

**TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY**

**Criticism of Feudalism in Dostoevsky's *Crime and Punishment*  
and Chekhov's *The Cherry Orchard***

**A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences,  
Tribhuvan University in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement for the  
Degree of Masters of Arts in English**

**By**

**Bishnu Aryal**

**Central Department of English**

**Kirtipur, Kathmandu**

**January 2010**

**Tribhuvan University**  
**Central Department of English**

**Letter of Recommendation**

Bishnu Aryal has completed this thesis entitled “Criticism of Feudalism in Dostoevsky’s *Crime and Punishment* and Chekhov’s *The Cherry Orchard*” under my supervision. He carried out this research from 2008 to 2010. I hereby recommend this thesis be submitted for viva voce.

---

Mr. Pam Bahadur Gurung  
Supervisor

Date: January 2010

**Tribhuvan University**  
**Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences**  
**Central Department of English**

**Letter of Approval**

This thesis entitled “Criticism of Feudalism in Dostoevsky's *Crime and Punishment* and Chekhov's *The Cherry Orchard*”, submitted to the Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University, Kirtipur, by Bishnu Aryal, has been approved by the undersigned members of the research committee.

Members of Research Committee

---

---

Internal examiner

---

---

---

External Examiner

---

---

---

Head, Central Department of English

Date:

## **Acknowledgements**

My sincere thank goes to Pam Bahadur Gurung, the supervisor of this research paper, for his guidance in the course of completion of this research paper. Similarly, I am highly indebted to the scholarly suggestions provided by Prof. Dr. Krishna Chandra Sharma, Head of Central Department of English.

I would also like to express my sincere thanks to Dr. Arun Gupto, Dr. Sanjeev Upraty, Badri Acharya and all my teachers of Central Department of English who helped me in many ways for completing this research.

I am indebted to my father Damodhar Padhya and mother Hem Kumari Padhya for their inspiration and support in many ways throughout my study and having the best wishes in my career. Similarly, I am obliged to my brother Krishna Padhya for his assistance in computerizing the work.

Finally, despite all efforts in shaping this text carefully, I apologize and remain ready to improve the errors as suggested by any scholars.

Bishnu Aryal

Date: January 2010

## Abstract

This research explores the criticism of feudalism as portrayed in Fyodor Dostoevsky's novel *Crime and Punishment* and Anton Chekhov's play *The Cherry Orchard*. Alena Ivenovna and Madame Renevskya are the scions of gentry. They have accumulated the money beyond expectation and the rest of people in both works of literature are peasantry. The central conflicts is between the class contradictions—aristocratic characters and peasantry. Raskolnikoff is a radical character and his practices are to demolish the social system- feudalism. Raskolnikoff kills Alena Ivenovna to liberate the whole peasantry economically. Raskolnikoff's alienation, Sonya's prostitution, channelization of mass culture by feudalists to suck mass peasantry are the other indicative subjects dealt in *Crime and Punishment*. Class inversions led by Lopakhin, anti-feudalistic ethos of Chekhov are the remarkably dealt subjects in *The Cherry Orchard*.

## Contents

	Page No.
<b>Letter of Recommendation</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>Letter of Approval</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>Acknowledgements</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>Abstract</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>I Exploring the Nexus between Feudalism and Capitalism in <i>Crime and Punishment</i> and <i>The Cherry Orchard</i></b>	<b>1-7</b>
<b>II. Marxist's Criticism on Feudalistic as well as Capitalistic Social System</b>	<b>10-20</b>
<b>III. Critique of Feudalistic Social System in <i>Crime and Punishment</i> and <i>The Cherry Orchard</i></b>	<b>21-42</b>
Class Consciousness in <i>Crime and Punishment</i>	21
Reification of Female Body in <i>Crime and Punishment</i>	25
The Mass Culture and Feudalism in <i>Crime and Punishment</i>	27
Alienation of Raskolnikoff in Feudalistic Society	30
Anti-feudalistic Ethos in <i>Crime and Punishment</i>	33
Class Consciousness in Chekhov's <i>The Cherry Orchard</i>	35
Alcoholic Haze in <i>The Cherry Orchard</i>	38
Anton Chekhov's Support to Anti-feudalistic Social Order	39
<i>Crime and Punishment</i> and <i>The Cherry Orchard</i> in Comparative Analysis	40
<b>IV. Conclusion</b>	<b>43-44</b>
<b>Works Cited</b>	

## **I Exploring the Nexus between Feudalism and Capitalism in**

### ***Crime and Punishment and The Cherry Orchard***

This research lays its focus on Russian writer Fyodor Dostoevsky's novel *Crime and Punishment* which was written in 1868 and Anton Chekhov's play *The Cherry Orchard* written in 1903. Both works of literature have the background of political vacillation in Russia. Russian society was on the mouth of political and cultural transition when the books were written. Russian society had the strong denouncement to the autocracy of Tsar Regime and the skirmishes were carried on to overpower the regime and the leftist intelligentsia was seeking the alternatives of it in nation level and the Russian society was in the mouth of the giving birth to a new economic system out of feudalism in societal level. Democracy in Europe was widely spread; many nations of Europe were democratized and they had adopted capitalism as an economic system rejecting the outdated feudalism. Democratic Britain and France were the centers of the world. The rise of capitalism didn't result from the collapse of the feudal system; it resulted from the development of a new system. Capitalism grew alongside the increasingly unstable feudal mode. A new class emerged from within feudal society. This new class created new property relations, new products, new labor relations and new means of distribution and exchange. Firstly, the peasant went to the proletariat category and the landlords to the bourgeois. In capitalism, merchants increased production of commodities, exchanged them on an increasingly free market, and manufactured them with unskilled wage laborers in place of the guild system. These innovations proved more efficient and the merchant class grew and developed great wealth, evolving into the new bourgeoisie. These economic innovations spurred massive change throughout all areas of society. In feudalism there was no chance to peasants to possess the position of the landlords but after the rise of capitalism this is possible with the new idea and technique. Initially the aristocracy was limited by the laws of the monarchs. The divine right of kings limited property

ownership to the noble class by birth. Landlords, no matter how materially wealthy and peasants were never allowed to purchase or own land forcefully. With the rise of capitalism, the political situation shifted dramatically, a period known as mercantilism began. Monarchs sponsored merchants and the feudal wars became trade wars, fought over the riches earned by the merchants.

When the bourgeoisie changed labor relations, they created a new lower class. Serfs left the fields and became proletarians. The bourgeoisie and the proletariat have different exploitative relationships to each other, to themselves. They lived radically different lives and had new and different spiritual needs. The capitalist system is based on the relationship between capital and labor. At its root, capitalism is about one class owning the means of production and another class exchanging labor power for wages. This system has a distinct set of assumptions and definitions; private property, commodity exchange, open and complacency-inducing a market system that requires constant growth. The capitalist system also has distinct intrinsic contradictions. Capitalism tends toward increasing inequality, the rich get richer and the poor get more numerous. The government exists to buffer these trends and slow them down through welfare programs.

Late capitalism is seemed no different from the feudalism in terms of exploitation. Few elites expand the market in jointly in the different names. The motifs are to collect money and rest people as guilds in feudalism. Both system has been intended to usurp the working class and left the mass in vagrant position. Feudalism and capitalism are both exploitative and both require forms of political control for the subordination of peasants and workers. Agro economy of feudalism is transferred into the market economy and working class is exploited into the form of labor.

Class consciousness becomes so pervasive and strident in the minds of character in both novel *Crime and Punishment* and play *The Cherry Orchard*. Raskolnikoff has become



half mad, he only thought the society in terms of class. All other characters also take the class as innate power rather than the human product. Raskolnikoff says, "Nature divides the men into two categories" (181). Raskolnikoff's monomaniacs are the outcome of class consciousness. Lopakhin's mind has been constructed under slavery; he almost uses the servile language to Madame Ranevskya in *The Cherry Orchard*. Alienation makes Raskolnikoff detach from the everyday common objects. He could not be habituated to the things and environment. The things in his room are new per day; even the senses are not in harmony. Dostoevsky says that "neither his eyes nor thoughts were in harmony with his surroundings, and he seized his hat and went out, giving no thought this time as to whom he might meet on the stairs" (34). The women of St. Petersburg have been undermined to the sensual object. The female body has been reified. The female's purpose is only to provide sex. Sonya is typical character suffered by the so called consumer society. She has to sell sexual services in cheap prices in St. Petersburg. She is called "young prostitute" by bourgeois society (1). The society of Petersburg is ruined by the capitalist by selling the liquor to the youths. Marmeladoff is sufferer of the liquor sold in market. Marmeladoff always is in alcoholic appearance throughout the novel. His manners are destroyed by the capitalist's product liquor. Lastly, he dies because of the liquor leaving the rest family destitute.

The class struggle is between the capitalist (or owning) class and the proletariat (or working) class. It has been put another way as the haves against the have-nots. When the poor of the world do rise up, it will be because they have finally gained sufficient number to be a social force powerful enough to achieve a higher state of civilization. Peace does not exist because there has been conflict; the conflict exists because there are classes and it is easy for the strong to exploit the weak. Neither the race nor sex conflict touches directly the class struggle. The class supremacy is in economic discrimination. Each color and sex can be the

oppressor and it is this system of oppression that pits races and sexes against each other. In *Communist Manifesto* Karl Marx says, “Oppressor and oppressed, stood in constant opposition to one another, carried on an uninterrupted, not hidden, now open fight, a fight that each time ended, either in a revolutionary re-constitution of society at large, or in the common ruin of the contending classes” (19). To take the side of the poor or the rich is to choose against the other, the oppressed against the oppressors and one class against the other. That perpetuates the struggle.

The base/superstructure model is always operating in capitalistic society. It is a model that regards the economy as the foundation or base of society. The cultural, political and social forms of life are, then, superstructures which are created out of the base and also serve to develop and extenuate the economic base. The economic base encompasses all of the forces of production, education, political awareness etc. Base structure is the “real social existence of man” and it fixes the other extraneous factors (33 Williams).

In a capitalistic society, the worker is alienated from his labour. He plays no part in deciding what to do or how to do it. The division of labour ensures that each worker only does one job, and the labour market decides which job any particular worker will do. During labour, the worker uses capital not under his own control. The capital available determines the nature of the work. On top of all this, the worker has no choice but to work, as wages are needed to provide the worker's means to life. Work has been seen to be 'not voluntary, but forced. This shows that in a capitalist society, the worker has been separated from the decisions of whether or not to work, what the work will be, and what form the work will take. This alienation of labour is the separation of man from his life-activity.

Not only is the worker alienated from his labour, but he is also separated from the result of his labour - the product. This is the most obvious manifestation of the alienation of the worker; he has no power over what he produces. The wage contract ensures that the

products of labour are surrendered to the capitalist, who then sells them on the market, and pays the worker a wage. Marx in *Capital* points out that the alienation of the product is double – “not only is the worker separate from his own product, but that product, as increasing the power of capital, actually weakens the worker’s position” (4). Capitalism also alienates man from other men because of the class antagonism. It is directed to separate workers from capitalists. As well as this antagonism, the labour market ensures that man will constantly be opposed to other men through competition and conflicts of self-interests. This means that any form of union is impossible.

Reification is a concrete view to watch the capitalistic society. Reification occurs when an abstract concept describing a relationship or context is treated as a concrete ‘thing’ or if something is treated as if it were a separate object when this is inappropriate because it is not an object or because it does not truly exist in separation. Capitalistic mode of production treats all the social and human subjective endeavors as a thing.

In *Crime and Punishment* there is a subaltern hero Raskolnikoff and a landlady Alena Ivonavna. Raskolnikoff goes to St. Petersburg to enhance his study of the university. He could not study further. He takes the loan from the landlady but could not repay it. The rent of his room is high and he could not pay it also. He is visited with the young prostitute Sonia and her pitiable family. Raskolnikoff sympathizes Marmeladoff who is a habitual drunkard. But he has the angst with the landlady. Eventually Raskolnikoff kills Alena Ivonavna with hatchet. The murder suspense deepens further. The police and other detectives could not catch the criminal because of the lack of factual evidence. Meanwhile Raskolnikoff falls in the love affair with Sonia. Raskolnikoff has the alter egos of the equality in the society. He always tries to see the equality but he never found. Lastly he thinks to surrender to the police. This is the simple story of the novel *Crime and Punishment*. The novel is very artistic in construction. *Crime and Punishment* is a brilliant portrait of sin and remorse, guilt and

justice, and redemption through suffering and sacrifice. The novel represents a 'testing' of the limits of individual freedom and is a gripping metaphysical detective story. This is most clearly seen in the motif of the 'underground hero,' that is, the hero who is alienated from technology and the so-called advances of civilization. The student Raskolnikov, poor and lonely, is the ideal field for the blossoming of evil ideas. In feeling he urges to murder an old lady, a rich and wicked money lender, he asks himself whether it would be wrong to kill a useless old woman. Despite all these features there are many questions which are unanswered within the novel. Why is Sonya adopting the prostitution as a profession? Who made Marmeladoff a drunk? What psychological complexities are cooperating in the killing of Alena Ivonavna? Many these types of questions are not answered within the paradigm of the text. Our small practice of research is to seek the answers of the questions relating the contexts and the theoretical applications.

Again, in *The Cherry Orchard* Anton Chekhov has taken forth many characters Madame Renevsky is owner of the cherry orchard. She is coming in Russia from France. Lopakhin is a serf and has been working in the cherry orchard of Madame Renevsky. He is very laborious and can easily adopt the new situation. Lopakhin eventually purchases the cherry orchard.

Despite the fact there are many questions which remain unanswered in the play. For example, why Madame Renevsky do not lease the orchard in spite of selling it? What does Lopakhin hide the mystery of purchasing the cherry orchard? Why Lopakhin's idea is thought as a wrong idea? Our small practice is around the search of these questions from inside and outside of the play.

To seek the answers from the different writers, Dostoevsky's *Crime and Punishment* is criticized from different dimensions. Joseph Frank says that the novel *Crime and Punishment* is the novel about the detectives of the criminal. Some characters possess the

excellent detective power who take the criminal in the door of justice. He says, “Dostoevsky thus internalizes and psychologizes the usual quest for the murder in the detective story plot and transfers this quest to the character himself; it is now Raskolnikoff who searches for his own motivation” (102).

This analysis provides a suspense that is similar to, though of course much deeper and more morally complex than, the conventional search for the criminal. To be sure, there is an investigating magistrate, Profiry Petrovich, whose task is to bring Raskolnikoff to justice; but this purely legal function is subordinate to his role of spurring on the course of Raskolnikoff’s own self-questionings and self-comprehension. Another critic George Gibian says that the *Crime and Punishment* is an attack of the Dostoevsky on the philosophy of rationalism. To quote him:

Dostoevsky’s attack against rationalism in *Crime and Punishment*; at this aspect of the novel has frequently failed to receive the adequate attention, not because it has been overlooked, but because often immediately noticed, perfunctorily mentioned, and then put out of mind as something obvious. (4)

According to Gibian, in *Crime and Punishment* Dostoevsky set himself the task of exposing the evils of rationalism by presenting an individual who followed its precepts and took them to their logical conclusion. By working out what would happen to Raskolnikoff, Dostoevsky intended to show how destructive the rational idea for individuals, nations and mankind for the causal logicity as Raskolnikoff has followed.

To talk about *The Cherry Orchard*, many critics have analyzed the play from different perspectives. They have thoroughly analyzed the play from different dimensions. One critic John Caryin in his criticism *Review of the Cherry Orchard* analyses from the perspective of the balance of morality and freedom. He praises the simplicity, progressiveness, loyalty and the prosperity of Lopakhin:

In the entire cast only one person he has normal; human sense. Lopakhin is the son of a serf who has prospered in freedom. He is loyal enough to the old masters, dogging their footsteps with good advice. But in the end it is he who buys the estate fells the cherry trees the villas of an industrial population. (566)

In the above lines the allegiances of Lopakhin is highlighted. He is austere but his ideas are supreme.

Another critic Peter Brook analyzes the play from the dimension of sympathy. Chekhov is the only one doctor who sympathizes to the patients and he says Chekhov is the infinitively detailed observer of the human comedy. He construes:

It's wrong to conclude that *The Cherry Orchard* should be performed as vaudeville. Chekhov is an infinitely detailed observer of the human comedy. As a doctor, he knew the meaning of certain kinds of behaviors, how to discern what was essential, to expose what he diagnosed. Although he shows tenderness and an attentive sympathy, he never sentimentalizes. (561)

The perceptiveness of Chekhov as a doctor is high and majestic. He thoroughly observes the human nature as an observer. To celebrate his intellect he does so.

These works of literature are analyzed from detective, rationalistic, progressive or sympathetic dimension. But there is impossible to find the exploration of the feudalistic mode of criticism in the two works of literature. This research will be from the prospective of the criticism of the feudalistic social order in relation to capitalism in Russia through the Marxist perspectives. We take all the contents and the symbolical meanings.

In this research, part I is about the introduction of the analytical quest of the unanswered questions. Part II, encompasses some preconceptions proletariats through which analyze the works of arts from the Marxist dimensions class consciousness, reification,

alienation, betrayal of mass culture etc. In chapter III, these concepts are applied to analyze *Crime and Punishment* and *The Cherry Orchard*. How are the characters and public suffering and victimized by so called consumer society? How did feudalists become wealthier and wealthier and deteriorating the mass society to earn money? How the liquor is used as a tool of income? Chapter IV epitomizes all the above stipulations.

## II. Marxist Criticism on Feudalistic as well as Capitalistic Social System

Marxism is a socio-economic, political and literary school of thought theorized by Karl Marx and elaborated by others. In this theory, community holds all the means of production, properties, industries and uses for the benefit of mass people. It takes the ethos of universal progress of whole community. In *Merriam-Webster's Learner's Dictionary*, Marxism is defined as “political, economic, and social theories of Karl Marx including the belief that struggle between social classes is a major force in history and there should eventually be a society in which there is no class”(458)

Class struggle is the basic premise of historical change and eventually capitalism will be superseded by communism because of the class struggle. Karl Marx in *Capital* has set forth the premises on “labored theory of wealth” (6). Capitalist’s means of production depended upon the labor to produce commodities and capitalist distribute the wage according to their labor. Class struggle leads to revolution against the unequal distribution of the wealth and the internal conflict there will emerge the eventual development of a classless society. Capitalism refers to an economic and political system where the means of production are privately owned and operated and the investment of capital, production, distribution, prices etc are determined through the open market by the private owners not by the government’s planned economy. Feudalism was a medieval economic system which has the theories of agro based economics. Feudalism in *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* has been defined as “the social system in which people were given land and protection by a nobleman and had to work and fight for him in return” (468). Capitalism is defined in *Oxford English Dictionary* as “an economic and political system in which a country’s trade and industry are controlled by private owners for profit” (125). Capitalism believes in the private ownership of property- the society with class division, free market and so on. In comparative understanding, the private possession of means of production vs. public possession, classed society vs. classless



society, private progress vs. mutual progress, free anarchic market vs. community's planned market etc. In this way, Marxism gives more space of progress for the community.

In the capitalistic social system, the division of class is inevitable. The formation of class has the direct relationship with the ownership of property. On the basis of possession and dispossession of the property modern society is divided into two categories-haves and have-nots (bourgeois and proletariat). Bourgeois possesses all the means of productions, industries, properties and all the institutions which generate the money and their income is the profit of these possessions. Proletariats have nothing but have to sell the manual as well as mental labor to get the wage to sustain their life. Proletariats have to depend on the capital because they have already separated from the means of production. This makes the working class tie with the wages like the peasant in the feudal bondage. Property relation defines the social space, politics, education. the condition of ownership of capital places them in dignity and prestige. Capitalists tended to be wealthy, powerful and prestigious all the times and the peasant quite opposite. Because of the different interests and status, there is always the conflict between these two classes as George Lukas argues "It is an ever-renewed struggle against the insidious effects of bourgeois ideology on the thought of the proletariat" (5). This type of class consciousness inevitably invites the groupings and within the group the common interest and sentiments are shared and the new policies are organized. These groupings reach up to an immense level and the transforms into the political force eventually. Conflict burgeons to the ideological level.

In the capitalistic social formation, there are two level of structural consciousness in society-- the base structure and the superstructure. Base consists of the means of production-- means of production industry, different mode of production, property, land etc and superstructure includes the politics, education, awareness, access in health. The principle is that the base structure determines the superstructure. In another words, the person will be

educated, politically aware if his base structure is strong. The proletariat will not be educated, aware and has no access in healthcare because of their weaker base structure.

Another errand attached with capitalism is the reification. Reification is the concept of the thingification or the objectification of the social relations. In another terms, all the things are treated as a matter. The commodification of human culture, behavior, sentiment, virtue which can be bought and sold is a most degrading aspect. Even the sex is commodified and can be brought and sell in the market. Capitalists have reified the working class into two levels. One is the reification of human virtues, sentiments .Working class women are used as the object- tool of sex. The bourgeois people buy these reified commodities. The next is the reification of the working class people themselves. The laborers in the industries are treated as the expendable commodities. They are the assets which wouldn't to be maintained .The wage by their labor is the cost to be maintaining them. As a productive asset they are used. Karl Marx in *Capital* says this concept “commodity fetishism” (1). The capitalists often argue with the introduction of the new technologies of mass production the mechanization of everything begins. By reification capitalist fulfill two levels of motives-first it will be easy to them to exploit working class and they can get easily what the working class possesses.

Next, the capitalists always want the mass people as a specific realm of the source of income. The ruling class through their monopoly control of the cultural industries as mass media, press, and literature. Through these cultural industries they consciously justify their system is without alternatives and as the most natural and permanent form of society. The dominant ideas and morality of bourgeois society serve as a vital defense of the material interest of the ruling class. They chanzalize the media and the society and even the human mind from which there is no chance of counter voice. These premises are accepted as a culture of the society. The whole discourse-- value systems, fundamental decencies are prearranged. The radio, film, books all disseminate the value systems and norms of capitalism

as absolute truth. The given education supports the capitalistic mode of production. The values and norms are directed to brainwash the mind of mass culture.

To fulfill the ambition, capitalists firstly have captured the media-television. Through television there is the broadcasting of the advertisement of commodities. Firstly we hear the advertisement as merely an advertisement and only for its sake but after the perpetual broadcasting this advertisement indoctrinates our mind--mind of mass culture and this imitation finally becomes absolute truth. The ads are telecasted mixing with the culture, art, humor and pleasure-pornography. That distributes the false consciousness, propaganda which lulls mass culture into accepting their condition. The promises are only to sell the produced commodities. As Theodore Adorno and Max Horkheimer have argued in *The Cultural Industry: Enlightenment as Mass Deception*:

The cultural industry perpetually cheats its consumers of what it perpetually promises. The promissory note which, with its plots and staging, it draws on pleasure is endlessly prolonged; the promise, which is actually all the spectacle consists of, is illusory: all it actually confirms is that the real point will never be reached, that the dinner must be satisfied with the menu. (138)

The media like radio and television are one-sided provocative tool of capitalist. They are 'authoritarian' as Theodore Adorno and Max Horkheimer said because there is no place for the voice of the audience and "the instrument of fraud practiced on happiness" (129). The audience only has to listen to them whatever they say or promise. By their one-sided provocation consumers are mentally captured within their framework of plot.

Capitalists often take the supports of other fields which have already been established. Culture is one which is used in every place. With the culture capitalists inject their formula of earning. Capitalists take the new clichés and jargons to justify the systems are new and always inclusive. Sometimes they justify the system by the epithets like freedom or human

rights. They argue the vast majority of people under the capitalistic system celebrate freedom. But this freedom is only the freedom to the bourgeois to open and purchase the means of production. The freedom is only the freedom of words, which is used to justify the system. There is the naked usurpation of the labor. There is always unemployment, homelessness, lackage of health care and the possibility of economic collapses. In the scarcity of the protection of the governmental institution; proletariat cannot get helped. The money from his labor is only the means to safeguard him. Hence the labor can get money by selling his manual or mental labor as far as the industry exists and the intention of the masters.

The next problem attached with capitalism is the anarchism. There is anarchism in two levels in capitalism-- one is anarchism in market--in production and circulation and the other is the anarchism in the society-- class inequality. The former is mostly created by the free market system. In free market the capitalist decide the market economy autonomously as R.A. Childs construes that “the free market agencies would not have objective rules” (13). There is no presence of the state and other external forces beyond the capitalists. The capitalists’ aim is to accumulate the capital from the market whether by selling the more commodities or by creating the artificial shortage in the market or by squeezing the salaries of the labor or by layoffs. The capitalists’ one-sided decision is always directed to suck the mass people of working class. They may not give the equal opportunities to the people of the production and circulation process.

By the nature of the competitive markets, there is no place for the co-ordination, subordination between the industries. Everyone’s aim is to accumulate capital and defeat other. If there are no beneficiaries then the commodities would not be produced. There is almost no place for the purpose of social service. The commodities will be produced only if there is more benefit for the producers. There is no place for the mutual progress in the market. Because of the ambition of defeating other, there are uncertainties in the production

of the commodities. Industry may be closed after the short span of time if there will be the curtailment of the beneficiaries. Again there can be overproduction of the commodities and that commodities cannot be distributed well, at that time there is also chance of the closing of the industry.

In the capitalistic social system, all the market management is controlled by “invisible hand” as Adam Smith says (1). Industry does not consult to the people how much quantity is needed and the choice of the public according to the time. The industry only produces and the production rate depends upon the selling rate in the market. There can be more demand beyond the expectation and there can be less demand. This all invites a kind of acrimony in the production, circulation and distribution of the commodities in the market.

But contrarily in Marxism, there is the better co-ordination among the industries and there is no chance for low or high production. There is no chance for the waste of the commodities. According to the demands of people, the industry produces the commodity. The state itself manages the coordination and subordination between the industries and between the public and industry. The state is the macrocosm which coordinates with the other bodies of the state.

The class inequality is next anarchism in capitalistic society. In the distribution of the property- the labor are deprived of the access to the means of production and forced to sell itself on the buyer's terms. Some countable numbers of capitalists possess the whole state's wealth and the whole mass is under the privileged position. As Marx in *Capital* says, “What the capitalist system demanded was a degraded and almost servile condition of the mass people, the transformation of them into mercenaries, and of their means of labor into capital” (27). The ruling class establishes itself in the society by the force and compels the working class to work for the profit of their boss. This forms the class division. In society the formation of class inevitably invites the conflicts. There is the maximum chance of the clash

in the society which leaves the society unrest and full of anarchy.

Alienation is the next problem of the capitalistic social system. By alienation we simply understand that the process that separates man from the part of himself. Alienation is the separation between the man and his life activities, his products, society and others. In capitalism, alienation is caused by class antagonism. Class antagonism starts with the division of the labor. The laborer feels more alienation in the society. The labor's alienation is mainly caused by the dispossession of the means of production. "The hostility of the worker's product is due to the fact that it is owned by the capitalists" (21 Oilman). The labor does not control the process of their work. The entrepreneur who owns the means of production also buys the labor power that he employs. The labor has to work totally under the direction of the owners. They leave the finished product eventually in the hand of the owners. In spite of their labor they take the money. That creates the gap between the product and the labor. The product stays in the form of external and independent object as Marx has argued "The alienation of the worker in his product means not only that his labor becomes an object, an external existence, but that exists outside him, independently, as something alien to him, and that it becomes a power of its own confronting him" ( 108). This incisively takes the alienation of the labor to their product.

The next alienation is in the society because of the class antagonism and the competition of the capitalists in the market. In the market, the capitalists' motive is to earn more money by any means. In this situation he is working lonely and a kind of estrangement prevails but this alienation is less severe than the alienation of the labor in the industry. In society the proletariat's estrangement to the lands, buildings are created because of the dispossession of these objects. In fact, the proletariats are not living the life of truly human lives. They always feel the world is always hostile to them. This creates the alienation to them.

The next defect of capitalism is the monopolism. By monopoly we understand a single seller of single industrial product in the market. Companies want to have the governmental permission to create the monopoly. In the creation of monopolies, they are established through the two ways. One is from the irrational political policies, mafias. These types of monopolies are very laughable monopolies and are most offensive and the second types of monopolies are established through the free markets. Though the second types of monopolies are also dangerous for the public and most dangerous for the working class. Monopolies tend to drive up prices and have negative effects on the establishment of a fair marketplace. The key issues surrounding the cases regarding monopolies is that there are many different types of monopolies, they exist for many reasons and purposes. In this case, the monopoly simply kicks away anyone else in the market. Monopoly is price marker and everyone must follow its lead. According to their sizes, they can often produce goods cheaper than their competitors and therefore can offer them at low prices. Eventually, the smaller companies may be forced out of business and a true monopoly then exists.

Monopolies are harmful for the existing small companies and the companies of the infantile stage. The large and rich companies kept forcing them out of business by means of undercutting the prices or by selling the commodities in loss until the collapse of the competitor. The ambition of established monopolies is to smother the infantile company. Monopolies are also harmful for the public and more dangerous for the subaltern class; they raise the price of market by joining force. They create a conspiracy against the public as Adam Smith argues that “people of some trade seldom meet together, even for merriment and diversion, but the conversation ends in a conspiracy against the public or in some contrivance to raise the prices” (8).

Monopolies make easier the owners of the means of productions to accumulate more money. There will certainly be the concentration of wealth into the countable monopolies and

the way the capital is concentrated in the few hands and the rest is allowed in the nation to be poorer in the every generation from that forward. The deeply rooted monopolies, the span of three or four generation after, the wealth of whole nation will be accumulated in their hands and the rest of the people lose everything except their physical body. At that time all the mass people will have to be enslaved by the companies because there will not be the source of money. The monopolies by nature will be stronger and stronger as the time pasts. As V.I. Lenin in *What is to be Done* has argued, “The social means of production remain the private property of a few. The general framework of formally recognized free competition remains and the yoke of a few monopolies on the rest of the population become a hundred times heavier, more burdensome and intolerable” (205). Nothing can stop them and they will have established themselves more sucker of the public because the price control of commodity, services will be beyond the control. For example, the monopoly of the banks of recent time is indicative. They take the expensive interest of their loan but they do not provide the interest or provide the nominal interest of the money of public.

The next problem of capitalism is the economic imperialism. Imperialism here is taken as an immense accumulation of capital in the few countries. With the concept of monopoly, there is the presence of imperialism. Imperialism in fact contradicts as monopoly to the concept of free competition. Monopoly is the basis of economic imperialism. In the modern world, all the source of raw materials and other sources are captured by the gigantic monopolist associations now called the multi-national conglomerates and they monopolize the skilled labors, best engineers, means of transportation etc and established an immense alliance of production and distribution. The multinational companies almost owned by the richest countries of the world. Lenin in *Imperialism the Highest Stage of Capitalism* has argued that the territorial division of the “whole world among the biggest capitalist power is completed” (266). They entered in the underdeveloped and developing countries on the name



of 'free trade'. They damage the native companies and suck the capital of these countries by selling the product in monopoly for almost many years. Native countries could not oppose them. Because of the fear of- they are many as well as powerful and can attack jointly in the underdeveloped countries. So the monopoly is established by force. The concept of multinational companies is an economic imperialism through which the capital of the whole world is accumulated to the few developed countries of the world. Almost all the third world countries are sucked by this type of business policy of rich countries.

The next problem of capitalism is parasitism. Like the parasites the capitalist seals and sucks the mass. We have just seen the parasitic nature of the developed countries through the monopoly of the multinational company towards the economically weaker countries.

Parasitism is caused by the imperialism. "The existence of purely parasitic financiers and the labour bribed out of the super profits of imperialism" (16 Choonara). Parasitism by nature in capitalism is directed from richer to the weaker. In the society, capitalist sells the things which are fantastic visually but weaker in quality. They do not care about the health of consumer. In fact the capitalist sells the poison to the consumer. We can see the food items in the market which are colored with chemical additives. Nobody cares about the health of the public. How to earn is the ethics of capitalist. They sell the other items, e.g. alcohol, mixing the items which can be made in low price and can be sold in expensive price. This shows the capitalist's parasitic nature-earn anyway.

In human history, capitalism has been cheating from the threshold of it. The advocates of capitalism had tried to convince the public naming it differently. Sometimes it was called mixed economy; it was only the nominal fleeting of the word capitalism. That was the wordy justification of the word. The capitalist provocatively has been citing private property, free enterprise, always profit, healthy competition, economic mobility, self-organization etc from the beginning. Perhaps these assertions may be true only for the parts of the people of the

nation-only for the capitalists. How can proletariat establish the enterprise and the enterprise will be free? How does proletariat get always profit? The philosophy is invalid for the total mass of the proletariats and generalizing their achievement and the theory is a new type of conspiracy to the proletariats.

Having all these flaws, does capitalism go further? Or exterminate after the short span of time? Where do the contradictions in capitalism thrive? These types of questions are arisen. We have seen in the human history, the contradiction certainly invites the changes. In other terms, contradictions are the potentiality of the change of the system.

Capitalism was developed out of feudalism as we have discussed earlier. In feudalism a monarch holds both the law-making power and the ability to claim ownership over the land rather than having to purchase it, the monarch loaned the land to vassals in exchange for various services, and the vassals in turn used serfs to work the land. They treated the whole country as slave state. There was the contradiction between the single monarchy vs. slavery, landlordism vs. landlessness. At that time capitalism was a progressive social system and as the resultant of contradiction capitalism was welcomed. Private means of production, free enterprise which were originally marked a great necessary step forward. But now capitalism has many contradictions.

### **III. Critique of Feudalistic Social System in *Crime and Punishment* and *The Cherry Orchard***

#### **Class Consciousness in *Crime and Punishment***

In modern capitalistic society, it is important to recognize that the formation of the social structures in relation to its major classes, and the struggle between them as the engine of moving forward in this structure. Structure itself is an ingredient in the struggle of classes. A class is defined by the ownership of property. Such ownership vests a person with the power to exclude others from the social activities and to use them for personal purposes. In relation to property there are two great classes of society: the bourgeoisie (who own the means of production such as machinery and factory buildings, and whose source of income is profit and the proletariat (who own their labor and sell it for a wage).

Class thus has been determined by property, not by the intellect or other endeavor. These have been determined by distribution and consumption, which itself ultimately reflects the production and power relations of classes. The social conditions of bourgeoisie production have been defined by affluence of property. Class is therefore a theoretical and formal relationship among individuals. The force transforming latent class membership into a struggle of classes is class interest. Out of similar class situations, individuals come to act similarly. They develop a mutual dependence, a community; a shared interest interrelated with a common income of profit or of wages. From this common interest classes have been formed, individuals form classes to the extent that their interests engage them in a struggle with the opposite class.

At first, the interests have associated with land ownership and rent in different forms. But as society matures, capital and land ownership merge, as do the interests of landowners and bourgeoisie. Finally the relation of production, the natural opposition between proletariat and bourgeoisie, determines all other activities.

Eventually, given the maturing of capitalism, the growing disparity between life conditions of bourgeoisie and proletariat, and the increasing homogenization within each class, individual struggles become generalized to coalitions outside the factories. Increasingly class conflict is manifested at the societal level. Class consciousness is increased, common interests and policies are organized, and the use of and struggle for political power occurs. Classes become political forces. It has been formed as an established state. The distribution of political power is determined by power over production (i.e., capital). Capital confers political power, which the bourgeois class uses to legitimize and protect their property and consequent social relations. Class relations have been transformed into political level, and in the mature capitalist society, the state's business is that of the bourgeoisie. Moreover, the intellectual basis of state rule, the ideas justifying the use of state power and its distribution, are those of the ruling class. The intellectual-social culture is merely a superstructure resting on the relation of production, on ownership of the means of production.

Modern capitalism is flourished out of the feudalism. In feudalism there was immense gap between the landlords and the peasants. Feudalism, by its very nature gave rise to a hierarchy of rank to a predominantly static social structure in which everyman knew his place; every man was the vassal, or servant of his landlords. The man swore fealty to his lord and in return the lord promised to protect him and to see that he received justice. Feudalism was the expression of a society in which every man was bound to every other by mutual ties of loyalty and servile. Feudal society was characterized by landlords and peasants. Landlords were the forefather of the bourgeois and peasants were of proletariats in modern capitalism. In the novel *Crime and Punishment* there is an immense gap between the landlord Alena Ivenovna and all other characters who are peasant class. The landlady is rich beyond the expectation and all the other characters--the public of St. Petersburg are under the privileged condition. Some people are dying because of the scarcity of grain but the landlady Alena

Ivanovna has tremendous accumulation of money. Dostoevsky says “She is as rich as a Jew, and can advance five thousand rubles at a moment’s notice (51)”. In this line Jew is a symbol of a feudal lord.

Again the property of the landlady is described as “A hundred, a thousand good deeds and enterprises could be carried out and upheld with the money this old woman has (52)”.

But the rest of the public of St. Petersburg are of proletariat class as Dostoevsky says “In the neighborhood of the Cyennaza or Haymarket, in those streets in the hearts of St. Petersburg, occupied by the artisan classes (10)”

Raskolnikoff is one revolutionary character of guild class. His demeanors are very reserved and he has lost his sensitiveness because of the poverty. The poverty has adamantly stroke him “poverty has once weighed him down, though, of late, he had lost his sensitiveness on that score (5)”. The peasantry resident of Raskolnikoff is described as “It was a tiny place not more than six feet length and its dirty buff paper hung in shreds, giving it a most miserable aspect (25)”. Raskolnikoff believes the men of the world are divided into two groups by nature – ordinary man (peasant) and extraordinary (feudal). The extraordinary man has to do whatever they want-breaking the law according to their capacity in the power. But the proletariat-ordinary men have not to traverse the limitation. He says:

Men are divided into ordinary and extraordinary men. The former must live in a state of obedience, and have no right to break the law, inasmuch as they are nothing more than ordinary men; the latter have a right to commit every kind of crime to break every law, from the very fact that they are extraordinary men. I think that is what you mean, unless I am mistaken? (180)

These lines show the peasant's frail psychologically. Showing the value system of class division as a permanent and god-gifted system feudal lords made peasants rickety.

Raskolnikoff says:

Nature divides men into two categories: the first, an inferior one, comprising ordinary men, the kind of material whose function it is to reproduce specimens like themselves; the other, a superior one, comprising men who have the gift or power to make a new word, thought, or deed felt. Their subdivisions are naturally innumerable, but these two main categories contain distinctively marked characteristics. (181)

These lines show the gap between the kinds of people in the contemporary Russia. How the mind of peasant was pessimistically constructed. They lived in underlined hopelessness. They had their own small world. There were two worlds –ordinary and extraordinary. The ordinary men were the material whose aim was to generate the new baby like them. The concept of class is deeply rooted in the novel. Proletariats were demented by the feudalistic society.

Raskolnikoff is of peasantry class, he cannot enhance his study in the university though he is a brilliant student in study. Poverty makes him lose sensitiveness. Let's look his miserable wearing "His dress was so miserable that anyone else might have scruple to go out in such rags during the day time. He felt no shame at exhibiting his tattered garments in the street. He would have felt differently had he come across anyone he knew, any of the old friends whom he usually avoided (6)". Not only Raskolnikoff but other characters are also poor. Marmeladoff says that poverty is not a crime according to him the poor has to retain the natural pride but in spite of that poor are tried to sweep away from the feudalistic society which is most humiliating act. He says:

It is true that poverty is no vice. I am aware that neither is intemperance a virtue-more's the pity! But indigence is a vice, sir. You may be poor, and yet retain your natural pride; but, when you are indigent, you retain nothing. An indigent man is not driven out of society with stick, but with a broom. Which is far more humiliating. (13)

The aforementioned theory of Marmeladoff tries to protest poverty in a little extent. The brutal exploitation of working class and fragmentation of peasant's mind is practiced in these lines. Beyond these above mention characters Sonya, Nastasia, Elizabeth Razoumikhin, Svidrigailoff, almost except the military characters are of peasant class. Alena Ivanovna is only of aristocratic class. Here Alena has accumulated all the property of the state and the rest public of St. Petersburg is left pauper. That was evil system and incompatible for the mass of the people.

### **Reification of Female Body in *Crime and Punishment***

Reification is to treat all the things as commodities. Due to the commodity nature of capitalist society social relations, human endeavors are objectified. For the easiness of barter the things are treated as commodities in capitalism. People fixate on or are fascinated by and that keeps them from seeing the actual truth behind it. When people try to understand the world in which they live, they fixate on money- who has it, how is it acquired, how is it spent or they fixate on commodities trying to understand economics as a matter of what it costs to make or to buy a product. Money fetishes the people and prevents people from seeing the truth about economics and the society. That one class of people is always exploiting another. The owner of the means of production exploits the proletariat on the force of money. Similarly, in feudalistic society the concept of reification was vastly practiced though the term had not been identified. As the feudal lords began to monetize peasant obligations in order to

purchase manufactured goods and weapons, production for the market was encouraged and inefficient peasants began to lose their land, which the lords then leased to larger, more efficient, and market-oriented farmers. The larger the numbers of peasants expropriated, the greater the labor force available in the cities and the lower the wages it was paid. In *Crime and Punishment* even sex is purchased in money as mentioned by Dostoevsky:

Women were everywhere, chattering and shouting. Some were squatting on the pathway. Here a soldier was strolling about, smoking a cigarette, drunk, spluttering oaths, and who appeared desirous of going somewhere, but had forgotten where; while scattered about were the drunk and half-drunk, rolling across the street. (110)

These above discussed lines and the propositions show the degraded construction of society of St. Petersburg in the feudalistic social system. The females are commodified and used as a flesh which provides the sex only. Female's only task is to sell their body in the market. Females are treated as a commodity. As commodity has both a use value and an exchange value. The use value in prostitution is satisfying the client's desire, the provision of sexual pleasure. The exchange value is the social labour embodied in that commodity, that is, the physical and mental labour involved in providing the sexual service.

In capitalism, the abstraction of society has been frequently reified into anybody that has the power to act. Society does not act-but people do. Reification objectifies the human subjective expression. In other word, human expressions are subjective and are externalized through objectification where they become part of a socially constructed reality. Feudalistic society also had not differed in the exploitation of female subjective. In *Crime and Punishment*, Dostoevsky construes his character Sonya:

Sonya had a thin and pale face, her small nose and chin were more or less pointed and angular, the whole face was not quite in harmony, and hence she



could be called pretty. Her blue eyes, on the other hand, were so limpid that, on becoming animated, they gave to the whole face such an expression of kindness that people felt involuntarily attracted towards her. Another characteristic peculiarity was noticeable in her face as in her person-she seemed much younger than her real age. (164)

In above mentioned lines there is the vivid picture of the externalization and the objectification of the human subjectivities. Why is the need of Sonya's beauty? Does it give to eat or drink? Many such questions arise. Her age is highlighted in the above lines. The age is important for women to sell sex. In the novel *Crime and Punishment* the subaltern female character Sonya Semenovna and other females are commodified- is treated as a sensual object. Prostitution as the purchase of a women's body for sexual use is the commodification of women. It fosters the notion that better sex can be brought for more money. That shows the supremacy of money rather than the human body. Sonya is called a 'young prostitute' by the feudalistic society. It takes place when the social relations between men take the form of relation only by means of money. The reification becomes not simply a relation between men that appears as a relation between things but rather a relation between men that appears in the form of property of the things.

### **The Mass Culture and Feudalism in *Crime and Punishment***

Mass society can be accounted for by attending to the term most often used as the polar opposite of mass, namely elite. A form of society theoretically identified as dominated by a small number of interconnected elites who control the conditions of life of the many, often by means of persuasion and manipulation. This indicates the politics of mass society - feudalists are the advocates of various kinds of cultural elite who should be privileged and promoted over the masses, claiming for themselves both exemption from and leadership of the misguided masses. Elites have projected this trend to usurp mass culture nakedly and

accumulate the capital.

This situation occurs when there is a social and economic normless situation. Morality is the vital controlling and limiting factor in society. Without this regulatory force people's aspirations overshoot realistic and socially contrived limits. In modern capitalism, day in, day out, there is the relentless media projection of capitalists attractive advertisements of the commodities make the mind dull of the mass culture. The mass culture cannot possibly emulate, but which nonetheless they are encouraged to do so. This inevitably leads to negative comparisons and massive disappointment, unhappiness and pathological behaviors. To fulfill the money accumulation interest capitalists are bent to establish their system which make them prosperous day per day. They say the bad way of money earning is punished but they themselves adopt the way. In feudalism also there were the guilds and the landlords who used the mass as source of income because the peasantry class undermined into landless farmer consequently. In *Crime and Punishment* feudalist's role is of parasites they only suck the mass public from any means and they destroy the host-society. The means is the liquor through that means feudalists fulfilled their untrammelled desire of money accumulation. Many characters are victimized by the feudalistic marketing of the liquor in *Crime and Punishment*. Feudalists sell the liquor for the petty purpose of economic gain but they do not care the aftermath of their product. The society itself remains sick under the alcoholism. The life of a sample character Marmeladoff's manner and lifestyle are degraded. Marmeladoff seems in the screen only in the drunken position. Marmeladoff only enjoys the liquor which helps him to forget the poverty of him though he knows the result. He blurts that "it was my own fault this time, and brought about by love of the bottle" (16). Now he is completely became a habitual drunkard. He could not alter his habit. Dostoevsky says:

Here Marmeladoff struck his forehead, set his teeth, and, closing his eyes, leaned on the table. In another minute, however, his expression suddenly

changed, and looking at Raskolnikoff with assumed cynicism, he said with a laugh: 'I went to Sonia today and asked her to give me something to drink! Ha, ha, ha!' (20)

The above mentioned line delineates the wild manners of Marmeladoff. He laughs traversing the human limitation. Obviously the drinking habit destroys the social prestige, health, money etc of the drunkard. There is no social status of Marmeladoff as we have just seen above. The money is also lost; Marmeladoff takes the money from Sonya for liquor. Marmeladoff boasts taking the money from Sonya. Sometimes Marmeladoff does not go home for days. He sleeps on the road or hay barges in the night after the drinking. He does not see the difference to sleep in the house and in public area. Dostoevsky describes:

Marmeladoff stopped and tried to smile, but his chin quivered. He succeeded, however, in supporting his emotion. Raskolnikoff did not know what to make of this drunkard, who had left home for five days and had been sleeping in the hay-barges, and yet cherished a morbid attachment to his family. (19)

These aforementioned lines show the irresponsibility of Marmeladoff to the family member, carelessness of Marmeladoff.

Eventually Marmeladoff dies because of the liquor. All the family, his wife Catherine Ivanovna, three children and Sonya are now economically helpless condition. The liquor –the product of feudalists has exterminated the life of Marmeladoff and makes the rest family helpless. That shows the crude and ruthless shucking endeavors of the feudalists in feudalistic social system. Marmeladoff is one example character whose life is swept away by the liquor.

Other youths of St. Petersburg are also victimized by the liquor. Raskolnikoff himself drinks excessively sometimes in his room and sometimes in the street and sleeps there. Dostoevsky delineates that "he drank a glass of brandy and took a cake, which latter he finished eating in the streets. As he had not tasted brandy for a very long time, it soon began

to have an effect upon him, although he had only taken one glass” (44).

These lines show the drinking as a habit of Raskolnikoff his low quality lifestyle and the irresponsibility. If there is the man in the society who are like Raskolnikoff and the other youth then how the society goes ahead? The student of Raskolnikoff-Razoumikhin also drinks and cuts a ridiculous figure under the influence of liquor. Arcadius svidrigailoff says, “I may perhaps undertake an expedition to north pole, because drink which used to be my only solace has at last sickened me” (200). Other men of St. Petersburg are also drunk. They use the derogatory language and fight with each other. Raskolnikoff saw two drunkards coming out at that moment leaning heavily on each other and exchanging abusive language. The tradesman also drinks Dostoevsky says that “a man partly drunk, who looked like a small tradesman, was sitting with a bottle of beer before him. By his side, a tall, stout man with a white beard, enveloped in great coat, was nodding on the bench in a state of complete intoxication” (11).

This all shows how the liquor is responsible for the betrayal of the peasantry of St. Petersburg. How the society has been becoming unhealthy under the splash of liquor. How men are dying.

### **Alienation of Raskolnikoff in Feudalistic Society**

Alienation refers to the separation of the things that naturally belongs together, or the antagonism between that is properly in harmony. The concept is mostly used to refer to the alienation of the people from aspects of their human nature. Alienation is an objective condition inherent in social and economic arrangement of capitalism. All the forms of production results objectification by which people manufacture goods which embody their creative talents yet come to stand apart from them. The product of worker actually begins to dominate the labor. Workers are paid less than the value they create. The product stays having an autonomous power; there will be more the price of the object than the labor has

been paid. The proportion of what they produce is appropriated by their boss. The worker is, therefore exploited. Quantitatively, boss also puts creative labour into the object he has assembled. The labor is coerced, forced labor. They bear no relationship with other labor and because they are under the supervision of the boss neither they bears the ability to gain the collective personal interest. In this way, workers are alienated from their product activity, in that they no longer thought their creative power is important neither they themselves are more important. Workers are committed no longer to satisfy their own need. Under capitalism, the relationship between the labour and the human expression changes, workers do at the demands of the capitalists, they are alienated because of the cooperative nature of work. The organization of the labor process and the commodity formation alienates them because they have to compete to their fellow workers to get the opportunity; additionally they have to compete to other fellow workers to get the next job in the production. They are as a commodity and the boss can take them when he needed them. The reduction of the labour to a commodity to be traded on the market has made the mind of the proletariat more dilapidated. They have felt the more aloofness. The proletariat has been already in isolation in the process of possession of the mode of production. Being deprived of the land involves the feeling of powerlessness, isolation, self-estrangement and discontentment to the present status and environment.

Likewise in feudalistic society there was the same condition of guilds as the proletariat in capitalism. Dispossession of the land rested the peasants more alienated. Raskolnikoff's alienation mostly comes from the class antagonism and the dispossession. Because of the dispossession he cannot enhance the study and he is demented. The demented personality is always aloof "How stupid of me to be cavern! I might let all out. Pity they do not let the air in here, it is stifling'. His head and sense were in a complete whirl, and a strange feeling came creeping over him; he felt he was losing all government over himself"

(75). Dostoevsky shows the chaotic mind of Raskolnikoff and aloofness. In the lines we see Raskolnikoff is not in the normal physical condition. It recognizes estrangement as its own power and control and has in it the semblance of human existence. The class of the peasant feels annihilated in estrangement, it sees in its own powerlessness and the reality of human existence. Dostoevsky asserts:

‘I must really be losing my senses!’ he sunk on the couch again, exhausted; another fit of intolerable shivering seized him and he mechanically pulled his old student’s cloak over him for warmth, as he fell into a delirious sleep. He lost all consciousness of himself. Not more than five minutes had elapsed before he woke up in intense excitement. (72)

These above lines say the Raskolnikoff’s physical as well as mental status. He has been alienated from himself. The mind is estranged to the body and vice versa. He has just awaked up, all the things are the same but he feels the strange. Everything is beyond his consciousness. The powerlessness is conceived as the expectancy or probability held by individual that his own behavior cannot determine the occurrence of the outcomes or reinforcement he seeks:

Raskolnikoff dropped the paper he held in his hand, and looked in amazement at the stylish lady who was treated with such scant ceremony. He was not long, however, before understanding what was the matter, and the affair rather amused him. He listened with pleasure, and experienced a great desire to laugh. His nervous system was quite disorganized. (77)

These above mentioned lines say the contradictory status of Raskolnikoff’s unbounded desire which are tried to express themselves and the physical body which is not going to be action. He is in utter powerlessness; the body has felt the estrangement. The outer surrounding is quite romantic but Raskolnikoff feels secluded in the mass. Meaninglessness refers to the

individual's sense of understanding the events in which he is engaged and he is unclear as to what he ought to believe, when his minimal standards for clarity in decision making are not met. As a result, the existence does not make any sense. Dostoevsky further asserts:

His heart beat wildly and his thoughts were agitated. He was stifled and cramped in this little yellow room, which felt like a cupboard. Neither his eyes nor thoughts were in harmony with his surroundings nor he seized his hat and went out, giving no thought this time as to whom he might meet on the stairs. (34)

These lines also delineate the abnormal status of Raskolnikoff in the normal surroundings. Raskolnikoff thinks only what he thinks is causeless. There is the dislocation of his physical body to the same surrounding and is alienated. Meaninglessness ultimately takes the person to the suicidal urges. There is the contemplation of the extermination of the physical body because there is no sense in living and non living in the hostile world. The alienated man is in dilemma of life and death. Subsequently Raskolnikoff's alienation transforms in the suicidal urges. He contemplates the suicide is best way to adopt. This is the extreme form of alienation. He contemplates and says that "well, I have. I notice, by the way, that the number of Nihilist has greatly increased-which is not to be wondered at in such times as these. Between us you are no Nihilist" (387). Raskolnikoff is in dilemma of death and life.

### **Anti-feudalistic Ethos in *Crime and Punishment***

In *Crime and Punishment*, a young student who is a believer in the new ideas of the subversion of society formulates a plan to kill a rich old woman with no redeeming qualities in order to save himself from abject poverty and his sister from a marriage of economic convenience. Raskolnikoff, like most students, believed that his ideas would be an important contribution to society. Raskolnikoff reasons that by killing the old pawn-broker, he can get the money, save his sister, and make a huge contribution to society, and the only cost would be this insufferable old woman who causes more misery than anything else. The cost/benefit

analysis is clear, and the reasoning is as sound as any that justified any war in the history of mankind. Rationally, killing this old woman should be no more of a crime than killing a stray dog. Only his truculence, held him back. By overcoming this fear and going forward with the plan, Raskolnikoff could join the ranks of those extraordinary men who are able to leap over the common moral laws in order to perform feats which benefit themselves, and which benefit society as a whole by providing it with the best, bravest, most daring leaders of Marxism. We can easily conceive that by taking the peasantry hero Dostoevsky is against the feudalistic system. The compendiums expressed in the novel *Crime and Punishment* are really heart touching. Dostoevsky pinpoints the responsibility of social system to move the public in right or wrong direction. Through Raskolnikoff, Dostoevsky says:

‘Listen, Rodia, and give us your opinion- I insist. Yesterday, when those fellows upset me’ and I was expecting you, having told them you were coming- these Socialists then commenced by airing their theory. We all know what it is –in other word, crime is a protest against a badly-organized social state of things- that’s all. When they have said all; they admit no other cause for criminal acts; in their own opinion, man is driven to commit crime in consequence of the irresistible influences of environment, and nothing else. This is their favorite theme. (178)

These aforementioned lines say the irresistible influence of environment- feudalistic social system derives the man to commit crime when it becomes severe and non sensitive to the downtrodden people. This remark shows the boisterous anti-feudalistic thinking of Dostoevsky. The next rendition is more famous which is expressed through Raskolnikoff to the police officer about the landlady:

A hundred, a thousand good deeds and enterprises could be carried out and held with the money this old woman has bequeathed to a monastery. A dozen



families might be saved from hunger, want, ruin, crime, and misery, and all with her money! Kill her, I say, take it from her, and dedicate it to the service of humanity and effaced and atoned for by a thousand good deeds? For one useless life a thousand lives saved from decay and death. One death and a hundred being restored to existence! There's a calculation for you. What proportion is the life of this miserable old woman? No more than the life of a flea, a beetle, nay, not even that, for she is pernicious. (52)

These aforementioned lines say the actual plight of the nation. The differences of the peasant and the landlords. One rich woman Alena Ivanovna vs. all the poor of the nation. The woman is extremely rich who is going to give the property to the monastery after her death which will be an immobilized and almost freezing capital. This shows how the money is piled in one's hand and the scarcity on the other's hand in the feudalistic social order. Again it also shows the anger of the working class to the tycoon. The small fight between people is perpetuated. It is the plea of Dostoevsky that it is better to kill the woman to rescue the thousands of lives who are dying because of the hunger. The killing will be the redemption of the mass of people from the poverty. Again Dostoevsky derides the manners of feudalists, capitalists, gentlemen and the scholars who spend the time playing cards. He says: "Very gentlemanly fellows, capitalists, men of letters- who spends their times in playing cards, in cheating one another" (200). In the working time the frontiers of society are playing cards and teasing each other for elapsing the time. How does the country move ahead by the system of feudalism?

### **Class Consciousness in Chekhov's *The Cherry Orchard***

Within feudalistic society, the serf had to live and work on a manor, which was owned by a feudal lords and the lord confiscated a portion of the value gained from production. There were regular conflicts between the landlords and the serf if the feudal

society due to the exploitation of the serfs giving rise to frequent peasant uprisings. The wealth of society continues to accrue to this wealthier class. In the play *The Cherry Orchard* there is also the class division. The consciousness of class has deeply rooted in the minds of serf class. The upper class does not want to lose their class and the lower class tries to overwhelm the upper class. There are two types of framework as Lopakhin says, “there used to be only the gentry and the peasant living in the country” (544).

According to the Lopakhin’s division of the whole people of Russia was divided into two groups-gentries-aristocratic and the peasants-the proletariats. In feudalistic Russian society there the few were rich and the whole were of working class. One woman Lyubov Andreyevna Ranevsky was exceptionally rich and all the other characters were unexpectedly poor. Like Alena Ivanovna in Dostoevsky’s novel the *Crime and Punishment* in *The Cherry Orchard* also Madame Renevsky was an immensely rich character. Her cherry orchard covered the spacious land. She had acres and acres of land. Madame Renevsky was a manor of the time. Manorialism commonly is recognized to have been founded by usurpation ,ruling class established itself by force and then compelled the peasantry to work for the profits of their lords. Madame Ranevsky has glorified the possession of the cherry orchard. Lyubov Andreyevna says, “If there is one thing in the Whole Province that is interesting, not to say remarkable, it’s our cherry orchard” (544).

Madame Renevsky’s cherry orchard was the only one thing which is biggest in the whole province. In other terms Madame Renevsky was only one richest tycoon in the whole province and the rest people were the working class. She valorizes her possession gathering the people with dignity. She says, “the nursery my dear, lovely nursery I used to sleep here when I was little” (542).

These lines are the evidence of the feudalistic sentiments of gentry. An attachment can be vividly seen in these above mentioned lines. On the other hand other character like

Lopakhin, Trofimov, Yasha, etc and other minute characters are of subaltern class. In every character's mentality is filled with the bourgeois value system- the rich man is worshipped and the poor is despicable. Trofimov says to Lopakhin "my idea of you, Yermolai Alekseich, is this; you're rich man you will soon be a millionaire. Just as the beast of pray, which devours everything that crosses its path, is necessary in your metabolic process, so are you necessary" (551).

These lines show the impression of class in the mind of the people in feudalistic social system. Possession is worshipped and dispossession is vindicated. The main prior working class Lopakhin says he is the serf in Renevsky's cherry orchard and his father was also the serf of Madame Renevsky's father and grandfather. Lopakhin says, "my father was one of your father's serfs' and your grandfather's, but you yourself did so much for me once' that I've forgotten all that and love you as if you were my own kin- more than my kin" (544). These lines say the generation to generation enslavement of the working class. The legacy of enslavement proceeds up to Lopakhin. Lopakhin is a prior working class character, he says his father is idiot who did not give him education and the life of working class is stupid. Lopakhin is a laborious person who believes in the hard labour. To rise economically one should have work hard. He works hard not sleeping in the night. Lophakin is made because of his own labour and his own idea. Because of the belonging to the working class Lopakhin's genuine idea of leasing the orchard is resisted by Madame Renevskay:

LOPAKHIN: I tell you every day. Every day I say the same thing. Both the cherry orchard and the land must be leased for summer cottages, and it must be done now, as quickly as possible-the auction is close at hand. Try to understand! Once you definitely decide on the cottages, you can raise as much money as you like, and then you are saved.

LYUBOV ANDREYEVNA: Cottages, summer people- forgive me, but it's so

vulgar. (550)

This shows how the gap has been created there between the peasantry and aristocratic people. The master idea of working class has been called the vulgar idea. This shows the exploitation beyond the limitation. This is the hollow boast of the aristocratic people. The peasants have been treated as animal at that time in Russian aristocratic society. Trofimov says, “yet they belittle their servants, treat the peasants like animals” (551). The above lines clarify how the feudal lords treated the serf. Comparatively Lopakhin has many ideas about the economy than the idea of Madame Renevskya. As Karl Marx has said the bourgeois will be lazy and sluggish and their decadence will be started. Perhaps Chekhov has projected the character who is aristocratic but very lazy in using ideas and spendthrift whose only task is squander money recklessly.

### **Alcoholic Haze in *The Cherry Orchard***

In the play *The Cherry Orchard* the alcohol has been used. Some characters have used it as a means of entertainment and other have used as a part of life. As a result, their life is damaged by the same alcohol and their family has been also betrayed. The alcohol has ruined the life of Madame Renevskya’s husband. Like the character Marmeladoff in Dostoevsky’s novel *Crime and Punishment* Madame Renevsky’s husband is a habitual drunkard. He has damaged not only the life of him but also the life of Madame Renevskya. He only amasses the debt in drinking. She says, “I married a man who did nothing but amass debts. My husband died from champagne- he drank terribly then, to my sorrow, I fell in love with another man, lived with him, and just at that time-that was my first punishment, a blow on the head” (550). The consequence and these lines show how the life of feudalistic Russia has been harmed by the alcohol. The producer has not thought the consequence of their product. Madame Renevskya’s husband is a sample of the many Russian people whose life has been ruined years after by alcohol in Russia.

One way or other the alcohol has been used in different consequence in this play too. Other characters life is also damaged by the alcohol. Lopakhin says his father used to beat him when his father was drunk and he become sick because of the same alcohol “all he did was beat me when he was drunk, and always with a sick” (550). These above mentioned lines portray Russian unhealthy society under the alcohol. In the play *The Cherry Orchard* the two characters’ life is badly affected by the alcohol. Other characters are also having been taking the liquor. Lopakhin takes the liquor and says, “Please, do me the honour of having a little glass at parting. I didn’t think of bringing champagne from town, and at the station I found only one bottle. Please! What’s the matter, friends, don’t you want any?” (558)

We have known that Lopakhin is a witty and laborious personality but the liquor has victimized him. He drinks after the possession of the cherry orchard. This shows as the capitalists in modern society, this shows that the feudal lords had become successful to sow the decencies of drinking the liquor in the sudden beneficiaries.

### **Anton Chekhov’s Support to the Anti-feudalistic Social Order**

*The Cherry Orchard* tells the story of a family losing its home. Lyubov Andreyevna Ranevskaya, together with her daughter Anya, her foster daughter Varya, and her brother Leonid Andreyevich Gayev, are forced by debt to give up their estate and its historic cherry orchard. From the beginning of the play, a family friend, a serf-turned-businessman which has the progressive idea, named Yermolay Alexeyevich Lopakhin has warned them of the impending catastrophe, and urged them to cut down the cherry orchard, subdivide the land, and lease it for summer cottages to achieve financial solvency. They refuse to entertain this idea, and prove incapable of coming up with a viable plan to save the estate. When the estate goes up for auction, Lopakhin buys it, and proceeds with his plan to cut down the trees and build summer houses. The lives of all the characters are changed: Ranevskaya will return to Paris, to her wayward lover. The servants – the eccentric governess Charlotta, the

chambermaid Dunyasha, the valet Yasha, and the clerk Yepikhodov – adapt themselves to the changed fortunes of their employers.

Anton Chekhov has presented firstly the theoretical proof of the victory of the peasantry class in the play *The Cherry Orchard* by taking Lopakhin and his purchase of the cherry orchard as a central concern. Chekhov's message is that the feudalists themselves got their own doom by their own system. The serf like Lopakhin can be rich. By showing the degrading consequence of Madame Renevskya and upgrading of Lopakhin hand in hand, Chekhov has valorized the working class value system. Chekhov immensely deals with many working class characters. The uncertainty is expressed in Lopakhin's terms, "it's the fruit of your imagination, hidden in the darkness of uncertainty" (557).

. The darkness of proletariat may transfer into the happy light. Now Lopakhin is winning the cherry orchard, his generations were only slave of the landlord. Lopakhin says, "I brought the estate where my father and grandfather were slaves, where they weren't even allowed in the kitchen" (557). By portraying the sentiments of the peasant class Anton Chekhov expresses the anti-feudalistic ethos through the play *The Cherry Orchard*.

### ***Crime and Punishment and The Cherry Orchard in Comparative Analysis***

The class has been interspersed as a parallel structure in both works of literature. The excessive centrism in money and the materiality is expressed in one way or other in the works. What the characters do is to earn more money. Sonya sells her body for the petty purpose of money .Similarly, Lopakhin involved in hard menial works for the purpose of money. Madame Ranevsky has been deeply concerned and wavered with the loss of the material basis. Her every activity is affected proportionate to the material basis. She adopts the culture and mentions the high class standards at the eleventh hour of her selling the cherry orchard. Madame Renevskya and the land lady-Alena Ivenovna both have the dignity to the pasts and the glory to the patrician class. But in both the works the rest of the people of St.

Petersburg are slaves, prostitute, mendicants and the dweller of the slum areas. In *Crime and Punishment* the poverty is further deepened by interpreting that it is a gift of the God. The trend of wealth is the innate quality is tried to be set up and the society has justified it. The indigent has been degrading himself as Dostoevsky has argued “yet society has justified, for the indigent man is the first to degrade himself” (13). In *Crime and Punishment*, the economy of the lower class is aggravating day per day. The central character Raskolnikoff is going towards hubris. He could not enhance his study, lastly he surrenders to the police as a result of the theory he has. There is the pessimistic objective in *Crime and Punishment* but *The Cherry Orchard* is more optimistic. The peasantry class is more developing class. Their condition has been getting better. Central peasant character Lopakhin replaces the aristocratic class. Lopakhin by his laborious works in the farms becomes able to buy the whole orchard. Raskolnikoff could ascend to the aristocratic class whether he sacrifices himself but by means of hard labour. Lopakhin becomes to ascend the aristocratic class.

The next similarity is the sentiment of Chekhov and Dostoevsky towards the works of arts. Both have written as an exacerbation of feudalistic social order. The feudalism had degraded the whole society because the society could not be guaranteed the education of the Raskolnikoff like students and could not provide the suitable profession for the Sonya like females. Sonya has many good qualities Dostoevsky has said her ‘pure’ and ‘self sacrificing’ in many places in the novel. It was an obligation of her to adopt the profession of prostitution. The person is forced to adopt an unintentional profession. It is a serious mistake of the nation to apply the unfavoured and crippled theory, Dostoevsky says, “there lies a theory in suffering” (340). In *The Cherry Orchard* Lopakhin’s prior generation has been suffering from the slavery. It means the transformation of the poverty one generation to next be more degradable. Lopakhin says repeatedly “my father was a peasant” (341). By showing Lopakhin’s father’s and grandfather’s history of slave bondage Chekhov is trying to say the

system of feudalism has many drawbacks. Lopakhin can only rescue his generation from poverty. Feudalism should be replaced.



#### IV. Conclusion

In this work, an attempt has been made to study Fyodor Dostoevsky's *Crime and Punishment* and Anton Chekhov's *The Cherry Orchard* from Marxist's perspective of criticizing of the feudalistic social order. Major characters and their economic, social backgrounds are in discrepancy. There is no protective body to save the crises through which about almost characters are suffering.

Dostoevsky in the novel gives emphasis in creating the character Raskolnikoff of peasantry class who has been seeking the redemption of the whole class by the murder of landlady. He attempts to kill landlady Alena Ivenovna is to free the working class. Raskolnikoff's attempt is to subvert the whole system of feudalism-unequal distribution of wealth. The landlady had usurped the total wealth of nation and the other people are under the privilege condition. This accumulation of wealth to a counted individual is an evil system. The class consciousness becomes the prison house to Raskolnikoff, Sonya and other almost characters except landlady. Raskolnikoff is half mad in the system of society which has divided the scion of gentry and yeoman. Raskolnikoff and Sonya felt the alienation in the society which is hostile and severe. Nothing is as a protection body to them. There is depression, powerlessness, alienation, meaninglessness, disillusionment of the character throughout the novel caused by social system. Sonya sells the sex in cheap price to the youths of St. Petersburg in the lack of opportunity. The family has been depending upon the income of prostitution of Sonya. This is the vivid presentation of the demonic social system-feudalism.

Anton Chekov's play presents the story of the serf character Lopakhin who is very progressive in nature and beliefs. At the eleventh hour he replaces the aristocratic class represented by Madame Renevskya. There is a kind of uncertainty; sometimes after he also can be replaced.

From the above arguments about the experimentation of Dostoevsky and Chekhov through works of literature we can say that the system feudalism has become outdated. It only includes elites and precludes mass people; therefore, it should be replaced.

## Works Cited

- Adorno, Theodore, and Max Horkheimer. "The Cultural Industry: Enlightenment as Mass Deception." *Intellectual History Reader*. Ed. by Dr. Birendra Pandey. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Kathmandu: M.K Publisher, 2005. 121-162
- Brook, Peter. "On Chekhov" *The Bedford Introduction to Drama*. Ed. by Lee A. Jacobs 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Boston: Bedford/St. Martins, 2001. 567-68.
- Chekhov, Anton. "The Cherry Orchard". Ed. Lee A. Jacobs. 541-61.
- Choonara, Joseph. *Unraveling Capitalism*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1991.
- Carbin, John "Review of the Cherry Orchard". Ed. by Lee A. Jacobs 565-66.
- Childs, R.A. *The Objectivism and the State* Princeton: Princeton UP, 1986.
- Dostoevsky, Fyodor. *Crime and Punishment* London: Wordsworth Edition Ltd., 1993.
- Frank, Joseph. *Dostoevsky: The Miraculous Years*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1995.
- Gibian, George. *Traditional Symbolism in Crime and Punishment*. Vol. LXX. New York: PMLA, 1955.
- Lenin, V.I. *What is to be Done?* Ed. Henry M. Christmas New York: International publishers, 1943.
- , ed. *Imperialism the Highest Stage of Capitalism*. New York: International Publishers, 1939.
- Lukas, George. *History and Class Consciousness*. London: Merlin, 1923.
- Marx, Karl. "Commodity Fetishism": *Capital*. Vol.1 .New York: International Publisher, 1967. 1-33
- , ed. "The Communist Manifesto". *Essays on the Creation of Knowledge*. Eds. Shreedhar P. Lohani, Rameshor P. Adhikari and Abhi N. Subedi. Kathmandu: Ratna Pustak, 1966. 66-72
- Oilman, Bert men. "Man's Relation to his Fellow." *Alienation: Marx's Conception of Man in*

*Capitalist Society*. London: Cambridge UP, 1971.17-53.

Williams, Raymond. "Base and Superstructure in Marxist Cultural Theory". *Problems in Materialism and Culture*. London:Verso, 2005. 27-51

Smith, Adam . *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. London, 1776.