

## Chapter I

### Introduction

#### 1.1 Social Determinism on Individual Life

Social determinism means the philosophical doctrine that all worldly events, including human behaviours, choices, actions and decisions, have sufficient causes and these are controlled by the society. Society has its own law and the invisible forces that help to change the individual on its own way. Determinism is the philosophical propositions that every event, including human cognition, decision and action, are causally determined by an unbroken chain of prior occurrences. It holds that there are no spontaneous, mysterious, or miraculous events. All events have the rational causes. The principal consequence of the deterministic claim is that it poses a challenge to the existence of individual free will. The fact is that we choose to act a certain way but it does not guarantee that our choice is free because social forces, surroundings and one's background affect the personality or self to be as it is. Taking the importance of society Schumacher, in his book *Small is Beautiful*, says, "It is widely held that everyone is born good, if one turns into criminal or exploiter that is the fault of the system of the society" (2). So how can we really be said to be free?

Determinism holds that everything or event is a natural and integral part of the interconnected universe. From the perspective of determinism, every event in nature is the result of prior, coexisting events. Every event is a confluence of influences. It regards humans as one with the unfolding matrix of the natural universe. Regarding determinism Basu Kaushik in his political and philosophical book *Prelude to Political Economy: a Study of the Social and Political Foundations of Economics* writes that determinism is the philosophical problem of conflict between freedom and choice, but

he strongly holds the view that whatever happens does so for causes prior to it in time.

So nothing can be other than what it is. He further writes:

There must be for some causes prior to the moment of the behavior.

And those causes must have causes. If we go on tracing the causes

further and further back, we will eventually reach causes over which

the individuals in question have no control. According to one strand of

determinism - one with which I have considerable sympathy - all

human action can be explained, in principle, by heredity and

environment, essentially the factors that are beyond the control of the

person in question. This seems to suggest that individuals do not have

free will. (258)

He wants to say that there is antagonistic relationship between free will and determinism but human action is totally enclosed by the strong thread of social determinism because one can not isolate himself from the clutch of the society.

*Oxford Advanced Learner's Encyclopedic Dictionary* defines Determinism as “a belief that one is not free to choose the sort of person one wants to be, or how one behaves, because these things are decided by one's background, surroundings,

etc”(245). It is used to show the process where a person's attitudes, opinions, beliefs or behaviours are altered or controlled. According to *The Oxford Dictionary of*

*Difficult Words* determinism refers, “The doctrine that all events, including human action, are ultimately determined by causes external to the will” (124). Some

philosophers have taken determinism to imply that individual human being has no free will and cannot be held morally responsible for their actions. So we are not

responsible for actions, that is, those actions over which we have no control and

which result from coercion, constraint, or justifiable ignorance. Further more,

determinism as per *The Oxford English Dictionary* means “The philosophical doctrine that human action is not free but necessarily determined by motives which are regarded as external forces acting upon the will” (552).

By going through all these definitions I can conclude that individual submits to the values of society and in doing so, acquires a personal interest in obeying social norms, rules and regulations. A child learns the values of society by responding to parental approval or discipline, and by imitating parents’ behaviours within the framework of society. Regarding Marx, Adams takes society as a means of determinism. He has the strong opinion that one can not alter his environment rather particular environment can alter the human beings as it is. Regarding him, Hazard Adams says, “It is not the consciousness of men that determines their being, but on the contrary, their social being that determines their consciousness” (24). He further writes, “Life is not determined by Consciousness, but consciousness, by life” (625). Likewise Robert Con Davis and Ronald Schleifer argue that the society shapes the existence of a man. They say, “The base is the real social existence of man” (379).

It is a popular misconception that determinism necessarily entails that humanity or an individual has no influence on the future and its events, however, determinists believe that the level to which human beings have influence over their future is itself dependent on present and past. Determinists have concluded that no one is morally responsible for what he or she does. Pierre-Simon Marquis de Laplace, a French philosopher and one of the greatest scientists is responsible for the classical formulation of determinism in the eighteenth century. For him:

The present state of the universe is the effect of its previous state and the cause of the state that follows it. If a mind, at any given moment, could know all of the forces operating in nature and the respective

positions of all its components, it would thereby know with certainty the future and the past of every entity, large or small. (494)

He links past events with that of present and present events with future. The relation among past, present and future is unalienable and an individual is a small part of this section. Human beings believe that they have free will. We feel as though we may freely choose to do whatever we like, however the world that we experience is a world of causes and effects. Everything we observe was caused by whatever preceded it. Even our own choices appear to have been caused by prior events. For instance, the choices we make now are based on the values we learned from our parents, culture and society which they learned from their parents, and so forth. Then how can we be free if our behaviors are determined by prior social events? In this regard Immanuel Kant, one of the greatest German philosophers argues:

The universality and necessity of the laws of nature as a prerequisite for understanding natural phenomena. The human being is, with respect to its existence in the natural world, subject to the same lawful necessity that governs all things. It is therefore determined in its motions. Whether that entails the determination of its volitions is another matter. Because the social law, if it governs our will, does so according to our nature as rational agents, we must somehow think of ourselves as if we were also things in the natural world. (124–125)

He discloses that the existence of human being is definitely the part of nature and therefore it is obviously to take the natural laws as obligation. He further admits that it is not easy to see how the two standpoints that are subjectivity and objectivity can be maintained simultaneously. What keeps the standpoint of freedom from collapsing into the natural standpoint is the distinction between subjectivity, the self

experienced as part of nature and governed by its laws, and moral objectivity, the self considered according to its own nature, capable of choosing on the basis of reasons, independently of the natural causes that would influence it.

In this way social determinism is inevitable on the life of individual. Wherever he goes and whatever he does that is nothing but the impact of the existing society.

Similarly Dostoevsky's *Crime and Punishment* (1866), one of the most powerful and influential works in the world literature, deals how an individual is trapped by the supremacy of the society, was first published in a journal named *The Russian Messenger*. It appeared in twelve monthly installments in 1866 and was later published as a novel. Along with Leo Tolstoy's *War and Peace*, it deals with the social determinism on individual. It argues the author's anguish for human suffering and pain due to the lack of money in the society. In a way, it is a social novel in which money is the key element of the society that shapes the mind and behaviours of the people exclusively. In the novel I obviously raise the questions about the place of individual in society, poverty and its consequences because it is the chief exponent of social determinism on individual.

Dostoevsky's depiction of the impoverished hero along with other powerful characters and his crime was not from his personal aspirations and his feelings of guilt that he felt after the murder of two women, the evil money usurer and her innocent sister, Lizaveta. It was the economic difference between suppresser and suppressed, rich and poor and rulers and ruled. Moreover it was the society that caused the people suffering like Raskolnikov, protagonist of the novel *Crime and Punishment V*. Yermilov, a great Russian critic, is of the same opinion when he asserts:

The book goes on to tell us the misery and want, the utter hopelessness endured by the Marmeladov family, with Katerina Ivanovena as the

embodiment of all that are insulted and humiliated. Each new scene of the humiliation and suffering inflicted on man brings up another throb of pain in the depth of Raskolnikov's soul. Which is nothing but caused by the environment of their family within the existing society. (168)

Yermilov's evaluation is quite appropriate here because Dostoevsky asserted that too much suppression leads to explosion. Eventually, Raskolnikov decides to be a rebel against society. Social causes foster the growth of crimes, particularly like the one, Raskolnikov committed. He further talks about the society which was responsible for such crimes. He says, "Raskolnikov fills the air of bourgeois society, and the author stresses that such ideas and moods are characteristics of the atmosphere of the time the novel was set in" (171).

Rodion Romanovich Raskolnikov, central character of the novel *Crime and Punishment* is a university student, poor and very ashamed of his life, decides to kill Alyona Ivanovna, an old pawnbroker who is crazy, deaf, sick, greedy and evil, but accidentally he also kills Lisaveta, her half sister who came home early. The guilt drives him insane and his friend, Razumikhin, has to care for him. Porfiry Petrovich, the investigator of the woman's murder, heard how he was acting and Raskolnikov was brought into the station. He passed out when the case was discussed and was interested in every detail of what happened. He meets the Marmeladov family who is very poor, the father is an alcoholic, and Sonia, his daughter, happens to be a prostitute so that she can help to sustain her family. Raskolnikov gives the money he received from the murder to the family. Marmeladov died, and the same day, Raskolnikov's mother and sister came to the town to plan his sister, Dounia's wedding. Raskolnikov confided in Dounia and a man named Arkady Ivanovich

Svidrigailov, who Dounia used to work for, overheard the conversation. Svidrigailov was in love with Dounia and blackmailed her into having sexual relations with him. Dounia resisted, tried to shoot him, and finally he gave up and killed himself. Raskolnikov never heard of the blackmail. Many times, Sonia talked to Raskolnikov about confessing and finding peace within himself. Finally, Raskolnikov visited Sonya to say goodbye and then turned himself into the police. He got a sentence of eight years in Siberia, and while he was there, he realized the real condition of a man in the midst of economic and social influence and its consequences.

In this way characters like Raskolnikov, Sonia, Katrina, Duonia and Marmeladov do not act rather they are acted upon in the novel. They become helpless in front of the mighty society. Therefore John Jones, famous critic, takes it as the novel of social influence because society is rather responsible for both the good and bad actions of an individual. He admits:

And, of course, the crime is accomplished in 'an absolutely accidental Way' with Raskolnikov being overwhelmed by 'the feeling of separation and alienation from humanity'. The motives for the crime in this draft, however, constitute only 'a dry and sketchy determinism'.

And Dostoevsky passes over 'the whole plot. In this account his need for and decision to accept punishment are social-motivated. (217)

*Crime and Punishment* has been quite popular since its publication. It has been staged as a play with the name *Petersburg Dreams* and has even been developed as a film because modern people interest in film than read it as a novel. The confession of crime that Raskolnikov does is said to be man's return to true life and his crime is the impact of society, however. It is a kind of salvation in a religious sense. His feeling of guilt shows the moral aspect of mankind that lacked in revolutionary individual.

Raskolnikov feels life. He does not assert his personality but destroys it for the sake of humanity. For Lev Kulidzhanov, the director of the film, the story of Raskolnikov is like the story of a man who has tried to overstep the boarder of the permissible to assert his human personality. Even Georgi Taratorkin, who plays the role of Raskolnikov in the film *Crime and Punishment*, is of the same view. To him “Punishment is a link in the chain of return to the good whereas crime is a social production” (160).

Social background, time, place and family environment play the crucial role in the novel. Almost all characters are controlled by the power of society. They are moving like the puppet due to the lack of money. Not only Raskolnikov but almost all characters are bounded by the same thread of poverty stricken. It is the main cause of all crimes in fact as George Bernard Shaw views poverty as “a mother of all crimes” (193).

Moreover, Dostoevsky brings conflict between reason and reality, body and mind, good and evil, God and man, Poor and rich. By creating ideas in binary opposition he dramatizes the real world using very simple dialogue. Bakhtin argues, “The basic Pattern of Dostoevsky’s dialogue is very simple; man is set against man, “I” against “the other” (122). Any way, the novel is successful to be evidence for how an individual is guided by the visible and invisible law of society.

## **1.2 Dostoevsky and the Social Influence**

Like the hero of *The Idiot*, Fyodor Mikhailovich Dostoevsky (1821 – 1881), one of the greatest novelists and social realists in the world literature, was born on November 11, 1821 in a Moscow hospital where his father, Mikhail Andreevich was a staff physician. The great Russian writer, the might of whose artistic talent Gorky considered equal to that of Shakespeare alone, gave expression in his writings



to the boundless social problems of mankind. Best known for his novels *Crime and Punishment*, *The Brothers Karamazov*, he attained profound philosophical insights which anticipated important developments in twentieth century thoughts including social determinism and psychoanalysis.

The atmosphere of the hospital, where his father had worked was situated in one of the worst areas in Moscow. Local landmarks included a cemetery for criminals, a lunatic asylum, and an orphanage for abandoned infants. These urban landscapes made a lasting impression on the young Dostoevsky, whose interest and compassion for the poor tormented him. Though his parents forbade it but Dostoevsky liked to wander out to the hospital garden, where the suffering patients sat to catch a glimpse of sun. He loved to spend time with these patients and hear their painful stories which are full of social problems.

No doubt it was the environment of the contemporary Russian society that influenced and determined him so much and therefore he exploited the contemporary themes like poverty and its consequences like crimes, murder, alcoholic, prostitution gambling, pain, suffering, anguish, alienation etc. in his writings. His finest works are novels of ideas, embodied in great characters with social problems and its impact on individuals. Dostoevsky often portrayed characters living in extreme poverty with equally disparate and troubled states of mind. This allowed him to explore human condition in the social context of nineteenth century Russian society.

During his time, Tsarist Monarch Alexander I was in the throne. The Tsarist monarchy had ruled Russia for a long time and the people were divided into nobility and peasantry. The serf-owning system was in existence in Russia as well as in other European countries as well. Dostoevsky felt antagonistic towards this system and even towards his father who mistreated his serfs. It is said that his father was killed by

his own serfs in 1839, perhaps due to the inequity between the haves and have nots. During the Tsarist regime, all crimes were punishable with death or hard labour in Siberia. People were punished without any proper investigation of their crimes because words were also deeds for the Tsar. Such justice was known as summary justice. Dostoevsky also was victimized by the same law when he was founded for his participation in the Petrashevsky circle, a radical intellectual discussion group of socialists who met to read and discuss political and economic books banned by the government.

Dostoevsky's involvement with the Petrashevsky circle is nothing but to reform the society and aware the people about the existing system. Petrashevsky circle influenced utopian socialists who planned to start printing pamphlets against the government. In 1849, He was arrested for his involvement in social reform and so he is sentenced to death but the government performed a mock execution and his sentence was commuted to four years of exile with hard labour at a Katorga prison camp in Omsk, Siberia. In this regard Thomas Garrigue Masaryk writes:

Nicholas I had condemned Dostoevsky to death for the public reading of Belinsky's writing against Gogol, but the capital sentence was commuted to Siberian exile for many years. It was the sudden change that came into the Tsar's mind. Most of the members of that circle hanged but by chance Dostoevsky and few members sent in an exile in Siberia for many years. (534)

Dostoevsky's prison experiences taught him to face the hardships of life. He experienced extreme human suffering, sorrows, torment, anguish dread and despair, guilt and punishment. It might be true that his writings are the outcome of his own

experiences. His characters show the two extreme polarities of life and death. The clash of class in Russian society gave rise to conflict in his characters' minds.

Dostoevsky returned to St. Petersburg in 1859 as a writer with a social and religious mission. He published three works that derive in different ways from his Siberian experiences. *The House of the Dead* (1861-62), a fictional account of prison life, was published in *Time* which was founded with his brother Mikhail. *The Insulted and Injured* (1861), which reflects the author's negation of naive utopianism in the face of evil, and *Winter Notes on Summer Impressions* (1863), his account of trip to Western Europe and its consequences.

From the turmoil of the 1860s emerged *Notes from Underground* (1864), a psychological study of an outsider. The book marked a watershed in Dostoevsky artistic development. *Notes from Underground* starts with a confession by the narrator. The story continues with the monologue of the Underground man, who reveals his inner self to his imaginary reader. His later works are more popular than the earlier ones. He wrote *Crime and Punishment* (1866) at a time of financial commitment to his debtors after the death of his brother. His other successful novels are *Poor Folk* (1846), *The Idiot* (1868), *The Possessed* (1872), *A Raw Youth* (1875), and his last novel *Brothers Karamazov* (1880).

Dostoevsky always employs poverty as a chief exponent of social determinism and its effect on individual in the Russian society. These are the subject matter for his novels. Besides, *Crime and Punishment*, his other works like *The Possessed* and *Brothers Karamazov*, portrays the individual undergone by poverty in combat and struggle against the tyranny of mass society

Really, Dostoevsky was called the "Livingstone of darkest misery" (xxxiv) because of his depiction and sympathy for the insulted and the injured people who

lived in darkest locality of St. Petersburg. Hence Donald Fanger rightly claims, “Dostoevsky was the first novelist to present ‘the life of the city in all its sordidness- not simply to show what these conditions automatically did to people, as the naturalists would show, but to raise the problem of how, within them, human beings might pursue the quest for dignity’ and why?” (211).

In the history of the Russian literature, Dostoevsky is regarded as the psychologist of genius and the social realist. George H. Hanna in this regard writes:

Dostoevsky was a psychologist of genius who had an acute perception of the contradictions of contemporary life and who revealed the intricate and tormenting experience of the individual under the power of money. He showed tremendous sympathy for all the oppressed and downtrodden and dreamed passionately of a morally pure and beautiful life. He did not know the true path to the achievement of his ideal and tried to find salvation in religious faith, in humanity and submission. (270)

Belkin, the great critic and writer, remarks: “Dostoevsky became passionately attracted to socialist ideas and to French utopian socialists, especially with Charles Fourier, and west European authors like Dickens, Balzac, Voltaire and other writers” (10). But the fact was that Russian science, literature and art developed in close contact with the culture of the west.

Of course, the post Crimean war era can be evaluated the era of great reforms and the dawn of Russian literature. Russian people become conscious of their rights and the writers produce their works in a great number. Russian writers and their reading public were familiar with the writings of Byron and Scott, Schiller and Goethe, Balzac and Beranger. E. J. Simmons evaluates history in his way:

The Crimean war and the reforms which followed the emancipation of the serfs, the creation of a new judicial system, and the foundation of local self government stabbed the Russian soul into life, relieved it of its culture, produced a great outburst of literature with enlarged and enriched the literature of the world, and gave to the world three greater novelists: Turgenev, Tolstoy and Dostoevsky. (Simmons 160-61)

Today, Dostoevsky is among the most widely read Nineteenth century novelists, perhaps because he effectively dramatized moral, religious, economic and social problems of the human beings in their life. Even Nietzsche, German critic and philosopher, Martin Luther and French philosopher J. P. Sartre admitted their indebtedness to him. He had affected the intellectual history of his generation and his great influence is in the creation of many characters in the Twentieth century Russian novel.

In this way, *Crime and Punishment* is also the result of contemporary Russian society and the environmental and familial background of Dostoevsky. On the other hand it also deals with the social problem of the life of an individual.

## Chapter II

### 2. Contemporary Russian Society and Notions of Determinism

#### 2.1 Social Background

Nineteenth century was the century of the domination of capital, and in Russia, with its economic and technological backwardness, powerful incursion of money into relations between people brought more strain than anywhere else. The problem of money, no doubt, was a mighty and terrible force for the people in the society of the whole world, let alone Russia. The serf-owning system was in existence in Russia as well as in other European countries. People were divided into two groups: nobility and peasantry. So the gap between haves and have-nots was the burning issue of the Russian society. This feudal system was not only practiced in Russia but it was a reality in the whole of world. Landowners were close contacted with the rulers and the ruling class victimized the working people.

Leading European countries completed their transition from the feudal to the capitalist mode of production in the last decades of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth century. The rising number of industries at this time point out a crisis in the feudal system. The chief concern of the ruling class was to build up the feudal structure that is the existing system of serfdom and the position of nobility. The rising capitalist class demanded a share of power and rights. So the result was an inner crisis in Russia. In this regard, S. Schidt, K. Tarnovsky and I. Berkhin assert in *A Short History of the USSR* that the nineteenth century saw the beginning of the crisis of the feudal serfdom system in Russia. That crisis was manifest, above all, in Russia's increasing lagging behind countries in Western Europe where capitalism was rapidly developing. They further point out:

The crisis of the feudal serfdom system was further reflected in the growing number of peasant actions and increasing unrest in the army. Another reflection of the crisis of the feudal serfdom system was the active rise of anti serfdom and anti feudal ideology. It was not in a rosy light but in the flames of war. It was a period of grim reaction. (71-73)

From the very beginning of the seventeenth century, Russian people anticipated a struggle, especially revolution against the existing system of Tsar because there was no political, social and cultural stability. As a result, the peasant war broke out against the feudal autocratic system, but it was suppressed and most of the reactionaries were sentenced to death under the summary justice. After the suppression of the peasant war, the position of the nobility grew more powerful and the “role of the feudal system started to change into capitalistic mode of production” (Illustrated History 55). The growing number of industries employed a great number of factory workers. Thus, it helped to produce the number of the working class people and they became more organized and powerful to wage war against Tsars.

Most of the European countries fell in such a crisis that they could not solve the problems within their countries. In the midst of such turmoil, Napoleon Bonaparte took advantage and came into power in France. He declared himself the emperor because he wanted to rule the whole world, but the Russian patriotic war of 1812 defeated the French army. People who defended Russia from the Napoleonic invasion wanted freedom from the existing system and expected to receive it. Then, within one year many revolts were practiced. There were more than thirty peasant revolts and the Tsarist government was gripped by fear. Even the young officers who were

progressive and aristocratic descent took part in the liberation of the country. They were also interested in making the country free from the yoke of serfdom.

On December 14, 1825, the Decembrists' movement, a secret society of revolutionary noblemen, made a plan to seize the Winter Palace, and the Peter and Paul Fortress to arrest the royal family and to call a constitution assembly. But it failed and more than one hundred people were exiled to Siberia. Some of them were executed by hanging.

The defeat of Decembrists in Russia and the revolutionary experience in other countries proved that it was impossible to overthrow Tsar and serf owning system without the support of middle and lower class people, especially working class people. This is why the Russian writers, educated revolutionaries and other people who were against the serf holding system met and decided to go together. Nevertheless, Russian intellectuals who wanted Russia free from the chain of serfdom felt the need of an organized protest against Tsarism and a group of young writers led by Mikhail Butascheich Petrashevsky formed a secret society to prepare an uprising. The members of this circle were arrested later and some of them were sentenced to death on the charge of corrupting people's minds. A few of them, including Dostoevsky, were exiled to penal servitude in Siberia in 1849.

Russia faced the continual crisis everywhere but the reign of Nicholas I saw the blossoming of modern literature. Thomas Garrigue Masaryk writes, "The great writers of this epoch led and sustained individualistic aspirations towards freedom" (425). He points out that Nicholas I had condemned Dostoevsky to death for the public reading of Belinsky's writing against Gogol, but the capital sentence was commuted to Siberian exile for many years. It was a sudden change that came into the Tsar's mind.



When Russia lost the Crimean war, the new Tsar, Alexander II, was forced to accept the terms of peace treaty which he signed in 1856. “The Crimean war brought the revolutionary crisis in Russia to head. It was now clear to all that the system of serfdom belonged to the past and had to go” (Illustrated History 54). In fact the abolition of serfdom appeared inevitable and eventually, the serf owning system was abolished in 1861. Then the Tsar was forced to make reforms in all sectors including judicial reform. However, some of its important features survived. Undoubtedly, it was a clear way to capitalism and the Marxist ideas started to spread at the same time.

Despite the oppression, revolutionary Russian literature managed to flourish in the 1840s and 50s. The period was dominated by social realism, which was founded by Alexander Pushkin who is considered Russia’s greatest and most influential poet and admired for his exquisite use of language. His influence extends to Dostoevsky, Tolstoy, and Chekhov. His most beloved work is the long poem, *Eugene Onegin*. He died in the same year as Dostoevsky’s mother, and Dostoevsky is said to have declared that if he weren’t already wearing mourning clothes, he would put them on, to mark the poet’s passing.

However the term became critical slogan as socialist realism that first appeared in 1832, the exponents of critical realism existed before the writers such as Belinsky, Herzen, Chernyshevsky and even Tolstoy who believed that the individual and the community were not opposing but complementary factors in each other’s well-being. “They were in a sense devotees of socialist realism. It has faith in life and in man” (Simmons 73). Similarly, Nikolai Gogol painted a series of vivid pen pictures of life in feudal Russia in his writings. He explored new possibilities for the novel, using his bizarre comic vision to craft social protest. *Dead Souls*, his most important work is

that satirizes the institution of serfdom. Dostoevsky admired Gogol and considered him one of his literary teachers.

Another writer, Chernyshevsky, who was a novelist and philosopher, especially and advocator of socialism, wrote his first novel in a prison in St. Petersburg. According to Melvin C Wren Chernyshevsky waged war against false art, against romanticism and idealism, employing the latter term to denote German Philosophy since the days of Kant and also against romanticist art, likewise contemned as characteristically German. The remark shows that Russian writers were influenced by writers of other countries and the revolution took place in socio-political, cultural as well as in literary fields.

Russian literature of the nineteenth century provided a congenial medium for the discussion of political and social issues whose direct presentation was censored. The writers of this period shared important qualities: attention to realistic, detailed descriptions of everyday Russian life, ugly side of life and a satirical attitude toward mediocrity and routine. All of those elements were articulated primarily in the novel and short story forms. The best novelists of this period are Ivan Turgenev, Dostoevsky and Tolstoy. An important tool for writers of social commentary under strict Tsarist censorship was a device called Aesopic language, a variety of linguistic tricks, allusions, and distortions comprehensible to an attuned reader but baffling to censors.

Novelists like Tolstoy and Dostoevsky wrote well-known books. Tolstoy's *War and Peace*, which is one of the best selling books in the world, illustrated the war between the Russian and the French army led by Napoleon. His books are said to be splendid. Russian history lauds him as a great genius with an unsurpassed knowledge of human psychology. Tolstoy wrote this novel in a grand epic style and other novels

are also quite popular. *Anna Karenina* and *Resurrection* are two long novels. In his great novels and other short stories as well as in plays, he has painted amazingly realistic pictures of life at various periods of development in the course of a whole century.

Thus the Nineteenth century Russian society was the society of upheaval and turmoil. There was no political, social and cultural stability. More than hundreds of revolutions were practiced. Really, people were facing poverty stricken. In the midst of poverty they were obliged to choose the short cut way that is robbery, murder and prostitution. It was not because their nature was so but because the system of the society was atrocious and indeed no one can talk about morality and philosophy when the situation is against.

In this way, Dostoevsky among the other great Russia writers raises the social problems like poverty stricken, social discrimination, crimes, pain and agony of nineteenth century Russian society and its effect on individual's mind and behaviours in his novel *Crime and Punishment*. In fact it was the society that made him gambler, revolutionary, socialist and finally a great writer as well. He himself asserts that a man is the slave of the society and therefore what he does or act is the influence of contemporary society and nothing else.

## **2.2 Notions of Determinism**

The second half of eighteenth century emerged with a new school of writers with their message of awkwardness of human situation and their existence on the basis of society. They present with the view that man does not act, he or she is acted upon because an individual is in the grip of the society. He must have to move according to the law of society. So morally he is not responsible what he does rather it is the society that governs an individual. In this regard Peter van Inwagen asserts

determinism as the natural laws and the individual behaviours are unknown because it is not up to us. He says,

If determinism is true, then our acts are the consequences of the laws of a true and events in the remote past. But it is not up to us what went on before we were born, and neither is it up to us what the laws of nature are. Therefore, the consequences of these things (including our present acts) are not up to us whatever they are. (56)

The idea that the world is composed of atoms moving under the influence of certain forces according to certain laws can be traced back to the Greek philosopher Laplace. Deterministic philosophy was prominent in the work of the seventeenth-century thinker Rene Descartes, and became widely known through his influence. Isaac Newton carried out a large part of the Cartesian program. His theory explained so many natural processes that it began to appear that the universe since the time of creation might actually have run its course in a deterministic fashion like a machine, without divine intervention. A century after Newton, Pierre Simon de Laplace argued that an omniscient calculator, provided with exact knowledge of the state of the universe at present, would be able to predict the entire future.

Determinism is the philosophical doctrine that every event or state of affairs is brought by antecedent events or states of affairs in accordance with universal social and causal laws that govern the world and human life as well. Thus, the state of the world at any instant determines a unique future, and that knowledge of all the positions of things and the prevailing natural forces would permit an intelligence to predict the future state of the world with absolute precision. This view was later advanced by Pierre-Simon, Marquis de Laplace (1749 -1827), French philosopher, in

the early nineteenth century, who was inspired by Newton's success at integrating our physical knowledge of the world.

Determinists deny the existence of chance though they concede that our ignorance of the laws or all relevant antecedent conditions make certain events unexpected and therefore apparently happen by chance as *The Cambridge Dictionary of Philosophy* defines determinism like this:

Since determinism is a universal doctrine, it embraces human actions and choices. But if actions and choices are determined, then some conclude that free will is an illusion. For the action or choice is an inevitable product of antecedent factors that rendered alternatives impossible, even if the agent had deliberated about options. An omniscient agent could have predicted the action or choice beforehand.

This conflict generates the problem of free will and determinism. (229)

All things in the universe are interconnected, and all changes are the effects of powers inherent in the society. No change occurs that would not be the necessary consequence of the preceding state. All facts are dependent upon and conditioned by their social causes. No deviation from the necessary course of affairs is possible. Eternal law regulates everything that is society. In this sense, Ludwig von Mises writes:

Determinism is the epistemological basis of the human search for knowledge. Man cannot even conceive the image of an undetermined universe. In such a world there could not be any awareness of material things and their changes. It would appear a senseless chaos. Nothing could be identified and distinguished from anything else. Nothing could be expected and predicted. In the midst of such an environment

man would be as helpless as if spoken to in an unknown language. No action could be designed. (73)

It is vain to search for the development of certain ideas out of other previously held ideas. For example, it is unscientific to describe how the philosophical ideas of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries evolved out of those of the sixteenth century. Determinists therefore reject the doctrine of free will as illusory. Man, they say, deceives himself in believing that he chooses the actions. Something unknown to the individual directs his will. He thinks that he weighs in his mind the pros and cons of the alternatives left to his choice and then makes a decision.

Determinism has historically been subject to various interpretations such as incompatibilists and compatibilists. Incompatibilists view determinism and free will as mutually exclusive that is believing in determinism requires one to believe free will to be an illusion. That is known as hard determinism. On the other hand compatibilists or soft determinists believe that the two ideas can be coherently reconciled that is they accept free will and reject determinism as well. They are called libertarians. Most of this disagreement is due to the fact that the definition of free will, like that of determinism, varies. Some feel it refers to the metaphysical truth of independent agency, whereas others simply define it as the feeling of agency that humans experience when they act. For example, David Hume argued that while it is possible that one does not freely arrive at one's set of desires and beliefs, the only meaningful interpretation of freedom relates to one's ability to translate those desires and beliefs into voluntary action.

There are three basic positions concerning man's choices: determinism, indeterminism and self-determinism or free will. Determinism is the belief that an individual is a member of the society and therefore one can not go beyond the law

of the society and all his actions are controlled by the power of the society as B. F.

Skinner believes:

All human behaviour is completely controlled by environmental factors.

Hence man is viewed as an instrumental cause of his behaviour. He is

like a knife in the hands of a butcher or a hammer in the grip of a

carpenter. He does not originate action but is the instrument through

which some other agent performs the action. (17-18)

On the other hand indeterminism is the view that there are no causes for man's actions, antecedent or otherwise. In order to support of the indeterminacy of all events Heisenberg's principle of uncertainty is often invoked. The principle states that it is impossible to predict where a subatomic particle is and how fast it is moving at any given moment. Like wise self determinism or free will is the belief that man determines his own behaviour freely, and no causal antecedents can sufficiently account for his actions.

Moreover there are variety in determinism like social determinism, causal or nomological determinism, logical determinism, theological determinism, ideological determinism, material determinism and the like.

Causal determinism is the thesis that future events are necessitated by past and present events combined with the laws of nature. Causal determinism has a subtle relationship with predictability that implies strict determinism, but lack of predictability does not necessarily imply lack of determinism. Limitations on predictability could alternatively be caused by lack of information, excessive complexity, etc. Where as, logical determinism is the notion that all propositions, whether about the past, present or future, are either true or false. The problem of free

will, in this context, is the problem of how choices can be free, given that what one does in the future is already determined as true or false in the present.

Like wise theological determinism is the concept that there is a God who determines all that humans will do, either by knowing their actions in advance via some form of omniscience or by decreeing their actions in advance. The problem of free will, in this context, is the problem of how our actions can be free, if there is a being who has determined them for us ahead of time. Medieval philosophers had dealt with it at length. During the Reformation it received new impetus from debates on predestination, debates renewed in the seventeenth century.

Determinism is sometimes confused with fatalism or predestination. Fatalism is the supernatural belief that all human actions are predetermined by God or unknown force. It holds that the natural world causes events in human life but is not itself influenced by human will or behavior. No matter what you do, the same things will happen to you.

Whereas determinism asserts that neither human affair has been prearranged nor does an individual have an unavoidable fate. It holds that every thing and event is a natural and integral part of the interconnected universe. Every event in nature is the result of prior or coexisting events or every event is a confluence of influences. Determinism regards humans as one with the unfolding matrix of the natural universe,

Social determinists maintain the population patterns, social groupings and especially the need to maintain a social order from the fundamental underpinnings of human existence. Ideology, technology and other cultural systems develop in relation to their importance in upholding social institutions. It considers certain human behaviors, such as having a particular sexual orientation, committing murder, or writing poetry. A social determinist looks only at social phenomena, such as customs,



expectations, education, system and interpersonal interactions to decide whether or not a given person would exhibit any of these behaviors. They would discount biological and other non-social factors, such as genetic makeup, the physical environment, etc. Ideas about nature and biology would be considered to be socially constructed.

Immanuel Kant takes determinism to be a kind of fact. He locates determinism in the empirical world or world of appearances, and freedom in the world of things-in-themselves, the world of reason. It is important that the latter world is not in time. So he is a determinist of a kind, opposed to the tradition of compatibilism, not really in the incompatibilist tradition, but tries to make his determinism and freedom as origination consistent by his own private means. He says:

Every human being has an empirical character for his power of choice, which is nothing other than a certain causality of his reason, in so far as in its effects in appearance this reason exhibits a rule, in accordance with which one could derive the rational grounds and the actions themselves according to their kind and degree, and estimate the subjective principles of his power of choice. Because this empirical character itself must be drawn from appearances as effect, and from the rule which experience provides, all the actions of the human being in appearance are determined in accord with the order of society. (12)

All the same an individual has his own free choice that is independent and autonomous but above them there is the society and its invisible forces that determine the behaviour of an individual. He further states that in the midst of society an individual has no choices even his freedom is tagged with the social phenomena. He says:

And if we could investigate all the appearances of his power of choice down to their basis, then there would be no human action that we could not predict with certainty, and recognize as necessary given its preceding conditions.

Thus in regard to this empirical character there is no freedom, and according to this character we can consider the human being solely by observing, and, as happens in anthropology, by trying to investigate the moving causes of his actions. (3)

At last, he questions how can an individual activity initiated by humans possibly be outside of society, an independent variable? It is unavoidable, fact and reality. Similarly David Hume takes determinism as a social connection that is constant conjunction. He begins by examining what we call necessity in physical processes. We are apt to suppose that there are laws in the society that determine the human beings. He comments:

Nature and the laws of society govern our behaviours. Throughout the history and across cultures our behaviours remain relatively. Similar motives produce similar actions and similar causes produce similar events. What we call 'human nature' springs from a certain regularity that we observe in human behaviours in all sorts of social circumstances. (9)

In this way the life of an individual is in the grip of the society. So what he does is entirely associated with the society where he lives. We can not isolate human beings from the yoke of society. A person becomes as per the society.

### **2.3 Marxism and Social Determinism**

Towards the middle of nineteenth century, Karl Marx (1818-1883) in association with Frederic Engels (1820-1895) invented radical economic, social and political theories which spread with amazing effect throughout the world heralding the dawn of new era. Now a days the same theory is called Marxism which has got success to influence the modern world by furnishing strong ideological basis, especially for political movements. While the world was gradually changing the socio-economic condition of the inhabitants caused by scientific discoveries and the establishment of large-scale of industries, Marx appeared in the political scenario as a radical economist, sociologist and supreme ideologist. People were then really facing transitional period in the field of economic and politics due to industrialization that had divided them into Haves and Have-nots group. Have nots group that is proletariat group, the lowest stratum of the society. Marx's theory inspired them to fight against capitalists who possess large amount of surplus, instead of the working class people who sell abundant labour but hardly collect food. Marx in his theory saw the necessity of seizing political and legal power to emancipate the proletariats from the capitalist's exploitation. Industrial Revolution was a kind of curse for the working class people in which "the proletariat were deprived of lands and tools and driven into factories where industrial capital devalued their labour" (Blamires 365-66). In this way, as a political theory Marxism advocates the class struggle of the proletariat against the capitalists until the workers are emancipated legally from the oppressors.

Marx was an extraordinarily influential political thinker in the whole history. Marxist theories of social and historical development had lasting effect in all social, economic and political activities. Marxism brought significant change in bourgeois ideology. It challenged the old viewpoint of philosophy itself. As Marx himself explicitly stated that "Philosophers have only interpreted the world in various ways;

the point is to change it” (Selden 12). His theories brought considerable change in the concept of art and literature.

Marxism treats literature as a mirror of socio-economic life and judges it on the basis of how far it has fulfilled this function. It strongly stresses that literature should be useful to life. Nevertheless, Marxism is primarily a theory of social, economic, political and revolutionary activities, it treats art and literature with special care. Art should try to express the fundamental struggle with nature and with their own nature. On this matter quoting Marx, Slaughter Cliff writes:

Art does not ‘reflect’ a given class structure such as capitalism. It is a product of the men thrown into struggle by the specific contradictions of the given social formations. In their literature and art men do not produce some mysteriously congruent copy of the social structure: rather they express the content of the fundamental struggle with nature and with their own nature which that society, at its particular stage of development, carries forward or inhibits, or does both at the same time.

(23)

Discarding all other concepts Marxist theoreticians have developed their own theories, known as Marxist theories of art and literature, which are believed by majority of these theoreticians that literature has social as well as political implications and it must be committed to the cause of people and should be used for the society’s progress.

However Marx and Engels did not propound any systematic theories concerning art and literature, they are found raise some basic questions about them in relation to their discussion about base and superstructure. Marxism thinkers claim that base affects the superstructure and with the change in base, superstructure also

automatically gets changed that is the change in socio-economic relations brings changes in ideology, politics, religion, art and literature as well and an individual is one of the parts of the society. It means society determines our consciousness. We do as per the environment, our circumstance, and our culture, over all our society. To analyze the society Marx makes an assumption and shows close relationship between base and superstructure that is individual and society. Any change in society brings innovations in individual or in other words an individual become helpless in front of the society. On this matter Jostein Gaarder writes:

“The most basic level is what we may call society’s conditions of production. In other words, the natural conditions or resources that is available to society. These are the foundation of any society, and this foundation clearly determines the type of production in the society, and by the same token, the nature of that society and its culture in general (394-95).

Many Marxists claim that Marx and Engels viewed this law of social determinism as the creative force in human progress. The final causes of all social changes and political revaluation are to be sought not in men’s brains, not in man’s insight into internal truth and justice but in the economics and society of each epoch. In this regard he further says:

Marx understood that condition in society super-structure could have an interactive effect on the basis of society, but he denied that society’s super-structure had any independent history of its own. What has driven historical development from the slave society of antiquity to the industrial society of today has primarily been determined by changes in the base of society. (396)

So there is the close relationship between Marxism and determinism as Ernest Mandel says regarding Marx, “People make their own history, but they do not make it as they please; they do not make it under self-selected circumstances, but under circumstances existing already, given and transmitted from the past” (2). Though an individual has his own existence but it is altered, distorted, added and modified entirely by the social phenomenon. All behavioural changes of an individual are brought about by environmental and social background. Summing up his determinism, Marx writes

Men enter into definite relations that are indispensable and independent of their will; these relations of production correspond to a definite stage of development of their material powers of production. The sum total of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation, on which rise legal and political superstructures and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production in material life determines the general character of the social, political and spiritual processes of life. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but, on the contrary, their social existence determines their consciousness. (11)

In this way we can take Marxism as social determinism because both of them strongly hold the society as the determining factor of the life of individual. Society as a base determines the human consciousness and that's all.

#### **2.4 Individual Free Will and Social Determinism**

Free will is a concept in traditional philosophy used to refer to the belief that human behavior is not absolutely determined by external causes but is the result of

choices made by an act of will by the agent. Such choices are themselves not determined by external causes, but are determined by the motives and intentions of the agent, which themselves are not absolutely determined by external causes. Free will advocates that human behavior is unique and is determined by the agent, not by God or the stars or the laws of nature. It is the power or capacity to choose among alternatives or to act in certain situations independently of natural, social, or divine restraints. Free will is denied by those who espouse any of various forms of determinism.

The belief of free will is one's ability to make rationale choices based on one's own motivation and desire. It is the view that our choices and actions are not causally necessitated. One is free to make the choices and there are no natural laws as well. So to have free will, we must have to btain at least two conditions. Firstly we must have two or more possibilities genuinely open to us when we face a choice and secondly our choice must not be forced. In this regard John Macquarrie argues

Free will is nothing rather than a something, a possibility rather than an actuality. It cannot be grasped by thought only known through the exercise of freedom; and perhaps even then it is only in those rare moments of anxiety in the face of freedom that we perceive something of the abyssal and primordial character of freedom. (139-40)

He takes free will as the most important things in human life. He comments nothing is more characteristic of the human spirit than freedom or free will. We are persons of spirit to the degree that we shape our own lives. As children, before our spirits had developed very far, we had little capacity to resist enculturation and choose our destinies. Belief in free will is the idea that human behaviours are not just based on external causes but is the result of the individual's ability to make choices bases on

their motive, and intentions, which is not determined by external causes. To have free will is to be able to make alternative choices. Therefore, one's actions are not predetermined. One is free to make choices based on what is most appropriate to him or her without being influenced by external stimulus. Human beings having free will are the cause of some of their own actions based on the choices that they make.

It means the ability to choose the actions without being forced to follow a certain course by either influence of others or by natural laws. It is necessary for the notion of personal responsibility. If people do not have free will, then it is difficult to argue that they are personally and morally responsible for their actions and if that is the case, how can they be punished for their misdeeds? In fact, how can they be praised for the good things they do, if those actions were not also freely chosen? These are some questions that the believers of free will often used to say.

Similarly free will is a philosophical term for a particular sort of capacity of rational agents to choose a course of action among various alternatives. On a minimalist account, free will is the ability to select a course of action as a means of fulfilling some desire. David Hume, for example, defines free will or liberty as, “Power of acting or of not acting, according to the determination of the will: that is, if we choose to remain at rest, we may; if we choose to move, we also may. This hypothetical liberty is universally allowed to belong to everyone who is not a prisoner and in chains” (11).

It suggests that freedom is simply the ability to select a course of action, and an agent is free if he is not being prevented by some external obstacle from completing that course of action. On the other hand Descartes, in the midst of exploring the scope and influence of the individual free will, declares that “the will is by its nature so free that it can never be constrained” (343). And as we’ve seen, he



believed that such freedom is present on every occasion when we make a conscious choice even, he further writes, “When a very evident reason moves us in one direction” (245). More recently, John Paul Sartre notoriously held that human beings have absolute freedom. He Says, “No limits to my freedom can be found except freedom itself, or, if you prefer, we are not free to cease being free” (567). His views on freedom flowed from his radical conception of human beings as lacking any kind of positive nature. Instead, we are non-beings whose being, moment to moment, is simply to choose as he further says:

For human reality, to be is to choose oneself; nothing comes to it either from the outside or from within which it can receive or accept. it is entirely abandoned to the intolerable necessity of making itself be, down to the slightest details. Thus freedom...is the being of man, i.e., his nothingness of being. (568-9)

The principle of free will has religious, ethical and scientific implications. For example, in the religious realm, free will may imply that an omnipotent divinity does not assert its power over individual will and choices. In ethics, it may imply that individuals can be held morally accountable for their actions. In the scientific realm, it may imply that the actions of the body, including the brain and the mind, are not wholly determined by physical causality. The question of free will has been a central issue since the beginning of philosophical thought.

Nevertheless we are free in so far as we alone determine our behavior. We are not free when others dictate or hamper our decisions or for reasons of illness or incapacity we cannot determine our actions. This meaning carries the question from the external empirical realm to the inner psychological domain of will or subjective determination. Although these meaning moves closer to the essence of the

determinism and free will issue, it still avoids the basic concerns of those posing the question. Yes, we may be self-determined and thus free, but our self-determination itself may be determined by the absolute necessity of external causation that is social commandments. We may choose to rob and steal, but this choice itself may have been ultimately determined by extreme poverty, a broken home, or an ineffective educational system. It seems, therefore, hardly fair to assign moral responsibility to a person whose self determination is so determined by social values and customs.

Moreover determinism on the contrast with free will means that the way things are at one moment is the necessary result of the ways things were the moment before. It means that every effect has its cause, and that nothing, not even the will, is exempt but it does not mean that the future is already established.

Moreover nature has the certain laws through which everything is controlled by and human beings are basically more complicated versions of material substances and therefore whatever governs any other material substance in the universe must also govern human life. Basically, we are subject to the kind of causation everything else is. Since nothing else exhibits free will but conforms to causal laws, so must we be. Social science is merely looking into the particulars of those causes, but we all know that we are subject to them in any case.

Others, however, argue that if the universe itself is deterministic in nature, then human actions must also be deterministic. Thus modern determinism tends to be an outgrowth of modern science. If human actions simply follow the course of natural law, then it is difficult to hold that those actions can be freely chosen. Those who advocate determinism run into something of a contradiction, however, when they try to argue their point with those who argue for free will. It is true that nothing is freely chosen and those who believe in the existence of free will do not do so by choice.

One thing to note about the debate between free will and determinism is that both terms tend to be defined in such a way as to explicitly exclude the other. But why must that be the case? The philosophical position of compatibilism argues that these concepts do not need to be defined in such a mutually exclusive manner and that in fact; both free will and determinism can be compatible.

The problem of free will or determinism is slightly different for the theist. Instead of wondering if natural laws mean that human actions are all determined, the theist must also ask whether or not their God has pre-determined all events in the universe, including their own. If so, that will mean that their ultimate fate will be determined. This position was adopted most completely and explicitly by the reform theologian John Calvin, who argued that some people are predestined to be saved and some are predestined to be damned, and there is nothing anyone can possibly do about it.

Determinists declare that there is no such thing as free will. They assert that every event has a cause and that there is a chain of causality that extends back to ones birth or even before one was born. It is believed that each link of the chain determines what will happen with the next link. Therefore, human beings actions are based on a chain of event that cause them to react in a particular way. This is because there is no free will and individuals' behaviors are predetermined. Everything that happens to an individual is based on the effect of some set of causes. A person's thoughts, actions and beliefs are all determined by preceding events within the society. Therefore, the choices that individuals make in life are predictable and cannot be avoided. So, individuals should not be held accountable for their actions since, they are not acts of free will. The action to make choices is determined by an individual wants, wishes,

desires, feelings and motivations. So, universal causality is incompatible with human freedom.

We live our everyday existence on the assumption that natural laws operate in the world that these laws operate at many levels and allow us to predict the behaviours of the individuals at those different levels. If there were no natural laws then it would not be possible to control and understand our environment. We must include human beings amongst the objects in the world that obey natural laws. We can not avoid the social determinism in our day to day life.

Believers of free will think that the decisions we make are ours to make in the first place. We choose according to our will though there are pressures put upon us, from our peers, our upbringing, our circumstances, our society, contemporary era and so on, but ultimately the choice is ours. In this point they admit that apart our free will there is the pressures of society which is stronger than our will. So it's clear that an individual has the free will but it is within the edge of society. It can not cross the limitation of the laws of the society.

In conclusion, the real paradox of free will and determinism is that free will can exist only in a determined universe. It means to say that free will may exist within the outline of particular society. But the fact is that an individual has no free will because he lives in the society where he obliged to follow the rules and regulations of the given society and it is the society that is responsible for his behaviours. In order to exercise our free will, our actions must have the potential to affect the outcome of events. Our actions cannot affect an event outcome unless there is a cause-effect relationship. Cause-effect is determinism.

**Part III**  
**3. Textual Analysis of *Crime and Punishment***

**3.1 Social Determinism in *Crime and Punishment***

Society determines not only the social events but also the human wishes, behaviours, patterns and the way of life. Unknowingly and unwillingly we are moving on the road of the society. Though we think that we are free to choose the job as we like but the society is responsible for each and every event of the individual's life. We do the actions but within the outline of society. Similarly in the novel *Crime and Punishment*, Raskolnikov's crime of murder, Sonia's prostitution, Marmeladov's alcoholism, Dounia's enslavement and Katrina's insanity are nothing but the impact of their family background, environment, poverty, particular time and overall the determinism of contemporary society.

Rodion Romanovitch Raskolnikov, a young university student in St. Petersburg, who is deeply in debt and owes rent to his landlady. He has had to drop his studies at the university due to the lack of money. He is sickly dressed in rags, short on money. Therefore he used to go to an elderly woman, Alyona Ivanovna, a pawnbroker to pawn his remaining things. On the other hand he is also handsome, and intelligent. His articles about the social crimes are the evidences that he wants to uplift his society by awaking the people and informing them about social crimes.

Raskol is a Russian word that means schism or split. Indeed he is tormented and divided by economically and psychologically. His soul is cramped by the social condition because regarding Raskolnikov, Dostoevsky himself says, "Low ceiling and tiny room cramp the soul and the mind. I would not go out I wouldn't work, I wouldn't even eat, I just lay there doing nothing." (351). Raskolnikov is in such a condition that he is obliged to sell his father's stockings to the Alyona Ivnovna, a

pawnbroker, in low price and pleads with her only for the four rubles. In fact he could not sustain his own life properly in the midst of society.

One evening he goes to a pub, where he meets Marmeladov, an unemployed civil servant, who is a drunkard, has the same fate like of Raskolnikov. Marmeladov pours out his life story to him, telling about his consumptive wife Katerina Ivanovna, his three small children, and his oldest daughter Sofya Sonia, who has had to prostitute herself to earn money so that she can help to support her family. Marmeladov himself had recently acquired a position, but almost immediately lost it through his alcoholism. He has been away from home for five days, having stolen his salary money and spent it all on drink. The story of his family is more wretched than Raskolnikov himself.

In the midst of poverty stricken Raskolnikov receives a letter from his mother, Pulcheria Alexandrovna telling him that his sister Avdotya Romanovna Dounia, who has been a governess under the provision of Svidrigaylov, has had to endure the mistreatment and exploitation from Svidrigaylov and his family. It disturbs him very much. Since the death of his father, Raskolnikov's mother and sister are greatly dependent upon him to make something of himself. His mother says in a letter to him, "You are all we have, Dounia and I, you are everything to us, our only hope and trust" (25). In the same letter, his mother also informs him of his sister's plan to marry with Peter Petrovich Luzhin, a government official and also is moving to St. Petersburg. Though his mother puts a positive spin on everything, it is clear that Luzhin does not love Dounia and is not worthy of her, and that Dounia knows this but has resolved to marry him to materially benefit her family. She is going to marry him only for her brother's sake. "You are marrying Luzhin for my sake. But I won't accept the

sacrifice” (170). So it is the letter from his mother that motivates him "to act at once and with speed" (38).

He reflects bitterly, on reading his mother’s letter informing him of his sister, Dounia’s consent to marry Luzhin. Dounia, in fact, wants to get marry with Luzhin not because she loves him but because of money. So Raskolnikov wants to stop the marriage and decides to visit his friend Razumikhin, but along the way he gets tired and decides to return home, walks through the Hay Market, where he overhears a couple of street traders talking about Alyona Ivanovna, a greedy pawn broker and Lisaveta, her sister. They are talking how society would be better off if the old pawnbroker Alyona Ivanovna were dead. The student at the bar tells the young officer, “Kill her, take her money, on condition that you dedicate yourself with its help to the service of humanity and the common good: don’t you think that thousands of good deeds will wipe out one little, insignificant transgression? For one life taken, thousands saved from corruption and decay” (56).

Later, in the streets, Raskolnikov also hears that the pawnbroker will be alone in her home the next evening. The street traders also tell Lisaveta to return the following day at seven o’clock. Thus, Raskolnikov discovers that Alyona Ivanovna will be at home alone the following evening. So he plans a bold act: to kill a repulsive old pawnbroker, Alyona Ivanovna. Because her murder will accomplish two things to him: give him the money he needs and prove that he is the progressive man of the society. In this regard Dostoevsky writes:

A hundred thousand good deeds could be done and helped on that old woman’s money, which will be buried in a monastery! Hundreds, thousands perhaps, might he set on the right path; dozens of families saved from destitution, from ruin, from vice, from the Lock hospitals –

and all with her money. Kill her, take her money and with the help of it devote oneself to the service of humanity and the good of all. What do you think, would not one tiny crime be wiped out by thousands of good deeds? For one life thousands would be saved from corruption and decay. One death, and a hundred lives in exchange – its simple arithmetic! (59)

This kind of discussion about the pawnbroker was a shock to Raskolnikov. A connection suddenly appeared between the ideas he repeated to himself in his trance, and the real world. Another person proclaimed almost exactly what he has been telling himself for months. This idle talk at a restaurant was to exert a great influence on him. It was as though there had really been something preordained here. On the one hand he is poor and has needed money and on the other hand this statement adds fuel to his action. Moreover in the streets, Raskolnikov hears that the pawnbroker will be alone in her home in the next evening. He was acting passively, mechanically, without engagement of his will.

Raskolnikov goes to the home of the elderly woman the following evening, knocks the door and when her back is turned, he attacks her striking on the head with an axe. He takes her purse and keys but when he is looking into her trunk in the bedroom, her sister Lisaveta all of a sudden returns to the home. Raskolnikov gets confused and also murders Lisaveta accidentally. Then he escapes from the building, and returns to his room.

In fact his will does not appear to control his actions at that movement. He talks and acts like an automaton. The day before the murder, when Raskolnikov learned that the old moneylender would be entirely alone at home the next evening, he felt like a man sentenced to death. He thought of nothing, and indeed he was quite



incapable of thinking, but he suddenly felt with all his being that he no longer possessed any freedom of reasoning or of will, and that everything was suddenly and irrevocably settled, almost an automatic influence upon him. It was as though someone had taken him by the hand and drawn him after himself, blindly, irresistibly, with social force, and without any objections on his part. As though he had been caught in the cog of a wheel by the hem of his coat and was being drawn into it.

After the crime Raskolnikov develops a nervous delirium that makes him ill. He is summoned to the police station to sign a promissory note to pay the rent to his landlady. In the police station people are talking about the murder. During a conversation about the murders, Raskolnikov faints, and the police begin to suspect him. He returns to his room, takes the purse and earrings he has stolen from the woman he has murdered, and walks through the city. He buries the purse and stolen articles under a stone in a courtyard.

Another day he receives thirty-five roubles that his mother has sent him, and his friend Razumikhin uses some of the money to buy him new clothes. Luzhin visits him, and gets insulted. Raskolnikov resents Luzhin's condescending attitude toward Dounia.

The drunken Marmeladov is accidentally run over by a horse-drawn carriage. Raskolnikov is nearby, and brings him home, where Marmeladov, after begging forgiveness, dies in the arms of his daughter, Sonia. Raskolnikov takes the money which his mother has sent him, and gives it to Katrina for the funeral. His mother and his sister Dounia, arrive in St. Petersburg the same day Marmeladov dies. They have come to prepare for Dounia's wedding to the affluent but repulsive Luzhin. Dounia's former employer, Svidrigailov, a man who has tried to seduce her and is still eager to see her, also shows up at Raskolnikov's apartment. Raskolnikov feels increasingly

tormented, but he still wants to go on living. He resists the temptation to kill himself and end his troubles. Because Sonia Marmeladov is so forgiving and at the same time, guilty herself of immoral acts, he decides that she is the only one in whom he can confide. He can't ignore Porfiry Petrovich either, though, because he knows that the investigator suspects him.

A workman named Nikolay confesses to the murder of the elderly woman pawnbroker but Raskolnikov confesses to Sonia that he is actually the murderer, and tries to justify his crime by saying that an individual is helpless in front of the power of society. He said that he killed the old woman not because he was a professional killer but because he was trapped by the societal circumstances. Sonia tells him to confess and says that he must learn to accept suffering, and be redeemed by it.

Svidrigaylov is listening through the door, and hears Raskolnikov's confession. Svidrigaylov then uses the information to try to force Dounia to sleep with him. Dounia refuses, and Svidrigaylov later takes a revolver and shoots himself in the head.

Raskolnikov goes to the police station, and confesses to the murder. He is sentenced to prison in Siberia, for a term of only eight years, due to his temporary insanity at the time of the murder. Sonia follows him to Siberia. Dounia and Razumikhin get married. Raskolnikov's mother becomes mentally unbalanced, and dies. Raskolnikov still feels that his only wrong was not having committed his crime successfully

On the other hand Dostoevsky also portrays the horrible condition of the Marmeladov's family. Marmeladov's daughter Sofya Sonia, whose name comes from the Greek word for wisdom, is bound to keep prostitution for the betterment of the family. Katerina Ivanovna seems to have gone mad. Due to the lack of money she

forces her small children to sing and dance to sustain her family. At last she also dies in the street. Street is the place where the poor people's life began and ends.

In this situation, a dead end, from which even suicide provides a poor man with no solution, it often drives people to commit crimes, no matter whether it is moral or immoral. So Raskolnikov choose the same path because he has no option. He remembers "Do you understand , sir, do you understand what it means when you have absolutely nowhere to turn? Marmeladov's question came suddenly into his mind, for every man must have somewhere to turn" (41).

These words form the basic idea, the kernel of the whole novel one has absolutely nowhere to turn! No other work in world literature gives expression with such force to individual's dependency in a rapacious society. This dependency shapes the lives of Raskolnikov, Marmeladov, Katerina Ivanovna, Sonia and Dounia. It is the question of giving up life altogether, of giving up the right to love his sister and his mother, of accepting his sister's sacrifice, of trampling all his human sentiments underfoot, Luzhin's benefactions, becoming his confidant and making a career as a lawyer under his patronage; in other words he has to kill the human being within him.

Raskolnikov kills Alyona Ivanovna, a greedy woman, not because he is a professional killer but because poverty, social environment, particular time and situation force him. On the account of crime Dostoevsky says regarding Raskolnikov:

I am not wrong. I'll show you the pamphlets. Everything with them is the influence of environment and nothing else. If society is normally organized, all crime will cease at once. No, brother, you are wrong, environment accounts for a great deal in crime; I can assure you of that. A crime of that nature may be very well ascribed to the influence of environment. (219-20)

After the crime he does not feel sorry because he thinks that he does not kill a human being, but a louse one. He says, "I am to put my little brick into the happiness of all and my heart will be at peace" (234). "It all depends on the environment. It's all the environment and man himself is nothing" (312). Raskolnikov confesses with Sonia, his beloved that his sole purpose for killing the pawn broker was to acquire money, Because he was the only one to whom his mother and sister were centered. He wants the happiness of his family members but due to the lack of money he could not achieve it. On the motive of murder Dostoevsky writes regarding Raskolnikov:

All their hopes were centered on me. I was a student, but I couldn't keep myself at the university and was forced for a time to leave it. By that time my mother would be worn out with grief and anxiety and I could not succeed in keeping her in comfort, while my sister . . . well my sister might well have fared worse! And it's a hard thing to pass everything by all one's mother and decorously accept the insults inflicted on one's sister. Why should one? When one has buried them, to burden oneself with others wife and children and to leave them again without a farthing? So I resolved to gain possession of the old woman's money and to use it for my first years without worrying my mother, to keep myself at the university and for a little while after leaving it and to do this all on a broad, thorough scale, so as to build up a completely new career and enter upon a new life of independence . . . well . . . that's all. (350)

In this way, Raskolnikov does the crime but he himself is not responsible. It is rather the social circumstances that made him a criminal because an individual is in the grip of society. Though he also wants to do well like others. He wants to save his

sister from an unhappy marriage and his mother from sacrificing for him. He wants to help the miserable Marmeladov family. But he seems unable to motivate himself to work or to find a way to break out of the poverty that traps him and killing and robbing became an easy way.

### **3.1 The Place of Individual in Society**

Taking Napoleon Bonaparte, Ralph Waldo Emerson said, “My son cannot replace me. I could not replace myself. I am the creature of circumstances” (113).

A person lives in a material and spiritual world. He is connected with nature and the events of social life by innumerable material and spiritual threads. In this constant interaction between the individual and the society there is a meaning which is denoted by the comprehensive term life. The social effect of the individual's behaviour is determined to a great extent by his position in the structure of the social whole. The individual world is formed by the around, things, institutions and relationships within the frame of society. Allan Paton asserts, in his famous novel *Cry, The Beloved Country* regarding the relationship between an individual and society, “Society and environmental is the creator. Keep it, guard it, care for it, for it keeps men, guards men, cares for men. Destroy it and man is destroyed” (7). Human activity is motivated by needs which are the objectively determined forms of a person's dependence on the external world, his subjective expectations of that world, his lack of certain objects and conditions that are necessary for his normal activity, self-fulfillment and development.

Society is defined as a group of humans broadly distinguished from other groups by mutual interests, participation in characteristic relationships, shared institutions, and a common culture. It is composed of a number of unique individuals

with the help of natural laws. So it is impossible to isolate individual from the rules, regulations, values norms and conventions of the society.

An individual is guided entirely by the social norms, values and the pattern. The individual is a link in the chain of the generations. His affairs are regulated not only by himself, but also by the social standards, by the collective reason or mind. The true token of individuality is the degree to which a certain individual in certain specific historical conditions has absorbed the essence of the society in which he lives. In this regard Berger and Luckmann comment that society has the traditions that normalize the behaviours on individual. They say:

The social norms and tradition normalize people's behaviors imperceptibly and form a society called a symbolic universe which gives people a direction and lets individuals judge whether or not their behaviours are legal. The symbolic universe is a reference to people's actions, each individual accepts and follows the standards of the symbolic universes and identifies himself as belonging to one symbolic universe. This is tradition and it makes sense for each individual.

(Berger and Luckmann 94)

Berger and Luckmann discussed the social construction process of reality and pointed out that a society is both a subjective and objective reality and can be understood through reviewing the sustained procedure of the internalizing and externalizing that people go through after they are born. In this way, people form their subjective views and establish an inter-subjective world, which becomes a foundation of knowledge in everyday life.

Since the society exists before the birth of each individual, the social norms and tradition normalize people's behaviour imperceptibly and form a society called a

symbolic universe. The symbolic universe gives people a direction and lets individuals judge whether or not their behaviour is legal. The symbolic universe is a reference to people's actions and provides the chance for people to share with others the collective memories. Each individual accepts and follows the standards of the symbolic universes and identifies himself as belonging to one symbolic universe. This is the externalization process.

Concerning the internalization process of personal knowledge, they describe the process of each person's entering into school and having contact with others. It is the process of socialization. People learn from the environment and those whom they encounter, especially the significant others and establish their personal stock of knowledge. People continue correcting and re-establishing the meanings during the process. They further say:

Everyday life is controlled by social norms. Therefore, practical knowledge, for example, the knowledge of solving problems, occupies an important position in the personal stock of knowledge. Another part of the personal stock of knowledge is determined by the person's social situation. Because people live in the society, they must play roles according to the social norms. From the objective and habitual traditions, people extract and absorb rules which become part of their personal knowledge, thus causing them to behave according to social norms. (229)

It is sometimes said that society carries the individual as a river carries a boat. An individual does float with the river. Though the events of social life do not come about by themselves, they are made. The great and small paths of the laws of history are blazed by human effort and often at the expense of human blood. The laws of

history are not charted in advance by superhuman forces, they are made by people but within the periphery of the society, within the outline of particular era because time and circumstance are above the individual. It is the foundation where an individual finds his existence associated with the norms and values of society. In this regard Boris Bursov admits:

In a man no everything depends upon the man himself, upon his natural gifts. At different times the circumstances of upbringing and the environment play a different but always immense role in a man's destiny. In any era the era itself is the true master of peoples' destinies. No matter what gifts a man may possess, he is always the child of his age. (152)

Really circumstances may break a great man and crush what is truly great within him. It may also happen that genius quits the scene at the height of his powers.

Man is free not from nature, not from society and their laws, but within the framework provided by the operation of both the laws of nature and society. When they are known, they make a person's will relatively free. But they also determine its limits, the limits to the realization of goals that man sets himself. Free will is not self-will or arbitrariness. Society imposes limits on human desires and constitutes a regulative force which must play the same role for moral needs which the organism plays for physical needs. In this regard, Robert K. Merton, a sociologist comments "Social structures exert a definite pressure upon certain persons in the society to engage in nonconforming rather than conforming conduct" (186).

Freedom and liberty are not to be found in nature. In nature there is no phenomenon in which these terms could be meaningfully applied. Whatever man does, he can never free himself from the restraints of nature that imposes upon him. If



he wants to succeed in acting, he must submit unconditionally to the laws of nature. In the same token Ludwig von Mises argues that individual freedom is interconnected with the laws of nature and society. He says:

Freedom and liberty always refer to inter human relations. A man is free as far as he can live and get on without being at the mercy of arbitrary decisions on the part of other people. In the frame of society everybody depends upon his fellow citizens. Social man cannot become independent without forsaking all the advantages of social cooperation. (12)

In this way, there is a close relationship between an individual and society. One cannot separate himself from the grip of society. The individual floats in the social environment all his life. So what he does is directly related with society. Then I can claim that society determines the individual.

### **3.3 Poverty as a Chief Exponent of Social Determinism**

“Hunger destroys the soul of the people” (qtd. Gorki 151). Gorky further says in his novel *Mother*, “There is no road leading away from poverty; all roads lead to it and none out of it” (191).

Poverty as a social phenomenon determines the individual that is closely associated with crime. “Money is, of course, despotic power, and at the same time it is the greatest leveler, and that is its chief power. Money levels all inequality” (qtd. Bursov 167). Though most of the poor people are not criminals, and many criminals are not poor, but people from environments dominated by poverty are more likely to commit crimes and to be punished. Other social problems, such as mental illness, prostitution and alcoholism, are common among the poor, in part because they are causes as well as effects of poverty and often because there is little medical provision

for dealing effectively with them. Poverty tends to breed poverty. In some cases, the handicap of poverty is passed from one generation to another. In this regard V.

Yermilobv remarks "it would seem that all the grief and torment that rack mankind look out to the agonizing scenes of wretched poverty" (161).

Poverty is a state in which resources, usually material but sometimes cultural and moral are lacking. It refers to a state in which the individual lacks the resources necessary for subsistence. On the other words it is a condition in which a person or community is deprived of or lacks the essentials for a minimum standard of well being and life. It is the social relationships and need, including social exclusion, dependency, and the ability to participate in society. This would include education and information. Poverty is not only about having income below the line, but it is also about the inability to sustain a specified level of well-being. Poverty and social exclusion can affect all age and groups. It is multi-faceted and combating it requires a multi-policy response. Regarding poverty George Bernard Shaw, a socialist play wright asserts that it is the major factor that determines the life of people. He shows the importance of money in his preface to *Major Barbara* Shaw himself writes:

The universal regards for money is the one hope-full in our civilization, the one sound spot in our social conscience. Money is the most important thing in the world. It represents health, strength, honor, generosity and beauty as conspicuously and undeniably as the want of it represents illness, weakness, disgrace, meanness and ugliness. Not the least of its virtues is that it destroys base peoples as certainly as it fortifies and dignifies noble people. It is only when it is cheapened to worthlessness for some and made impossibly dear to others, that it becomes a curse. In short, it is a curse only in such foolish social

conditions that life itself is a curse. For the two things are separable: money is the counter that enables life to be disturbed socially: it is life as truly as sovereigns and bank notes are money.

Poverty is a curse, the bitterest of curses. The hell of which Russian people are most afraid is the hell of poverty; and this is true, not of Russian people alone, but the people of all over the civilized world, no matter what their nationality. It is to escape this hell that we strive and strain and struggle; and work on oftentimes in blind habit long after the necessity for work is gone. Poverty is the mother of ignorance, the breeder of crime. So Shaw concludes that poverty is the foundation of all crimes. In order to prove that he further says:

Poverty is the worst of crimes. All the other crimes are virtues beside it: all the other dishonours are chivalry itself by comparison. Poverty blights whole cities; spreads horrible pestilences; strikes dead the very souls of all who come within sight, sound, or smell of it. What you call crime is nothing: a murder here and a theft there, a blow now and a curse then: what do they matter? They are only the accidents and illnesses of life: there are not fifty genuine professional criminals in London. (776)

In Dostoevsky's *Crime and Punishment*, nearly every character becomes weighed down by the same oppressive force, which slowly deteriorates the social structure in St. Petersburg. Not only Raskolnikov, center character of the novel but also Sonia, Marmeladova, Katrina and other so many characters have the same fate. Crushed by poverty, Raskolnikov has to leave the university because he cannot afford to pay the fees. His mother and sister are faced with starvation, so that the only prospect awaiting his sister Dounia is the fate of Sonia Marmeladova, a street walker

forced to follow her miserable trade so as to support her consumptive mother and her little sisters. To save her beloved brother, Dounia consents to make the same sacrifice as Sonia. The only difference is that she agrees to marry Luzin, whom she abhors. Luzhin is a classical figure of a bourgeois man of business, scoundrel, self-centered and vulgar tyrant, climber, miser and coward who has slandered the defenseless Sonia. Dounia and her mother are prepared to turn a blind eye to all the despicable qualities in this man, so as to enable Raskolnikov to take his degree.

The novel is set in Haymarket Square, a slum section of St. Petersburg notorious for its intolerable living conditions. Because Dostoevsky knew the city so well, and had lived in the kinds of tenement rooms he describes, Dostoevsky is very specific about the sights and smells of his characters experience. By choosing to set the novel in the summer, when the drunken crowds filled the streets and the air reeked, Dostoevsky was able to create the feelings of physical repulsion brought on by an oppressive environment. By mentioning particular street names and tracing the routes of the characters, he was emphasizing the social power on individual.

Dostoevsky describes St. Petersburg as a dirty and crowded city. In the city of Petersburg, young women prostitute themselves to make money for their destitute families. Additionally, random drunks can be seen sprawled out all over the city during broad daylight. It is the city of nothing but poverty and its consequences. The arena is full of slums, revolutionary students and petty titular councilors. It is a symbol of the incompatibility of logical planning with humankind's natural sensibilities. The city did not grow randomly or organically, but entirely by Tsarist decree. Nonetheless, it is a dank and depressing place to live, at least for those in the vicinity of Haymarket Square, where the story takes place. Joseph Frank, Dostoevsky's biographer, says:

Dostoevsky does everything in his considerable artistic powers to accentuate the squalor and human wretchedness that pass before Raskolnikov's eyes. And within the wretchedness and squalor of Dostoevsky's Petersburg, one location is most central to Crime and Punishment: flat 14 at 9 Srednaya Meshchanskaya Street, Raskolnikov's room. (104)

Raskolnikov, protagonist of the novel, lives in a tiny cup board like room on the garret of a run-down apartment building in St. Petersburg. The room is as shabby as it is small not a seemingly likely place for posing intellectual questions of great significance. His room becomes a nexus for the story. It is there Raskolnikov cowers, broods and slips into depraved and fitful slumber. Though he is a university student but hopelessly in debt to his landlady, and avoided meeting with her. His rented room is the image of his poor condition. Dostoevsky describes his room like this:

He gazed round his little room with loathing. It was a tiny little cubby-hole of a place, no more than six paces long, and so low that anybody of even a little more than average height felt uncomfortable in it, fearful that at any moment he might bump his head against the ceiling. The yellowish dusty wall-paper peeling off the walls gave it a wretchedly shabby appearance, and the furniture was in keeping; there were three rickety chairs and a stained deal table in a corner, holding a few books and papers so covered with dust that it was plain that they had not been touched for a long time; and lastly there was a large and clumsy sofa, taking up almost the whole of one wall and half the width of the room, and with a print cover now old and worn into holes. This served Raskolnikov as a bed. (23)

In *Crime and Punishment*, Dostoevsky first shows the clear image of a poverty stricken man who is deprived from all basic necessities like fooding, clothing and renting. Dostoevsky's explains Raskolnikov's physical appearance. He says:

In July a young man came out of the garret in which he lodged in S. place. His garret was under the roof of a high five –storeyed house, and was more like a cupboard than a room. He had become so completely absorbed in himself and isolated from his fellows that he dreaded meeting not only his landlady but anyone at all. He was crushed by poverty. He was very weak; for two days he had scarcely tasted food. He was so badly dressed that even a man to shabbiness would have been ashamed to be seen in the street in such rags. (3-4)

These lines clearly illustrate the pathetic condition of Raskolnikov, the protagonist of the novel. His physical appearance, his mental trauma and the surrounding are the image of his real existence. Dostoevsky further describes the poor condition of Raskolnikov. He says:

It had a poverty-stricken appearance, with its dusty yellow paper peeling off the walls, and it was so low-pitched that a man of more than average height was ill at ease in it and felt every moment that he would knock his head against the ceiling. The furniture was in keeping with the room: there were three old chairs, rather rickety; a painted table in the corner on which lay a few manuscripts and books. A big, clumsy sofa occupied almost the whole of one wall and half the floor space of the room: it was once covered with chintz, but was now in rags and served Raskolnikov as a bed. (24)

So, in *Crime and Punishment* the strong reason that Raskolnikov murders the pawnbroker is nothing but for money. Raskolnikov states in his confession to Sonya, "It was to rob her" (348). In fact he needed the money to lift him out of his inhuman poverty and to rescue his sister from the drooling of that lecherous landlord. It was a reasonable thing to do. The old woman had money, she was cruel to those around her, her life was worthless and she was an insect, a noxious creature, completely repulsive. No one would miss her, therefore he killed her. His need was superior then that of the Alyona Ivanovna.

It is obvious that he needed money for school. Also, if he had the money to put himself through school, his mother would not have to scrimp and borrow from others to help her son. Geoffrey Kabat says, "Murder is an attempt to annihilate a symbol of the oppressive forces of a society in which money gives one power over other people's lives and in which lack of money means dependence on others" (124). Raskolnikov, frustrated, humiliated, and embittered by his poverty, saw no recourse but murder to enable him to survive in a society that was so lacking in its duty to the individual and so indifferent to his needs.

Like wise the life of Marmeladov's family also faces the same fate of poverty. Father Marmeladov, who, in a fit of drunkenness, has abandoned his job and proceeded on a five-day drinking binge, afraid to return home to his family. He tells Raskolnikov about his sickly wife, Katerina Ivanovna and his daughter, Sonia who has been forced into prostitution to support the family. Dostoevsky in this regard says:

Well, when one has no alternative, there is nowhere else one can go!  
For every man must have some where to go. Since there are times  
when one absolutely must go somewhere! When my own daughter first  
went out with a yellow ticket. Honoured sir, honoured sir, you know

every man ought to have at least one place where people feel for him!!

(13-14)

Sonia has become a prostitute because her father is a drunk, unable to support his family. But, miraculously, she seems untouched by her experience, although she acknowledges the brutal truth that life on the street has only three possible outcomes: suicide, madness, or corruption but apart that she has no alternative. He befriends her family at the time of her father's death, and he defends her against a false charge of theft.

Marmeladov family is the another crystal example of poverty crushing, who is in more worse situation than Raskolnikov's family. The father Semyon Marmeladov, a public official who has a drinking problem. He is such an alcoholic that he cannot support his family at all. He is fully aware that he has ruined the lives of himself and his family with his bad habit. He run down by a horse and carriage while walking around town later he ends up dying. The reader should take into account that he died by the hands of a wealthy person or a noble person and in a time when people of social rank thought poor people were not worthy enough to live and it was perfectly alright to hit a poor person. In addition, his wife Katerina has consumption, bloody cheeks and a persistent bloody cough. She is slowly deteriorating, mentally and physically. Later due to her lack of money she forces her children to dance in the streets, and beg for money and at last she dies in the street. Dostoevsky asserts:

She keeps beating the children and they are all crying. She is teaching Lida to sing "My Village", the boy to dance, Polenka the same. She is tearing up all the clothes, and making them little caps like actors; she means to carry a tin basin and make it tinkle, instead of music. . . She



won't listen to anything . . . Imagine the state of things! It's beyond anything! (357)

Sonia, their daughter, depicts how all women are treated in Russia in nineteenth century. She devotes all her time to her family even if she has to prostitute herself in order to keep her family alive, her father steals from her for his alcohol, and yet she continues to support her mother and father. The best example for Raskolnikov being better off than the Marmelov's, is evident when he donates his last bit of money to their family.

Aside from the victims of poverty there lurk people who decide to take immediate advantage of any poor people. Three characters that take advantage of poor people include Alyona Ivanova, Pyotr Luzhin, and Arkady Svidrigailov. A major abuser, Alyona Ivanova, of the poor class of people. She employs herself as a pawnbroker and she gives very little money for people's family heirlooms just so they can get through the next day. In addition she uses her simple sister Lizaveta by making her somewhat of a slave. Pyotr Luzhin is a stingy, self-absorbed, narrow-minded person. Who wishes to marry a beautiful, intelligent, poor girl like Dounia so that she will owe him for life. Svidrigailov who has potentially killed his wife, has raped a dumb girl and he attempted to rape Dounia and turn in Raskolnikov. We know each of these people is stopped before they can complete more damage. Raskolnikov murdered Alyona Ivanova ending her abuse of impoverish people. Additionally, Dounia fought with both Luzhin and Svidrigailov. Dostoyevsky uses these characters as a antagonists and opposes of societies natural order.

In the end society has no cure for the problems and injustices that it faces, but with the imprisonment of Raskolnikov, readers can see a beam of light which shines a

new day on the social ills in Russia. More importantly it serves to show redemption will come after the crime produced by the poverty in St. Petersburg.

In this way, society determines the behaviours of individual. Here in the novel *Crime and Punishment* Raskolnikov's criminal act is totally determined by the social factor such as his poverty, family background, contemporary social condition and the like. Not only Raskolnikov but almost all characters like Sonia, Marmeladov, Dounia and Katrina are bounded by the same string. Poverty is the main cause of all crimes. It affects people entirely. Taking poverty, Allan Paton in his novel *Cry, The Beloved Country*, Says:

Our natives today produce criminals and prostitutes and drunkards, not because it is their nature to do so, but because their simple system of order and tradition and convention has been destroyed. It was destroyed by the impact of our own civilization. Our civilization has therefore an inescapable duty to set up another system of order and tradition and convention. (127)

So the misdeeds of any individual are not their own choices but our system or our civilization is itself responsible for the crimes of an individual. By emphasizing the depersonalization Raskolnikov experiences during the murder, the fact that he was scarcely aware of himself and acted almost mechanically. So I conclude that some social force of nature, and not the person Raskolnikov, is to blame for the death of the usurer.

### **3.4 Critical Responses on the Novel *Crime and Punishment***

Dostoesky, who is one of the dominant figures in world literature, exploited universal themes such as poverty, crimes, pain, suffering, morality, religion and social realism in his writings. As a realist, he sought to reveal the deep darkness and

constant struggle of good and evil in the society. He was also impressed by Russian writers such as Gogol, Belinsky, Puskin and others who advocated socialist realism in Russia. *Crime and Punishment* is a popular novel that has received at the center of the critical interest and has received much critical appraisals since its first publication in 1866. Dostoevsky's writing in *Crime and Punishment* cannot be confined to any particular style. Its language, idea, theme and other features in the presentation have made it distinct from other novels. He gained much more popularity through his writings, especially because of *Crime and Punishment*, which is mainly about the social determinism. Almost all characters are highly influenced by the society.

*Crime and Punishment* has been quite popular since its publication. It has been staged as a play with the name *Petersburg Dreams* and has even been developed in a film. The confession of crime that Raskolnikov does is said to be a man's return to true life. It is a kind of salvation in religious sense. His feeling of guilt depicts the moral aspect of mankind that lacked in individuals like Raskolnikov who tried to revolt against God's authority. For Lev Kuldzaov, the director of the film, the story of Raskolnikov is like the story of a man who has tried to overstep the border of the permissible to assert his human personality. Her further comments at the conclusion of the novel in these lines, "In our adaptation we have refrained from screening the epilogue in which Dostoevsky, in a highly expressed form, summed up the conclusions of his long novel affirming the possibility of a man's return to true life" (156). Georgi Taratorkin, who plays the role of Raskolnikov in the film *Crime and Punishment*, is of the same view. For him "Punishment is a link in the chain of return to the good" (160).

Dostoevsky's presentation of Raskolnikov who holds the belief of superman in *Crime and Punishment* reminds us of the Nietzschean belief in world literature, the

concept of separatedness, alienation, loneliness of humans from the world that Dostoevsky brought in the character of Raskolnikov is the outcome of his prison experience in his fifties. In this connection, another critic, Belkin, writes, “He was tormented by the sense of separateness, of disunity with making, which he felt immediately after committing the crime” (21). His central character, Raskolnikov wanted happiness, especially about his family but rather than getting the real joy, this person is stricken by poverty and feels lonely and suffers.

The critical responses on *Crime and Punishment* present different critics’ views regarding its theme and technique. Various critics of the novel in different periods of time have commented from different perspectives.

From the beginning of his literary career, Dostoevsky was much praised for his psychological insight into the human mind. He has presented social contractions of life in his novels. His liberal humanitarian ideas are contradictory to his revolutionary and reactionary world view. Yuri Olesha comments, “In Dostoevsky’s fiction, the objective truth of life, the vital logic of the development of reality is at war with false abstract schemata” (125).

Despair and soreness of Dostoevsky’s characters remind us of the autocratic Tsarist regime under which Dostoevsky was brought up and began his literary pursuit. The domination of the landlords on the serfs, on the working class by industrialists was sharply criticized in some of his novels. In the novel *Crime and Punishment*, the pawn broker woman and Luzhin, one of the male characters in the novel represent bourgeois characteristics whereas Sonia, Raskolnikov, his sister Dounia and other characters represent the proletariat. V. Yermilov, a contemporary critic, in this connection views:

The ruthless exploitation of the peasantry by the landowners with the resultant growth of the peasant movement, the sharpening of the class struggle, the crying need of the abolition of serfdom and the development of social consciousness and revolutionary thought – all these exerted a powerful influence on the young Dostoevsky, who had a keen perception of the general situation and breathed the air of all times, such things found full expression in his works of the period. (19)

Yermilov further asserts about the belief that society was responsible for such crimes. He says, “Raskolnikov fills the air of bourgeois society, and the author stresses that such ideas and moods are characteristics of the atmosphere of the time the novel was set in” (171). Among the 20<sup>th</sup> century critics, J. M. Murry calls Dostoevsky a moralist, he says, “Dostoevsky can point the moral in the imperishable stuff of humanity, he can show the very pulses of the heart which drives the murderer to the stool of repentance: (33). Dostoevsky presents Raskolnikov so artistically that readers have an inexpressible sympathy of watching the behaviour that is guided by the norms, values and pattern of society.

In the series of the comment on the hero’s moral loss and struggle between vice and virtue in his dualistic heart and his repentance over the sin he committed, a critic, J. M. Murry writes:

The hero is one of them, a profoundly human, suffering nihilist in whose soul life and theory conflict. On one level, in fact, the work is a social novel, a satirical debunking of radical youth preaching Chevnyshevsky’s doctrine of revolutionary democracy. But the novel’s focus concerns Raskolnikov’s tormented struggle between good and evil. (27)

Murry, in the same context of conflict between Raskolnikov's reason and the morality in his mind argues further:

Although motivation for the murder is ambiguous, the novel's central idea is unmistakable: reason cannot take the place of the living process of life. For Raskolnikov dialectics had taken the place of life. In prison, his satanic pride which had led him to violate the moral law, gives way to the realization that happiness cannot be achieved by a reasoned plan of existence but must be earned by suffering. (27)

The modern critics on *Crime and Punishment* evaluate the novel as an ethical and moral lesson to the world of amoral and sinners. The self-punishment of Raskolnikov is certainly a moral code for all immoral. Dostoevsky creates the use of simple arithmetic in the case of Raskolnikov's plan to kill a woman usurer. But his protagonist could not stand on his own because his so-called rational principle which violated the God's attributions of holiness, love and truth goes completely wrong. Morally Raskolnikov felt guilty and confessed his crime ultimately. Savva Danglov quotes Dostoevsky from his notebooks, where he talks about moral thus, "The best people become known for their superior moral qualities and superior moral influence" (78)

Although this novel *Crime and Punishment* has been viewed from different perspectives, but this text very strongly manifests the social determinism on individual.

## Part IV

### Conclusion

#### 4.1 Individual's Life: A Consequence of Social Determinism

The above discussion regarding the social determinism on individual's life in Dostoevsky's *Crime and Punishment* fully justifies the individual's relevance to society. The various social laws and situations depicted in it have close relation to reality as well. The contemporary social background of nineteenth century Russia, family environment of the characters and economic problems among the people raised by Dostoevsky are the real problems faced by all the people in the world, let alone Russia.

The extreme believer of social realism, Dostoevsky has the notion and deep conviction that every one on this earth is influenced by the social reality because society is the foundation of all kinds of individual's good and bad deeds. We cannot imagine our existence beyond the society. Moreover, Dostoevsky agrees with the view that poverty, family environment, contemporary situation can define the individual on its own way. An individual can not escape from the society whether it is for or against to him, one has to face it. Dostoevskian conviction that social determinism on individual is inevitable.

Dostoevsky's *Crime and Punishment* effectively portrays the dreadful condition of an individual in the society. It is the story about how an individual's life is limited within the surrounding of the society. A person's wishes, behaviours and even his actions are determined by the norms, values, rules and regulations of the society that he lives.

Raskolnikov, the protagonist of the novel *Crime and Punishment*, is also influenced by the society. His poverty, family background and the situation are

horrible which he could not alter till his life. Raskolnikov is only a beam of his family who has the huge burden to give the direction of his family member, especially after his father's death. His mother and sister are waiting him for their bright future. But for Raskolnikov the atmosphere is stifling to suffocation in Petersburg. The words spoken by Marmeladov in the scene in which Raskolnikov first meets him in tavern form the keynote of the whole book, "A man has absolutely nowhere to turn to!" (15).

Marmeladov's children are starving at home and Katernia is sick and after the death of her husband, Marmeladov she is driven out of her senses by insult and humiliation. She arranges a kind of poverty parade in the streets of the capital. Her children sing and dance in the street to amuse the crowd just for living. Sonia, on the other hand, is the last option to support the family but she knows that a poor and respectable girl can not earn much by honest work therefore she is obliged to keep the prostitution. Each word spoken by the unfortunate father in the tavern cannot but evoke a response in Raskolnikov's heart. He might well have asked, with his own sister in mind, and if Sonia has been injured by Klopstock, his sister, Dounia has been injured by men like Svidrigailov.

Though we cannot justify the death but behind every event there are some reasons. Raskolnikov suffers from all the material, family and social happiness. Though he tries his best to achieve the social rank but all his proper ways are blocked. He could not continue his study in the university, his sister is exploited physically and mentally from the hands of rich men in the village, he is in debt and has no money to pay his rent and has no occupation too. Along this he has to pawn his father and sister's valuable things just for living. In this horrible situation no one can think a moral subject. Obviously, one is obliged to choose a short cut way, which is easy to take. So he also chooses an easy way to kill the pawn broker for money and rob her.



In this way Raskolnikov's crime, Sonia's prostitution, Svidrigailov's suicide case, Katernia's madness and Maremeladov's death are the fact that individual's life is in the hand of society because an individual can have no religion, no faith and no morality so long as he/she is poor. Poverty keeps the soul to temptation and is, therefore, the greatest of crimes, because it is the fountain of all bad deeds.

## Works Cited

- Audi, Robert. Ed. *The Cambridge Dictionary of Philosophy*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Dostoevsky's Dialogue*. SL. No. 2 (275), Writers' Union of the USSR, 1971.118-121.
- Belkin, A. *An Introduction: Dostoevsky and His Short Stories*. Trans. Julius Katzer. Moscow: Progress Publishing House, 1852.
- Berger, P.L. and Luckmann, T. *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. New York: Anchor Books, 1966.
- Blamires, Harry. *A Critical History of Literary Criticism*. London: Macmillan Press, 1991.
- Bursov, Boris. *Dostoevsky as a Person*. S. No. 9 (282), Writer's Union of the USSR, 1971. 152-53
- Chesterton, G. K. *George Bernard Shaw*. London: Bodley Head, 1909.
- Cowie, A. P. Ed. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Encyclopedic Dictionary*. Second ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Davis, Robert Con and Ronald Schleifer. *Contemporary Literary Criticism: Literary and Cultural Studies*. London: Longman Inc, 1989.
- Descartes, Rene. *The Philosophical Writings of Descartes*, Vol. I-III, Trans by Cottingham, J., Stoothoff, R., & Murdoch, D. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- Dostoevsky Fyodor. *Crime and Punishment*. Trans. Constance Garnett. Crib Street: Wordsworth Classics, 2000.
- Emerson, Ralph Waldo. *Representative Men*. London: Bell and Daldy, 1870.
- Fanger, Donald. *Dostoevsky and Romantic Realism*. Chicago and London: University

- of Chicago Press, 1965.
- Frank, Joseph. *Dostoevsky: The Miraculous Years*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995.
- Gaarder, Jostein. *Sophie's World*. New York: Berkley Books, 1996.
- Gorky, Maxim. *Mother*. New Delhi: Adarsh Books 2005.
- History of the USSR*. Part I. Trans. George H. Hanna. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1977.
- Hobson, Archie. Ed. *The Oxford Dictionary of Difficult Words*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Hume, David. *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 1977.
- Illustrated History of USSR*. Moscow: Noveski Press, Regency Publishing House, 1977.
- Inwagen, Peter van. *An Essay on Free Will*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983.
- Jones, John. *Dostoevsky*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983.
- Kabat, Geoffrey. *Ideology and Imagination*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1978.
- Kant, Immanuel. *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*. Trans H. J. Paton, New York: Prentice Hall, 1964.
- Kaushik, Basu. *Prelude to Political Economy: a Study of the social and Political Foundations of Economics*. Great Clarendon Street: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Kulidzhanov, Lev. *Crime and Punishment*. SL. No. 2 (275). Moscow: Writers Union of the USSR, 1971. 135-157
- Laplace, Pierre Simon. *Theory Analysis and Probabilities*. Third ed. Paris: Prentice

- Hall, 1820.
- Macquarrie, John. *Existentialism*. New York: Penguin Books Publication 1973.
- Mandel, Ernest. "Why I am a Marxist." Ed. Gilbert Achcar. London: University of Calgary Press, 1999. 232-259.
- Marx, Karl. "German Ideology." *Critical Theory Since 1965*. Ed. Hazard Adams and Leary Searle. Tallahassee Florida Street: University Press, 1986. 625-27.
- . *Critique of Political Economy*. Ed. Paul Mattick, Chicago: Merlin Press, 1978.
- Masaryk, Thomas Garrigue. *The Spirit of Russia: Studies in History, Literature and Philosophy*. Trans. Eden and Cedar Paul. London: George Allen and Unwin Press, 1955.
- Merton, Robert K. *Social Theory and Social Structure*. New York: The Free Press, 1968
- Mises, Von Ludwig. *Treatise on Social and Economic Evolution*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957.
- Murry, J. M. *Feodor Dostoevsky: A Critical Study*. Boston: Fontana Press, 1924.
- Olesha, Yuri. *Soviet Authors on Dostoevsky*. Moscow: Writers Union of the USSR, 1971.
- Paton, Allan. *Cry, The Beloved country*. London: Penguin Books Publication, 1987.
- Sartre, John Paul. *Being and Nothingness*. New York: Washington Square Press, 1956.
- Schmidt, S, et al. *A Short History of the USSR*. Trans. George H. Hanna. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1984.
- Schumacher, E. F. *Small is Beautiful*. London: Vintage Random House, 1993.
- Selden, Raman. *A Reader's Guide to Contemporary Literary Theory*. London: Harvester, 1989

Shaw, George Bernard. "Major Barbara." *The Bedford Introduction to Drama*. Ed.

Lee A. Jacobus. Boston: St. Martin's Press, 1993. 776 - 791

Simpson, J. A. and Weiner, S. C. *The Oxford English Dictionary*. Second ed. Vol. IV,

Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.

Slaughter, Cliff. *Marxism, Ideology and Literature*. London and Basinstoke:

Macmillan Press, 1929.

*The New Encyclopedia Britannica*. Fifteenth Ed. Vol. III, London: William Benton

Publisher, 1983.

Yermilov, V. *Fyodor Dostoevsky*. Trans. J. Katzer. Moscow: Foreign Language

Publishing House, 1968.