremendous struggle ensued between the two boys, and Simon found himself beaten, torn, bruised rolled on the ground in the middle of the ring of the applauding little vagabonds" (37). Why the school fellows who are the innocent children behave in this way with Simon is all because of their mother who took pride in having husband: "They had all of them in their familiars heard of La Blanchotte, and although in public she was welcome enough, the mothers among themselves

treated her with compassion of a some what disdainful kind, which the children had caught without in the least knowing why" (35). Thus, La Blanchotte is treated with disdain in the society. Such type of disdain is the exploitation of her.

The analysis that has been made so far makes it obvious that Maupassant depicts the society in which low class people or workers are exploited by the upper class people or their masters, but indirectly. Rather they are exploited in the name of religion and morality. Ignorance of the low class people is also a motivating factor for the rich people to exploit the common people. Besides these, compulsion of the common people and their pleasure seeking tendency are equally responsible to be exploited.

Class Struggle and its Outcome

The analysis made in the previous chapter has made it obvious that both the writers, Chekhov and Maupassant, present the two opposing classes in the society through their stories in which the workers or the lower class people are exploited by their masters or the upper class people. As Marx has said that the history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggle, the workers do not remain passive. They struggle hard to be free from the grip of their masters or from the grip of the upper class people. They try their best for their social and economic upliftment. However, in the case of Chekhov's stories, it is all in vain, whereas in the case of Maupassant's stories, the workers or the low class people succeed in their struggle. They uplift their social and economic status.

Chekhov shows the grim situation of the workers or the low class people. They struggle to be free from the grip of their masters or the upper class people for their social and economic upliftment. Vanka in "Vanka" writes a letter to his grandfather in the village requesting to take him from there, otherwise he would die: "I can't bear this anymore ... I bow to the ground to you, and will pray to God for ever

and ever, take me from here or I shall die" (144). When he completes his letter, he folds the sheet and put it into an envelope. He put the address, "The village, to my grandfather" (146). He also added, "Konstantin Makarych" (146). Then he ran to the first post box and slipped his precious letter into the slit. In doing so, he is hopeful that the letter will reach to his grandfather and he will be freed. But it is sure that the letter will not reach to his grandfather nor he will be freed because the letter is not properly addressed as Nathan Rosen writes: "The letter will never reach grandfather and Vanka's future looks hopeless" (442). The misery of Vanka is uncertain.

The same is the condition of Varka in the "Sleepy" who is leading a miserable life. She does not get chance to sleep either. As the pain upon Varka is extreme and as she realizes it is the child that has not let her sleep, she decides to kill the baby:

"Varka steals up to the cradle and bends over the baby. When she has strangled him, she quickly lies down on the floor, laughs with delight that she can sleep, and in a minute is sleeping as sound as the dead"(94). In doing so, Varka feels relief in her life, but how she will be treated the other day is uncertain. Anyway, killing the baby, for her, is struggling to free herself from the exploitation of her master. She feels it because of the baby and kills it but she does not think a bit of its outcome. It is sure that she will be accused of murder and her life is sure to undergo more miserable condition. The misery of her life is uncertain.

Similarly, Hryukin, a craftsman in "Chameleon", when he is bitten by a dog, complains with the police superintendent, Otchumyelov:

I was walking along here, not interfering with anyone, your honour,
Hryukin begins, coughing into his first, 'I was talking about firewood
to Mitry Mitrich, when this low brute for no rhyme bit my finger ...
kindly excuse me I am a craftsman ... Mine is fine work. I must have
damage, for I shan't be able to use this finger for a week, may be ... it's

not even the law your honour that one should put with from a beast. If everyone is going to be bitten, life won't be worth living.' (14),

In the hope of getting compensation. After hearing all these, Otchumyelov assures Hryukin that the dog owner will be fined;

'H'm, very well', says Otchumyelov sternly, coughing and raising his eyebrows.' Very well', whose dog is it: I won't let this pass! I'll teach them to let their dogs run all over the place! It's time these gentry were looked after, if they won't obey the regulations! When he's fined, the blackguard, I will teach him what it means to keep dogs and such stray cattle!' (14)

But when it is proved that the dog is General Zhigalov's, Otchumyelov is frightened. He calls Hryukin faulty and scolds him too: "It may be a valuable dog, and if every swine goes striking a cigar in its mouth, it will soon be ruined. A dog is a delicate animal. And you put your hand down, you blackhead. It's no use your displaying your fool of finger. It's your own fault" (16).

In fact, Hryukin's complaint against the dog with the police superintendent is his struggle. But his struggle is all in vain. He does not get justice as the people of power are above the law. Instead of giving justice, Otchumyelov threatens Hryukin, "I'll make you smart yet" (16). It shows that how long the common people like Hryukin will be dominated by the people of power is uncertain.

Similarly, Fyokla in "A Day in the Country" calls the other people for help when Dyanika's hand gets crushed by a tree when he was trying to take the eggs of cuckoo out, to get their sympathy. But no one cares her. She is helped by Terenty, a homeless man: "The wood has broken at the edge of the hole and Jammed Dyanika's hand: he could push it further in, but could not pull it out. Terenty snaps of the broken piece and the boy's hand, red and crushed is released" (20). Thus one homeless and

helpless is helped by the other homeless and helpless, not by the upper class people. This sort of co-operation among the helpless people is their struggle for their social and economic upliftment.

The suffering of Dyanika and Fyokla is endless. After Dyanika is rescued from the accident, he returns to the village together with Fyokla and Terenty. They return to the village only towards the evening. So, the children go for the night to a deserted barn without food while Terenty leaves them and goes to the tavern. They sleep on the straw. Dyanika does not fall asleep;

He goes into the darkness, and it seems to him that he is seeing all that he has seen in the day; the storm clouds, the bright sunshine, the birds, the fish and lanky Terenty. The number of his impressions, together with exhaustion and hunger, are too much for him; he is as hot as though he were on fire and tosses from side to side. He longs to tell someone all that is hunting him now in the darkness and agitating his soul, but there is none to tell. (24)

Thus, Dyanika is alienated. There is no hope that these children will come out of this helpless situation. How long these children suffer in the cruel society is uncertain.

Furthermore, Nikolay in "Peasants" moves towards village together with his wife Olga and the daughter Sasha. His movement from the city towards the village is his struggle for the social and economic upliftment. But, it does not occur as he had expected for the belonged to the poor peasant family which is exploited by those who were closer to the administrative authorities. When his family fails to pay the tax, they loot whatever is found in the peasants' family. Wherever Nikolay goes, he gets no peace in mind. So, his health degrades and dies, "He wrapped up in a quilt and in a sheepskin, but got colder and colder. Towards the evening he began to be in a great distress; asked to be laid in the ground, asked the tailor not to smoke; then he subsided

under the sheepskin and towards morning he died" (85). In fact the cruel exploitation by the high class people underlines behind the death of Nikolay. Nikolay dies leaving his wife and daughter helpless.

After the death of Nikolay, Olga feels their life more miserable in the village. She finds the elders of the village doing everything for their self and peasants coarse, dishonest, filthy, drunken and worse than the beasts. So right after the death of Nikolay, Olga decides to leave the village as they could not undergo the oppressed life any longer. Olga and her daughter, the two helpless creatures move away from the village. Olga, leaving village to have peace in mind is also her struggle to be free from the exploitation by rich people.

After leaving the village, they ultimately reach a big village where they could do nothing except begging alms;

Olga bowed down before the open windows, and said in a loud, thin, chanting voice: 'Good Christian folk, give alms, for Christ's sake, that god's blessing may be upon you, and that your parents may be in the kingdom of heaven in peace eternal' 'Good Christian Folk', Sasha began Chanting, 'Give for Christ's sake, that God's blessing, the heavenly kingdom. (88)

Thus, it has been clear that the family of Nikolay has been shattered by upper class people. Nikolay struggles a lot to be free from the exploitation by the upper class people. His struggle is in vain. Rather, he dies of it. The exploitation by the capitalist society kills Nikolay, the head of the family, and compels his wife and daughter to beg alms for their livelihood. How long will they lead their life by begging is uncertain.

The analysis that has been made so far shows that Chekhov shows the workers or the low class people struggling to be free from the exploitation by their masters or

upper class people. In doing so Chekhov is in favour of the Marxist perspective of the class struggle. But Chekhov depicts the very static society. The workers or the lower class people do not succeed in their struggle. He shows the grim situation of the workers or the low class people. In doing, he is anti-Marxist. He does not expect the workers or the low class people to be free from the exploitation by their masters or the upper class people.

But Maupassant depicts very progressive society. He shows the worker or the low class people struggling to be free from the exploitation of their masters or high class people. Quite contrarily to Chekhov's, they succeed in their struggle and start living a normal and subjective life after having led an oppressed life. The Louisels in "The Necklace" do not lose their heart even though they have to pay a huge amount of money which they had borrow to give the replace of the necklace which Mrs. Louisel borrows from Madame Forestier to give others her impressions in the party, but she loses. They overwork. They pay off the entire loan within ten years, "At the end of ten years they had restored all, all with interest of the usurers, and accumulated interest, besides" (185).

Maupassant portrays tragic to comic aspects of life in this story. The Louisels' hardships in their life are over when they pay off the entire loan. They return to their normal life. They start living a normal life after having led a miserable life. The Louisels are happy for they got success in their struggle as Mrs. Louisel says: "I returned another to you exactly like it. And it has taken us ten years to pay for it. You can understand that it was not easy for us who have nothing. But it is finished and I am decently content" (186).

Similarly, Rose, a farm girl in "The Story of a Farm Girl" becomes the victim of her master who marries her by force for she is a hardworking girl. He has also the

hope of getting child by her. But when they did not have child for a long time, the master starts scolding and beating her:

Then war broke out between them; he called her names and beat her. They quarreled all day long, and when they were in bed together at night, he flung insult and obscenities at her, panting with rage until one night, not being able to think of any means of making her suffer more, he ordered her to get up and go and stand out of doors in the rain until daylight. (128).

But she did not obey him. In doing so, she appears rebellious. Here starts her struggle against her master cum husband. As she does not obey him he beats her. But she becomes daring. She accuses her master of not having a child.

Then in her disdain she rebelled and flinging him against the wall with a furious gesture, she sat up and in an altered voice she hissed, 'I have had a child', I have had one by Jacques; you know Jacques well. He promised to marry me but left this neighborhood without keeping his world. (28).

This daring expression makes her master realize that it was his fault in not having baby. So he becomes ready to accept her child by Jacques as his own. He becomes happy. He laughs in his happiness: "Then still laughing, he kissed his weeping and agitated wife on both cheeks" (29). He is really happy in having a child as he says, "Well, I am really glad at this, I am not saying it for farm's sake, but I am glad; I am really very glad" (29). Her struggle brings her happiness too for she can keep her child with her, on the one hand. On the other hand, her conflict with her master is over. Thus, a farm girl like Rose succeeds in her struggle and starts living a normal life after having led an oppressed life. A farm girl attains the position of mistress of the farm.

Likewise, the young Latitudinarian in "Ghosts" struggles hard to get his paternal property when he is disinherited from it. He thinks that there lies a very clever deceit and tries to discover it. He talks to his father and discovers that it was all because of his dead mother's will:

When I remonstrated with him yesterday evening he referred to my dead mother and at last assured me, in a voice of the deepest conviction, that she had frequently appeared to him, had threatened him with all the torments of the damned if he did not disinherit his son who had fallen from God and leave all his property to the Church. (92)

He goes on for further investigation and discovered that his mother did not appear to his father in their house, but in the churchyard where she was buried. It strengthens his suspicions and visits the churchyard in the midnight secretly together with police inspector when his father goes to consult the spirit of his dead mother again for the third time. They catch the ghost which turns out to be the Sexton: "Meanwhile, the police sergeant and the policeman who had come into the churchyard, has caught the ghost and dragged it forwards. It was the Sexton, who had put on a flowing white dress and wore a wax mask, which bore a striking resemblance to his mother, so the son declared" (93).

In doing so, the relationship between the father and the son improves which had degraded after the father had disinherited his son from the paternal property. The Latitudinarian succeeds to get his paternal property.

In the same way, the doctor in "The Devil" imposes his ideas upon the farmer and does not let him leave his dying mother though she gives her son the permission to leave her. Anyway the farmer has to go to the farm for the harvesting. So, he tries to leave his mother anyhow. So, the doctor compromises his ideas that the farmer should be with his dying mother and advises him to hire La Rapet to attend the dying

woman and allows him to go to his work: "And if you must get your wheat today, go and fetch Rapet's wife and make her look after your mother" (237). Thus, the dispute is settled. The farmer succeeds to be free from the influence of the people of power.

Furthermore, as Simon in "Simon's Papa", is alienated, he decides to kill himself by drawing in a river and moves towards it. It is anyway his struggle to be away from such lowly life. But, he is rescued by Philip Remy, the blacksmith. Simon makes Philip Remy promise to become his father. Ultimately, Philip Remy becomes the husband to his mother. The helpless and fatherless boy gets father who promised the boy security: "You will tell your schoolfellows that your papa is Philip Remy, the blacksmith, and that he will pull the ears of all who do you any harm" (42). Thus, the helpless and alienated Simon and his mother get the support of Philip Remy. They climb up the social status and become equal to everyone. Their miserable life is over.

Thus, Maupassant shows the workers or the lower class people successful in their struggle. They get success in attaining social and economic upliftment. They move from the life of lack to the normal life. After having led an oppressed life, they start living a normal life. In being so, Maupassant expects the workers or the lower class people to be free from the grip of their masters or the upper class people. Quite contrary to Chekhov, Maupassant is Marxist.

Chapter IV. Conclusion: Chekhov an Anti-Marxist and Maupassant a Marxist

Both Chekhov and Maupassant depict the society in which the masters or the upper class people exploit the workers or the lower class people. Workers are inhumanely treated. They lead a very difficult life. They have low social and economic status. So they struggle hard to be free from the exploited life. In doing so, there lie similarities between Chekhov and Maupassant. However, there lies significant difference in the nature of exploitation and outcome of the workers' struggle for their social and economic upliftment.

As regard Chekhov, he shows the direct exploitation of workers. The workers are treated no better than the animals. They are physically and mentally exploited. They undergo the harsh treatment by their masters. It is unbearable. So, they seek for the best possible way to come out of the cruelty of their masters. They struggle for their emancipation. Vanka, in "Vanka" writes a letter to his grandfather requesting him for help drops it into the letter box and dreams that his letter has reached to his grand father. Similarly, Varka, in "Sleepy" kills the baby and sleeps soundly. Similarly, Hryukin in "Chameleon" asks for the help of police superintendent, Otchumyelov, to get justice. Nikolay Tchikldyeev in "Peasants" moves towards the village together with his wife and daughter for the comfortable life. But all is in Vain. It is sure that Vanka's letter will not reach his grand father nor he will be rescued, his suffering is endless for he has not properly addressed the letter. In the same way, Varka will undergo more painful life for she has strangled the baby. Similarly, rather than giving Hryukin justice, Otchumyelov threatens him. Thus Chekhov's characters belonging to the worker's class lead an oppressed life. So, for the social and economic upliftment, they struggle, but in vain. What can be concluded from this that Chekhov shows the grim aspect of humanity? He does not expect the workers to be free from

the exploitation of their masters or upper class people. He does not hope for the worker's emancipation. He is anti-Marxist.

As regards Maupassant, he also shows the exploitation of the workers or the lower class people by their masters or the people of power. The people of power exploit the lower class people in the name of religion, morality, marital relationship and friendship. Louisel in "The Necklace" is cheated by her own friend Madame Forestier who gave her a false gem, but got an original one in replace. Rose in "The Story of a Farm Girl" is married by force by her master for he thinks that she would enrich him by her hard work. The young Latitudinarian is disinherited for he turned into protestant. Moreover, the people of lower class are exploited by the people of power because of their own ignorance as well: Mrs. Louisel is cheated for she believes her friend, Madame Forester and everything she possesses to be valuable and original, young latitudinarian is exploited for his father follows catholic Church blindly, Rose is exploited for she does not understand her master cum husband who wants child any way. However, they do not remain passive; they struggle hard to come out of the suffering caused by the people of power. Louisels work hard to pay off the debt. Rose, in "The story of a Farm Girl" dares to tell her husband about her child. And the young Latitudinarian visits the churchyard at midnight together with police. As a result of struggle they free themselves out of the grip of people of power. They return to their normal life after having led an oppressed life.

Thus Maupassant shows the exploitation of lower class people resulting in class struggle. Ultimately, they succeed to come out of the grip of the people of power. Maupassant, through his stories anticipates the workers come out of the exploitation by the people of power. He expects social change. He anticipates workers' emancipation through their struggle. He expects the harmonious society

where the masters and workers work together. In this way, Chekhov is an anti-Marxist writer, whereas Maupassant is a Marxist writer.

Works Cited

- Adams, Hazard, Comp. *Critical Theory Since Plato*. Rev. ed. 1992.
- Artinian, Artine. "Maupassant as Seen by American and English Writers of Today." *The French Review* 17.1 (Oct. 1934): 9-14.
- Chekhov, Anton. *Selected Russian Short Stories*. New Delhi: Carmello Books, 2007
- Cogman, P.W.M. "Maupassant Conteur et Romancier by Christopher Liody." *The Modern Language Review* 90.3 (Jul. 1995): 770-71
- Ewanik, John, Comp. and Ed. *Russian Short Stories*. Boston; D.C. Heath and Co. (1962). Viii, 215.
- Hawley, James P. "Antonio Gramscis Marxims: Class, State and Work." *Social Problems* 27.5 (Jun 1980): 584-600.
- Jacobus, Lee A. *The Bedford Introduction to Drama*. 4th ed. Newyork, Boston: Bedford, 2001.
- Kaspin, Albert. "Russian Stories." *The Slavic and East European Journal* 6.2 (Summer. 1962): 171-75.
- Lethbridge, Robert. "A Day in the Country and Other Stories by Guy de Maupassant." *The modern Language Review* 87.2 (Apr. 1992) 491-91.
- Lohani, Adhikary and Subedi , Abhin N. Comp. and Ed. *Essays on the Creationof Knowledge*. 2nd ed. Bhotahity, Ktm: Ratna Pustak Bhandar, 2001.
- Maupassant. *The Best of Maupassant*. New Delhi: Indialog Pvt. Ltd., 2002.
- Moger, Angela S. " Narrative Structure in Maupassant: Frames of Desire." *PMLA*100.3 (May. 1985): 315-27.
- Moore, Olin H. "The Romanticism of Guyde Maupassant." *PMLA* 33.1 (1918): 96-134.
- Pandey, Beerendra , comp. *Intellectual History Reader A Critical Introduction*. Kathmandu: M.K. Publishers & Distrubutirs.

- Rabinowitz, Standley J. "Short Stories by Anton Chekhov." *The Slavic and East European Journal* 24.1 (Spring.1980): 66-67
- Rosen, Nathen. "The Unconsciousness in Chekhov's 'Vanka' (With a Note on Sleepy)." *The Slavic and East European Journal* 15.4 (Winter-1971): 441-56.
- Sallenave and Stoikl, Allan. "Marxism, Psychoanalysis." *Substance* 5.15 Oct. 1976, 58-67.
- Struv, Gleb, ed. *Russian Stories: Ruskie Rasskazy*. New York: Bantou Books, 1961
- "On Anton Chekhov's Craftsmanship: The Anatomy of a Story." *Slavic Review* 203 (Oct. 1961) 465-76.
- Wolff and Cullenberg, Stephen. "Marxims and Post Marxism." *Social Text* 15 (Autumn. 1986): 126-35.