

## I. Introduction

Class consciousness is a weapon for social revolution. It makes people revolt against oppressive socio-economic system. It rejects exploitation, hierarchy and ideologies which have been rooted for a long time. Economic condition is a main cause that creates disorder and class division in the society. It pushes up proletarians to do progressive works to destroy class system in society. This study applies Ideology and class consciousness in reading Dostoevsky's *Crime and Punishment* and its characters protesting against unjust social economic system. They reject oppressive ideological apparatuses of cruel Tsarist Russia. The protagonist, Raskolnikov, rejects capitalistic ideology and rebels affirming Marxist ideology. He protests for existing socio-economic system, poverty, religion, law, hierarchy, exploitation and insulting over poor people. His attempts are for betterment of society. Class conflict is necessary for better society that is free of oppression. His consciousness grows for struggling against unjust society. Social inequality pushes Raskolnikov to murder the pawnbroker woman. He resists against economic exploitation. It is necessary for to him murder to fulfill materially.

Other proletarian characters Sonia, Dounia and Marmeladov are trapped in bourgeois system. They don't get freedom in it. Sonia engages in prostitution that is a compulsion to her. She saves her life from prostitution that is certain in classed society. Marmeladov faces death within the mechanism of the capitalistic society. These characters have been victims under capitalistic economic and social system. Luzhin, pawn broker woman and Svidrigailov exploit poor people. They don't want resistance from lower class people. They want to continue existing social and economic condition but proletarians characters want to change existing system so that there is class struggle in the society

This research studies ideology and class consciousness for depicting socio-economic state of Tsarist Russia through *Crime and Punishment*. Class conflict, poverty, class consciousness and resistance will be dealt in this research paper. This chapter will proceed with a general introduction to the writer and novel and critical comments on the novel. The second chapter elaborates the methodology employed in this study ideology and class consciousness of Lukacs. The third chapter presents a detail textual analysis with textual citations so as to expose how the novel documents the instances of domination of ideology and class consciousness up on proletarians who were living under classed Russian Tsarist system and their resistance in reading *Crime and Punishment*. It proceeds with the analysis of socio- economic status, class consciousness materialism, utopian concept, poverty, exploitation and resistance. The final chapter concludes the study with a brief recounting of the work.

Fyodor Mikhailovitch Dostoevsky (1821-1881) was the one of the greatest writer of Russia. He was born in Moscow. He analyzed Micro aspect of human life and put deep philosophical insights in his novels. During the period when Dostoevsky was receiving his education and establishing his literary career (1830 to 1860s), Russia was stirred by intense intellectual debate. The small class of the educated people thought that major changes were needed for better society. Backward country was to be addressed its social problems and found its way successfully in the world. His reflected viewpoint rejected all the traditional conventions of society of Russia.

During 1860s and 70s, his great novels were published. *The House of the Dead* (1860–61) a work of fiction, which is based on his prison experiences, is called his autobiography. His later novels are more popular than the earlier ones. He wrote *Crime and Punishment* in 1866 at a time of financial commitment to his debtors after the death of his brother. It was highly praised from different point of view. His other

successful novels are *The Idiot* (1868), *The Devils* (1872), *A Raw Youth* (1875) and *Brother Karamazov* (1880).

*Crime and Punishment* was first published in the conservative journal "The Russian Messenger", appearing in twelve monthly installments in 1866. It shows poverty, class conflict, and plight of proletariats and power of lower class people through the action of protagonist, Raskolnikov. Economic condition makes Raskolnikov struggle for bourgeois society. He shows resistance against bourgeois society. He breaks laws bourgeois and transgresses them and makes his own He doesn't fear his action and its consequences. He overcomes them and obtains salvation from bourgeois trap. Sonia and Dounia are other characters tortured by bourgeois ideology. Sonia is engaged in prostitution to support her family. Dounia is exploited by Luzhin and Svidrigailov. Both girls try to resist the upper class with the help of Raskolnikov. Through Marxist ideology proletarians try to resist against capitalist exploitation.

Dostoevsky has faith on Marxism. He believes that there is a class division which brings inhumanity in the society .Real world is constituted by class conflict, economic and social contradictions and alienation of the individual under capitalism. Raskolnikov is alienated from the society by economic cause. This alienation pushes him murder of pawnbroker woman .He kills her to save his sister Dounia from marrying just to provide money for him. Class consciousness of Raskolnikov is directly, repeatedly and extensively explored through out the novel.

*Crime and Punishment* has received much critical responses since its first publication in 1866. Its language, idea, theme and other features have made it distinct literary work. Talking about Dostoevsky's language and technique, Mikhail Bakthin argues, "Dostoevsky institutes a new genre, the Polyphonic novel, which is

characterized by the multiplicity of voices present in it, none of which are subjected to the authoritarian control of the writer himself"(22). Other critic David Forgacs quotes about Dostoevsky's protesting nature in the society. He says "Dostoevsky like Goethe's Prometheus, creates not voiceless slaves (as does Zeus), but rather free people who are capable of standing beside their creator, of disagreeing with him and even of rebelling against him" (195).

Dostoevsky was deeply interested in economic condition. He presents his hero tragically suffering in his harsh economic situation. His hero searches for freedom from debased condition. Despair and soreness of Dostoevsky's characters remind us of the autocratic Tsarist regime under which Dostoevsky was brought up and begun his literary pursuit. The domination of the landlords on the serfs was sharply criticized in this novel. In the novel, the pawn broker woman, Luzuhin and Svdrigailov are represented bourgeois exploitative characteristics where as Sonia, Raskolnikov, his sister Dounia and other characters represented as suppressed proletarians.

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 again asserts about the belief that society was responsible for crimes. He says, "Raskolnikov felt air of bourgeois society, and the author stressed that such

ideas and moods are characteristics of the atmosphere of the time the novel was set in" (171).

Raskolnikov murdering of pawnbroker woman is economic cause.

Dostoevsky's hero Raskolnikov resists for social inequality. His murdering of the old pawnbroker is the result of his dire poverty and that, in fact, Raskolnikov's position in society left him no alternative but murder and robbery if he has to keep body and soul together, and eventually realize his tremendous natural abilities. The novel is an expose of the evil system which forced upon so brilliant a person as Raskolnikov the choice between crime and death by starvation.

Marxist critic Lukacs supports Dostoevsky's works. Lukacs says,

"Dostoevsky creates social reality in his novel, his views of the nature of social connections inevitably changes with it"(86). Dostoevsky presents root of society.

Talking about feature of Dostoevsky's writing Lukacs again says:

Dostoevsky remained in the last analysis and individualist. He could surmount the narrow limitations of the isolated self. He fathomed, dissected and illuminated this as nobody else, but he always adhered to man as an individual, with examining the social roots of man's being and consciousness. He shows the position occupied by his characters in terms of social class. (50)

Thus, this novel has drawn attention of many critics who have interpreted novel focusing on different themes like exploitation, freedom of peasant, class struggle, and social realism, rebel of proletariats, dark human sprits, poverty, and class consciousness. However, studying the text from ideology and class consciousness will help a better understanding of socio-economic reality of the proletariats under Tsarist system.

## II. Ideology

### Ideology in Marxism

The term ideology has a whole range of meanings. It is traced through by divergent histories. It is defined as a body of ideas characteristic of a particular social group, ideas or false ideas, which help to legitimate a dominant political power; as forms of thought motivated by social interests; as socially necessary illusion. Some later definitions of Ideology see it as a form of discourse related with power, identity, and meaning in social life. It is defined as a process of production of meanings, signs and values in social life.

Ideology was not much discussed by Marx and Engels after the *German Ideology*, which they wrote jointly from 1845-46, but it has become a key concept in Marxist criticism of literature and the other arts. Ideology is used in a variety of non Marxist ways. It is any set of political ideas that are applied rigorously, to a neutral name for ways of perceiving and thinking which are specific to individual's race, or sex, or education, or ethnic group. In its distinctively Marxist use, the reigning Ideology in any era is conceived to be, ultimately, the product of its economic structural, the resulting class-relations and class-interest. In a famed architectural metaphor Marx says, " Ideology as a superstructure of which the concurrent socioeconomic system is the base " (18). Engels described, "Ideology as a false consciousness"(12).

Many later Marxists consider it to be constituted largely by unconscious prepossessions that are illusory. Capitalist economic organization that emerged during the eighteenth century and reigning ideology incorporates the interests of the dominate and exploitative class bourgeois, who are the owners of the means of

production and distribution, as opposed to the proletariat, or wage earning working class. This ideology has the hidden function of legitimizing and maintaining the position, power, and economic interests of the ruling class. Bourgeois ideology is regarded as both producing and permeating the social and cultural institutions and practices of the present era including religion, morality, philosophy, politics, and the legal system, as well as literature and the other arts. Marxist critique Terry Eagleton has presented ideology as:

The process of production of meanings, signs and values in social life, a body of ideas characteristic of a particular social group or class, ideas which help to legitimate a dominant political power, false ideas which help to legitimate a dominant political power, action-oriented sets of beliefs, the indispensable medium in which individuals live out their relations to a social structure and the process whereby social life is converted to a natural reality. (qtd.in Eagleton1-2)

Ideology is any set of beliefs motivated by social interests, and it cannot simply signify the dominant form of thought in a society. Ideology is both illusion and the medium in which social actors make sense of their world, and it tells us something rather depressing modes of sense-making. It is part of what we mean by claiming that human beings are somewhat rational that we would be puzzled to encounter someone who held conviction which they acknowledged to be illusory.

One central lineage, from Hegel and Marx to George Lukacs and some later Marxist thinkers, has been much preoccupied with ideas of true and false cognition, with ideology as illusion distortion and mystification; whereas an alternative tradition of thought has been less epistemological than sociological, concerned more with the function of ideas within social life than with their reality or unreality. The opposite of

ideology would be less absolute truth than empirical or pragmatic. Other great Philosopher Martin Heidegger links ideology with pre understanding. He says, "Ideology is pre-understanding"(qtd. in Eagleton 17).

American political theorist Edward Shils mixes ideology with resistance to innovation. He defines, "ideology of an explicit, closed, resistant to innovation promulgated with a great deal of affectivity and require total adherence from their devotees"(qtd. in Eagleton 11). Other critic Alvin Gouldner thinks that ideology is doctrine that links with consciousness. He sardonically encapsulates ambivalences, "Ideology is the mind-inflaming realm of the doctrinaire, the dogmatic, the impassioned, the dehumanizing, the false, and the irrational and, of course, the extremist consciousness" (qtd. in Eagleton 4).

Ideology can be viewed as false consciousness. But this is fairly an unpopular notion of ideology for a number of reasons. For one thing, epistemology itself is at the moment somewhere out of fashion, and the assumption that some of our ideas match or correspond to the way things are, while others do not, is felt by some to be naive, discreditable theory of knowledge for another thing, the idea of false consciousness can be taken as implying the possibility of some unequivocally correct way of viewing the world, which is under deep suspicion

Althusser, an influential French Marxist philosopher, focuses on the structure of society constituted by ideology. The social formation is a structure in which the various levels exist in complex relations of inner contradiction and mutual conflict. He defines, " Ideology is a representation of the imaginary relationship of individuals to their real condition of existence"(104). Ideology is not for him at root a matter of such description at all, and criteria of truth and falsehood are thus largely irrelevant to it. Althusser again says, "Ideology is a particular organization of signifying practices



which goes to constitute human being as social subjects, and which produces the lived relations by which such subjects are connected to the dominant relations of production in a society"(120). Ideology covers all the various political modalities of such relations, and identification with the dominant power to an oppositional stance towards it. Althusser adopts the broader sense of ideology. There is no doubt that he strikes a lethal blow at any purely rationalistic theory of ideology

Ideology will live on in its purely sociological function, and mystification will yield to the mythical. Ideology will still be in a certain sense false; but its falsity will no longer be in the service of dominant interests. Slavoj Žižek claims that Leninism-Stalinism suddenly adopted the term proletarian ideology in late 1920s in order to designate not the distortion of proletarian consciousness under the pressure of bourgeois Ideology, but the very subjective driving force of proletarian revolutionary activity. This shift in the notion of ideology was strictly correlative to the reinterpretation on Marxism itself as an impartial objective science, as a science that does not in itself involve the proletarian subjective position. He states:

Ideology is no longer conceived as homogeneous mechanism that guarantees social reproduction, as the cement of society; it turns into a Wittgensteinian family's vaguely connected and heterogeneous procedures whose reach is strictly localized [...] endeavor to demonstrate that an Ideology either exerts an influence that is crucial, but constrained to some narrow social stratum.(14)

Michael Foucault presents ideology with power. He thinks that power is not limited with armies and other administration. It gives power to rule in society. Ideology can linger existing power. He says:

Power is not something confined to armies and parliaments: it is, rather, a pervasive, intangible network of force which weaves itself into our slightest power to its more obvious political manifestations would itself be and ideological move, values and beliefs bound up with power, then the term Ideology threatens to expand to vanishing point. (qtd. in Eagleton 7)

Ideology is the scientific study of human ideas. But soon it came to mean a system of ideas themselves. The early ideologues of the eighteenth century France drew heavily on John Lock's empiricist philosophy in their war against metaphysics. The aim of the Enlightenment ideologues, as spokesmen for the revolutionary bourgeoisie of eighteenth century Europe, was to reconstruct society from the ground up on a rational base. Critic Theodor Adorno thinks ideology is exchange with commodity. He says, "Mechanism of abstract exchange is the very secret of Ideology itself"(68).

Ideology is the product of the position and interest of the particular class. In any historical era, the dominant Ideology, embodies and Serves to legitimize and perpetuate the interest of dominant economic and social class of the time. Ideology supports powers it pushes up capitalistic society to exploit over poor people sustaining their existing power for a long time.

Marxism is a political theory that advocates class struggle of the proletariat against the ruling until the political power is seized and socialist emancipated society is established. This brought a significant change in the bourgeois ideology. Literature, from Marxist point of view, is treated as the reflection of the social-economic life. When we talk of the socio-economic life of society, we can find distinct classes in struggle for the economic, political as well as social advantages. So, literature, from Marxism should reflect this dialectical totality of a society and the value of literature

is judge on the basis of how far it has done this function. It should aim for the betterment of society. But Adorno says, "the whole sphere of art and literature put all efforts on bringing newness in theatrical production even so they all agree on the point that literature can be properly understood within a larger framework of social reality" (qtd. in Tyson 167). Adorno again says, "Literary work does not give us a neatly shaped reflection and knowledge of reality but works within reality to expose its contradictions"(104).

Marxist critic Terry Eagleton writes," Literary theory without any relevance to socio-economic situation is only an academic myth , literary theory has a most particular relevance to his political system and it has helped writing not to sustain and reinforce its assumption "(196).

Marxist critic Slaughter discusses his concept about art and literature. He portrays that working class people and their productive force must include in literary work. He states:

Writers should take the side of working class in conceiving their subject matter, demonstrating some automatic progressiveness of the productive forces which must be victorious against the production relations [...] imagine that a commonsense adoption of Progressive themes within existing literary forms constitutes a revolutionary line in are and literature. (174)

Marxists believe that all social phenomena, from child rearing practices to environmental concerns, are cultural productions and that culture cannot be separated from the socioeconomic system. Althusser here assimilated:

Society is not a monolithic whole, but is constituted by a diversity of non synchronous social formations, or ideological state apparatuses, including religious, legal Political and literary institutions. Each of these is interrelated with the others in complex ways, but possesses a relative autonomy; only in the last instance is the Ideology of a particular institution determined by its material base in contemporary economic production, in an influential reconsideration of the nature of ideology. (178)

The Italian Communist Antonio Gramsci, maintains the original Marxist distinction between the economic base and the cultural superstructure, but replaces the older notion:

Culture is a disguised reflection of the material base with the concept that the relation between the two is one of reciprocity, or interactive influence and emphasis on the popular, as opposed to the elite elements of culture, ranging from folklore and popular music to the cinema, widely echoed concept is that of hegemony: that a social class achieves a predominant influence and power, not by direct and overt means, but by succeeding in making its ideological view of society so pervasive that the subordinate classes unwittingly accept and participate in their own oppression. (qtd. in Eagleton 111)

Lukacs says that Marxism is an ideology of proletariats. Marxism and ideology are linked to each other. Ideological discourse described as any system of mental representations of lived experience reworked into a specifically literary discourse. Later Marxist critics have been increasingly hospitable to the tactical use for dealing with ideology in literature that concepts derived from deconstruction and Lacan's

version of Freudian psycho-analysis. Their views on poststructuralist analysis are useful to Marxist analysis of literary texts. They serve to undermine reigning beliefs and certainties. Preliminary to the properly Marxist enterprise of exposing ideological motivation and application of the criticism of literature toward politically desirable ends are closed linked each other.

### **Lukacs and Ideology**

George Lukacs (1885-1971) is a Hungarian Marxist philosopher, writer and literary critic who influenced the mainstream of European communism. His major contributions include the formulation of Marxist system of aesthetics that opposed political control of artists and defended humanism and an elaboration of Marx's theory of alienation within industrial society. He was the exponent of Marxist humanism who did the important contribution of Marxist theory to aesthetics in the analysis of the condition of labor and in the critique of the alienated and reified consciousness of man under capitalism. Lukacs developed a multifaceted approach to literary criticism in which historical condition of society and the reality of class consciousness are singled out as the ideological agenda of works of literature and the major source of their appeal. A neo-Hegelian work claims that only the intuition of the proletariat can properly apprehend the totality of history, but world revolution is contingent, not inevitable, and Marxism is an instrument, not a prediction. Lukacs renounced this heresy after residence in the Soviet Union under Stalin. After Khrushchev's denunciation of Stalin, Lukacs advocated peaceful coexistence and intellectual rather than political subversion. He again related Marx to Hegel and even to Aristotle, against the Stalinist claim that Marx made a radically new departure.

Lukacs' neo-Marxist literary criticism can be tendentious but his appealed to those anxious to salvage the more humane aspects of Marxism and to promote

revolution, even against a modified capitalism and social democracy by intellectual rather than by political means. By 1920, Lukacs was a member of the communist party and came under the influence of Marx and Lenin. He studied the Marxist ideology. He read Marx's *Capital* and *Communist Manifesto* with youthful enthusiasm. Lukacs early hatred of capitalism was strengthened by his association to the revolutionary youths in Budapest and the reading of Marx and Engels as well.

Lukacs rejects romanticism and criticizes naturalism that attempts to reproduce photographic picture of life, with equal vigor. He wants to discuss about naturalism and observes:

Their exclusion of historical determinants (meditations) which in the everyday life of the average person are not, as a rule, reality perceptible, but which interacting in their totality with everyday existence from the concrete, essential features of an historical situation, transformed naturalist authenticity into abstraction[...]. Disharmonious and so the art created in such society loses its aesthetic pleasure. To illustrate this he sets movements of Enlightenment, idealism and Realism in a Marxist version of history in which the old harmony of the ancient Greek is forever lost, though nostalgia for it remains. (222)

Marxist philosophy claims that the generation of ideas and feeling in a head is not personal phenomenon as it directly corresponds to the objective reality and is determined by it. As a true Marxist, Lukacs criticizes the modernist literary practice of separating individual from social process. The stream of consciousness as narrative method is equally unacceptable to him. In his view, the modernist unmediated type of reflection of reality is erroneous. The modernist writers entirely fail to present reality as they sacrifice. Dynamic historical environment is the interest of rendering

subjective impression. They cut their characters away from the social historical process and plunge them into inescapable flux. He objects such fragmentation and presentation of man as solitary being unaffected by the social forces.

Reflection outside reality is the key idea of his theory of art. Art for him is social historical phenomenon. But the reality in literary works and the reality in the actual world need not have one to one correspondence. Artistic representation is not photographic as the art is not a machine. A photographic machine presents everything indifferently as it can not react, whereas, an artist is a sensitive creature, he feels and reacts. So, a picture presented in a literary work like novels, dramas, poems etc. ultimately passes through the active and sensitive minds of the author. His interpretation of the world is influenced by the previous experience and his own living and dislike. For Lukacs, the world is chaos from where an artist picks up the materials. The objective reality which lies in the chaotic state is given form and arranged in sequence. Lukacs accuses the naturalist writers of neglecting the important question of life and history. Naturalist writers are alienated from comprehensive social problems. They possess a superficial vision of life and dismiss the inner and constant antagonism between the classes. They are unable to apprehend the basis and historical truth. He says, "The naturalist manner of portrayal inestimably blunts both popular movements and popular attitudes; it deprives one of the historical objectivity and other of consciousness" (212). Lukacs strongly differentiates literary Modernism from contemporary Realism by attacking the emphasis on a specific type of formalism emphasized by both the modernist writers and their exemplary critics. In Lukacs's view such formalism turns technique into something absolute which stands above, or in place of the ostensible content of the work itself.

Modernism is unable to comprehend the relationship between action and history the revolutionary unity exhibited by subjective praxis in the world at large.

George Lukacs presents a flexible view of the role of Ideology. He proposed that each great work of literature creates its own world, which is unique and seemingly distinct from everyday reality. But masters of realism in the novel such as Balzac or Tolstoy by bringing to life the greatest possible richness of the objective conditions of life and by creating typical characters that manifest to and extreme the essential tendencies and determinants of their epoch. Own conscious ideology in producing a fictional world is a reflection of life in the greatest concreteness and clarity and with all its motivating contradictions. This is the fictional world of such writer's accords with the Marxist conception of the real world as formed by class conflict, economic and social Contradictions and the alienation of the individuals under capitalism

Lukacs follows Hegel in seeing the novel as the bourgeois epic, but an epic which unlike its classical counterpart reveals the homelessness and alienation of man is at home in the universe, moving ,watching rounded, complete world of immanent meaning which is adequate to his soul's demands. The novel arise when that harmonious integration of man and his world is shattered; the hero of fiction is now in search of a totality, estranged from a either too large or too narrow to give shape to his desires. Lukacs' major critical concepts totality, typicality and world-historical are essentially Hegelian rather than directly Marxist, although Marx and Engels certainly use the notion o f typically in their own literary criticism. All great art is socially progressive in the sense that is overtly reactionary; it realizes the vital world historical force of the author's conscious politic. The realist writer penetrated through the accidental phenomena of social life to disclose the essence or essentials of a



condition, selecting and combining them into a total form and fleshing them out in concrete experience.

George Lukacs adopts Lenin's epistemological theory of reflection. He says, "All apprehension of the external world is just a reflection of it in human consciousness" (12). In other words, he accepts uncritically the curious notion that concepts are somehow pictures in one's head of external reality. But true knowledge, for both Lenin and Lukacs, is not thereby a matter of initial sense impressions; it is, Lukacs claims, a more profound and comprehensive reflection of objective reality than is given in appearance. In other words, it is a perception of the categories which underline those appearances categories which are discoverable by scientific theory of great art. This is clearly the most reputable form of reflections. If the mind can penetrate to the categories beneath immediate experience, then consciousness is clearly practice which works on that experience to transform it into truth. Lukacs wants finally to preserve the idea that consciousness is an active force; in his late work on Marxist aesthetics, he sees artistic consciousness as a creative intervention into the world rather than as a mere reflection of it.

Ideology is belief system, that is, a product of culture conditioning. All Ideologies are equally productive of desirable. Undesirable ideologies promote repressive political agenda. Marxist theorists differ in their estimation of the degree to which we are programmed by ideology, all agree that the most successful ideologies are not recognized as ideologies but are thought to be natural ways of seeing the world by the people who subscribe to them. The role of ideology in maintaining those in power is important. Ideology supports or undermines the socioeconomic system in which that cultural production plays a significant role.

## **Lukacs, History and Class Consciousness**

Marxism, its victory over Revisionism and utopianism can never mean the defeat and false tendencies. It is an every-renewed struggle against the insidious effects of bourgeois Ideology on the thought of the proletariat. Marxist orthodoxy is no guardian of traditions; it is the eternally prophet proclaiming the relation between the task of the immediate present and the totality of the historical process. Men's consciousness determines their existence but on the contrary, their social existence that determines their consciousness. The core of existence stands revealed as a social process can be seen as the product. In line with Marx's thought, Lukacs criticized the individualist bourgeois philosophy of the subject, which found itself on the voluntary and conscious subject. In ideology, he asserts the primacy of social relations and the world is the product of human activity, but this can be seen only if the primacy of social process on individual consciousness, which is but the effect of ideological mystification, is accepted. This doesn't entail that Lukacs restrain human liberty on behalf of some kind of sociological determinism: to the contrary, this production of existence is the possibility of praxis. Henceforth, the problem consists in the relationship between theory and practice.

The so-called eternal laws of economics are dismissed as the ideological illusion projected by the current form of objectivity. Lukacs also writes, "It is only when the core of being has showed itself as social becoming, that the being itself can appear as a product, so far unconscious, of human activity, and this activity, in turn, as the decisive element of the transformation of being"(85).

Lukacs presents the category of reifications whereby, due to the commodity nature of capitalist society, social relations become objectified, including the ability for a spontaneous emergence of class consciousness. He repudiated the ideas in

particular the belief in the proletariat as a subject-object of history in *History and class consciousness*. Lukacs felt that both authors' nostalgic and pro aristocratic politics allowed them accurate and critical stances because of their opposition to the rising bourgeois.

Crucial elements in Lukacs' ideology, he privileges their authorial approach. Lukacs sets up a dialectical opposition between two elements he believes inherent to human experience. He maintains that dialectical relation exists between the appearance of events as subjective, unfettered experience and their essence as provoked by the objective totality of capitalism. Lukacs explains:

Good realists, such as Tomas Mann, create a contrast between the consciousness of their characters appearance and a reality only as it appears to themselves and their characters Mann succeeds because he creates this contrast, conversely, modernist writers fail because they portray reality only as it appears to themselves and their characters subjectively. (78)

Established relation to society shows consciousness of men existence that they have at any given time emerged in all essential characteristics. It appears in justified in the social and historical situation. That is to say, objectively, it appears as a false consciousness. On the other hand, we may see the same consciousness as something which fails subjectively to reach its self-appointed goals.

The relation with concrete totality and the dialectical determinants arising from it transcend pure description and yield the category of objective possibility. By relating consciousness to the whole of society it becomes possible to infer the thoughts and feelings which men would have in a particular situation if they were able

to assess. Class consciousness is neither the sum nor the average of what is thought or felt by the single individuals who make up the class. And yet the historically significant actions of the class as a whole are determined in the last resort by consciousness and not by the thought of the individual and these actions can be understood only by reference to consciousness.

All forms of class consciousness are Ideological. Ideology about the bourgeois is its inability to grasp the structure of the social formation on account of the dire effects of reification. Reification fragments and dislocates our social experience; so that under its influence we forget that society is a collective process and come to see it instead merely as this or that isolated object or institution. Proletariats are the prototypical commodities, forced to sell their labor power in order to survive, they can be seen as the essence of social order based on commodity fetishism; and the self-consciousness of the proletariat is therefore, as it was, the commodity form coming to awareness of it.

There are certain forms of knowledge notably, the self-knowledge of an exploited class or other ideologies, and so to figure as an emancipator force. Lukacs places emphasis rather on the phenomenon of reification as concept he derives from Marx's doctrine of commodity fetishism. It is said that consciousness is itself inherently ideological, simply by virtue of its partiality. In *History and class Consciousness* another residually idealist model of ideology is also confusingly at work, which would seem to locate the essence of bourgeois to be ripe for hegemony. Lukacs expresses as, "Men whose interests and consciousness enable them to organize the whole of society in accordance with those interests of material"(197).

Historical Marxism presumes organic and internal relation between class subject and its world view. There are social classes such as the petty bourgeois

contradiction incarnate. The one deriving from commodity fetishism is the other from a historicist view as the world view of a class subject. As far as the proletariat is concerned, class consciousness is passively subject to the effect of reification: Isolation and fragmentation is only apparent. The movement of commodities on the market, the birth of their value, in a word, the real framework of every rational calculation is not merely subject to strict laws but also presupposes the strict ordering of all that happens. The atomization of the individual is, then, only the reflex in consciousness of the fact that the natural laws of capitalist production have been extended to cover every manifestation of life in society;

Reification is immediate reality of every person living in capitalist society. It can be overcome only by constant and constantly renewed effort to disrupt the reified structure of existence by concretely relating to the concretely manifested contradictions of the total development, by becoming conscious of the immanent meanings of these contradictions for the total development.

There is an internal consistency between Lukacs's imposition of form of matter and his Marxist rationale for the historical necessity of violence, which he developed in *History and Class Consciousness*. In analyzing the historical use of violence, Lukacs concluded:

Violence in service of principle confers a new function on it because violence is now put in the service of man and the flowering of man. There is a coherent pattern in his imposition of form on chaotic life and his transformation of the demiurge into a proletarian will to universality. It is interesting to note that he treated violence as an integral political process. (25)

*History and Class Consciousness* is marred by a typically idealist overestimation of consciousness itself, the consciousnesses of the proletariat. For it is not in the first place the consciousness of the working class, actual or potential, which leads Marxism to select it as the prime agency of revolutionary change. If the working class figure as an agent, it is for structural, material reasons the fact that it is the only body of located within the productive process of capitalism, so trained and organized by that process and utterly indispensable to it, as to be capable of taking it over. In this sense it is capitalism, not Marxism, which selects the instruments of revolutionary overthrow, patiently nurturing its own potential gravedigger.

Lukacs says that a true artist is the one who is successful in depicting the social, economic and historical reality through his literary works. The principle of artistic creation applies not only in the case of Lukacs but also in the case of every Marxist literary theoretician for all artistic creations are inseparable from the socio-historical phenomenon. Therefore, art is a special form of reflection of reality which is the sum total of society.

### **III. Ideology and Class Consciousness in *Crime and Punishment***

Hunger and social exploitation always compel lower or working people to live in difficulties. Their everyday life always revolves around such labor exploitation and harsh situation. They become just the object like machines. Their human dignity is totally lost. The working people cost their value of life; the value of body and soul. The real construction of the society depends on hierarchy between higher to the lower-class. Poor people struggle for life every day and night. Class theory suggests social, economic and subjective factors determine certain class in society; it is the range of income, nature of occupation, governing or being governed, social conditions and values that locate distinction. Distribution of property is not equal, and there arises the revolution. An individual in society is nothing but a lump of soil. The economic and material base is the tool that formats a shape and size of subjective world of him. The locality, the system of education, cultural values and institutions he bears and carries out, he perceives the things and means are some of the factors that assist high to compose the culture and ideological superstructure. To proletariats, consciousness not only has to overcome internal contradiction but it also has to conflict.

If a man is rich in a society his bad activities are subdued but men of lower rank are not highlighted if they have good breeding in manner and intelligence. Rich men, enjoy all powers and facilities and suck the blood of poor people. This act shows cruelty and inhumanity of capitalist society. Poor men are taken as commodity and when they work they're praised highly. But, when they do not able to work, they are thrown in the dust. In society, there are varieties of men who are different from others not only from their facial expressions, castes and other features but in their socio-economic base. All members of society do not possess equal property and earning that

categorizes men in different social class. This unequal distribution of wealth creates antagonism and conflict.

Dostoevsky described bourgeois and proletariat in vision of Russian society's loneliness and drabness which the big city imposes on its inhabitants, as is so poignantly brought out in the scene. In an evening hour Raskolnikov stops on a street corner to listen to a sentimental song ground out on a barrel organ and using by a girl in a cracked and coarsened voice. He says:

Do you like street music?" said Raskolnikov, addressing a middle aged man standing idly by him. "I love to hear singing to a street organ, "said Raskolnikov, and his manner seemed strangely out of keeping with the subject."I like it on cold, dark damp evenings they must be damp when all the passers by have pale green, sickly faces, or better still when the wet snow is falling straight down, where there's no wind you know what I mean? And the street lamps shine through [...]. (212)

There is misery in big cities caused by classed system. Poor people look like crazy people at the eyes of bourgeois people. Catching Raskolnikov talking to himself on the street, Svidrigailov says to him "This is a town of crazy people [...]. There are few places where there are so many gloomy, queer influences on the soul of man as in Petersburg"(302). There is indeed something peculiarly Petersburgian about Raskolnikov, and not merely in the sense that he belongs to its Proletariat of undergraduates. It is in the heat and stench of its slums, as he wanders endlessly through the streets, that Raskolnikov spawns his idea, which he himself likens.

Prostitution is closely connected with that of drunkenness not only in the figure of Sonia but number of incidental figures, the seduced girl, whom Raskolnikov



rescues from her lecherous pursuer. Hunger and poverty are chief causes of prostitution. The writer argues that one cannot condemn these daughters. He says, "Of civil servants who are retired or rich men who have squandered their money, these are women who have nothing to eat, who are consumed by need pricked by the needle which provides a pitiful maintenance of pennies for laborious work" (167).

One can meet in a single evening a hundred prostitutes on any fine, brightly lighted street, and nevertheless have not the slightest notion of the state of their morality. Big cities are full with prostitutes by social exploitation and economic inequality. Exploitation melts prostitution around the cities.

Raskolnikov is warm and compassionate. He is shocked at the appalling poverty, destitution, alcoholism, prostitution and the all-pervasive gloom. He is appalled at the poverty and the suffering of Marmeladov whose daughter Sonia has taken to prostitution in order to feed her stepmother and the children. When he learns that his innocent and intelligent sister Dounia has been involving Svidrigailov and is now forced to marry Luzhin. Raskolnikov is repulsed at the prevailing injustice all around him. He views the impending marriage as nothing better than prostitution. His dream of an old, weak and helpless mare being beaten to death by the cruel cabdriver reflects his view of sympathy over poor mankind at the given point of time.

Almost every character in the novel except Luzhin, Svidrigailov, and the police officials are desperately poor. Poverty inherently forces families to separate. Raskolnikov often attempts to distance himself from Pulcheria and Dounia. He scolds his sister when he knows that she is marrying to help him out financially; he also rejects Razumihin's offer of a job. Dostoevsky's descriptions of poverty allow him to address important social issues, and to create rich, problematic situations in which the only way to survive is self-sacrifice. Poverty enables characters such as Sonia and

Dounia to demonstrate their strength and Compassion. Luzhins's exposition socialist case for the relationship between crime and poverty which prompts Raskolnikov exclaims, "Why, carry out logically the theory you were advocating just now, and it follows that people may be killed [...]"(131). His idealistic motive for his crime conceals utilitarian self-interest as manifest as that of the detestable to Luzhin.

By opposing exploitation Raskolnikov attempts to prove himself the potential man killing a woman, thus plunging himself into the base world of sin. Raskolnikov, a poverty ridden and psychologically battered, believes himself to be exempt from the laws of ordinary man. His murder and an attempt establish the truth of his superiority that makes him believe that he has the right to murder Alyona Ivanovna, the pawn broker. He is expelled student from the university because of the dire poverty. He is hopelessly in debt to his landlady. Because of this, she has stopped sending dinner up to him. He has not paid his back rent so he slips out unnoticed from the eyes of the landlady.

His sister Dounia is exploited as a house servant because of poor financial condition. In such a continual struggle, Raskolnikov is entangled and crushed by all types of deficiencies in his life. He hatches the plot against the money lender he regards himself liberator of the whole humanity. He says, "[...]. Yes [...] a man holds the fate of the world in his hands, and yet [...]" (1). He believes that he wants to kill Alyona because she was blood sucking leach on the body of the poor.

Raskolnikov believes he is doing mankind a service by removing the dishonest and unfair pawnbroker. He thinks that the old woman is crazy, greedy, deaf and evil. She charges scandalous rates of interest, devours the well-being of others and having reduced her younger sister to the stage of servant; oppresses her with work. At last, he decides to kill and rob her so as to make his mother, who is living in the province,

happy and he will be able to save his sister from a degrading marriage and then finish his studies by going abroad.

Raskolnikov experiences human suffering inevitable because he is crushed by poverty. Even in a feverish condition he continues to seek a way to achieve genuine happiness, which is possible only for a free individual. Dostoevsky once wrote that poverty is not a vice although it humiliates people. An old character, Marmeladov, speaks about humiliation:

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

Marmeladov makes Raskolnikov aware that poor people are not evil in themselves. They have their natural pride; but, an indigent man is humiliated and loses his pride. Marmeladov himself is poor. He has lost his pride and is humiliated.

Raskolnikov desires power and keeps himself above all codes of laws, including moral law invites conflicts in his mind, his motto, everything is permitted leads him to murder to prove himself a heroic person. Raskolnikov does not like to remain a mere coward; he thinks that the hero should do heroic deed to change social condition. Paul Tillich's view on courage is applicable to Raskolnikov, "we've defended courage as the self-affirmation of being in spite of non-being. The power of this self-affirmation is the power of being which is effective in every act of courage

and faith is the experience of his power" (218). Raskolnikov's rebellious nature is similar to that of the radical socialist thinkers among whom Dostoevsky was one.

He says, "Crime is protested against badly organized social state of things and man is driven to commit crime in consequence of the irresistible influence of environment, and nothing else" (178).

The will to power is one of the most important aspects of Raskolnikov's faith. Raskolnikov reminds Sonia of her wretched condition and now suggests her to get rid of such a situation in the following words, "well you will later on, Liberty and Power, but above all. Power! To rule over all trembling creature, over the whole ant-hill. That is a goal! Remember that's the heirloom I leave you" (235).

Raskolnikov going to Siberia suggests the way to a utopian world. During Dostoevsky's lifetime, the common desire of socialist utopians was an ideal world of their own thought. When Raskolnikov bows down to the earth and kisses it, a respectable man observes him, "He is pilgrim bound for Jerusalem, lads; he is taking leave of his children and his native land; he is wishing everybody good bye, event St. Petersburg and the ground of the capital" (385). He loves native land and faith over it. He wants to make all people respected in their land

Sonia is aware of her situation. Sonia desires to continue life with Raskolnikov. She has no time to think of herself, to realize her suffering. She always thinks of her father and the whole family. She sacrifices herself for the sake of her family, but Raskolnikov sacrifices himself as well as the life of another human being for the betterment of people in general. It shows that Dostoevsky is optimistic about future world. He advocates utopia world where people would get betterment. There would not be classed society. Classless structure would make utopian world.

Raskolnikov was supported by Sonia as his girlfriend and they would continue their lives. They want to make better society. Here Raskolnikov falls in utopian society. Like others Marxist, Dostoevsky was lured by utopian society. Narrator presents as:

Seven years! At the beginning of their happiness at some moments they were both ready to look on those seven years as though they were seven days. He did not know that the new life would not be given him for nothing that he would have to pay dearly for it, that it would cost him great striving, great suffering. (462)

Raskolnikov, who used reason and logic to rationalize his act of murder against the old woman, he figured that since the old woman was a plague to society. Raskolnikov should kill her to eliminate her burdensome decisions. Raskolnikov initially displays a determined, steadfast conscience as he plots to kill the old woman. On the night before the murder, he slept unusually long and with dreaming. This characterization seems to imply that his mind was so clear to murder that he didn't need to consider any other option; he planned on killing the old woman because she negatively affected others. His resolution seems to be predestined, as he reflects following the conversation between the soldier and the student, the tavern conversation had an extreme influence on him in the further development of the affair; as though there were indeed some predestination, some indication in it.

This feeling of predestination gives Raskolnikov peace and comfort to follow through with the murder. His actions during the day of murder are precise, he cuts the hole in his jacket to place the axe; he arrives at the old woman's house precisely when she is supposed to be alone, and plans how to get rid of the evidence. He rebels to existence society's harm ness. He believes murdering is correct for any social and economic rules because she is exploiter of society. He forgets other human beings

when he did crime. He thought other existence would not prevent for right work. Because of his overblown ego, Raskolnikov was ignorant of the warnings he received not killing the old woman. Raskolnikov remembered his dream of the beating of the horse. The dream was set in Raskolnikov's childhood, representing his innocence. The men take jubilant joy and satisfaction out of beating the horse to death. If he had such reaction to a dream of killing a horse, then one would think that the thought of savagely killing a human with an axe would hold more grave results. However, Raskolnikov wakes up, saying, "Thank God it was only a dream! But what's wrong? Am I coming down with a fever such a hideous dream?" (59). This reveals Raskolnikov is conscious of the potential results of his own actions.

He is very interested to protest against exploitation of rich people. They thought poor people are like animal, they have to beat them like horse. They make them die like horse, Poor man have to work. Here Dostoevsky advocates Master and servants because he was grown up in Tsarist Regime. Concept of Serfdom was fallen on him. Raskolnikov resists against his master like angry animal does when it is beaten time to time. Raskolnikov's class conscience directs him to follow through with the murder. He says, "Ivanovna, the old pawnbroker, is an evil person who is actually harming society by her vile and cynical grasp on the poor people who come to her for pawning various articles in time of distress"(62).

According to Hegel, any harmful segment of society should be removed. Raskolnikov tries to remove harmful thing from society. The old pawnbroker has a lot of money which will be wasted upon useless manners .With this money, Raskolnikov will be able to complete his university education without being cramped and then devote him to the service of humanity. Raskolnikov could use the money that the old pawnbroker has squeezed out of the poor people by distributing among

the destitute families and hundreds of people would be saved from starvation and ruin. Hundred thousand good deeds could be done and helped on that old woman's money, dozens of families saved from destitution.

Dostoevsky's bourgeois character Svidrigailov believes self satisfaction. He enjoys power, material and means of production. He thinks that will must be fulfilled by exploitation. He gives importance to money, power and merriment of life. He is bound with individualistic Ideology. He says:

Since there is no will (or power) beyond that of my own, then I must completely assert my own Will until it is totally free of all restraint against it. Since there is no Power beyond me which functions to punish, I am free to assert completely my own Will. The question is which shall prevail? The 'I' which is known to me OR some power which no one knows or understands. (125)

Svidrigailov can badly treat girl to satisfy his will, he can be the instrument of causing the death of a servant and his wife; he can pursue Dounia without any fear of some power punishing him. He asserts his own will in order to gratify his own desires.

Poverty is common in bourgeois society. Class division is very worse in capitalistic society. Upper class and lower class are always in tussle. Means of productions and power belong to upper class people. Lower class people are only labors. They are deprived by physical goods. Raskolnikov is suffered by poverty. He is not able to pay money of lodging and fooding so that he is run away from land lady. As narrator says:

He was crushed by poverty, the anxieties of his position had of late ceased to weight upon him. He had given up attending to matters of

practical importance; he had lost all desires to do son. Nothing that any landlady could do had a real terror for him. But to be stooped on the stairs to be forced to listen to her trivial, irrelevant, gossip, to his brains for excuse, to prevaricate, to lie-no, rather than that, he would creep down the stairs like a cat and slip out unseen. (2)

Raskolnikov and Marmeladov went to the Marmeladov's house together when they were intoxicated. Marmeladov's wife insulted them. Marmeladov was fallen in poverty as narrator says:

A Grimy little door at the very top of the stairs stood ajar. A very poor looking room about ten paces long was lighted up by a candle end; the whole of it was visible from the entrances. It was all in disorder, littered up with rages of all sorts. Especially children's garments, across the farther corner was stretched a ragged sheet. Behind it probably was the bed. There was nothing in the room except two chairs and a sofa covered with American leather, full of holes, before which stood an old deal kitchen table, unpainted and uncovered, at the edge of the table, stood, a smoldering tallow candle in an iron candlestick. (22)

Marmeladov drank wine because of the mental tension that was caused by bourgeois Ideology. He was out of the government work because of his weakness in work that was made by capitalistic society. He was poor by exploitation. Competition is given priority that looses him and he is out of work. There is no humanity and mutual help. He couldn't earn money. He stole money from the house and drank wine. It was his habit. He couldn't protest against the bad social system. His Ideology was to bear the incidents



Raskolnikov has aggressive view to protest upper class people. He got letter from the mother and knew that his sister was exploited by Svidrigailov. Dounia was going to marry to provide money to Raskolnikov who needed money to continue his life in city. He killed Pawn Broker and robbed money. He thought that he would give the money to poor people. He had done the crime because he was alienated from the capitalistic society.

Tsarist regime made society worse. There were classes. Even in rural area there were upper class and lower class people. Svidrigailov and Luzhin had belonged to upper class. They got exploitive profit from the villagers. They committed wrong activities over villagers. They couldn't protest against them. They were dominated by upper class people's Ideology. They respected higher class people. They took money as interest from the rich people. Dounia was exploited by Svidrigailov and Luzhin. They thought Dounias as object. They tried to exchange her with money. Dounia did rebel against them when she got help from her brother Raskolnikov.

Objectification is main norms of bourgeois society. All the things are determined by money. Class division supports objectification. Poor people are kept under control of objects .Personal motive is dominated by money. To survive, poor people have to make there bodies like objects .Specification and classification are main weapons to exploit over poor people by rich people. Sonia is fallen in victim of objectification. Her body is used as object for enjoyment and fulfillment of sexual satisfaction of upper class money oriented rich people. Her body is used as using and throwing object Sonia is daughter of Marmeladov, involves in prostitution to support her family. She earns money to feed the family members. In the capitalistic society, girl is thought as fixed object. It is used to change with money to get pleasure. Sonia

is suffered by it she doesn't like to do it but she has to do .Sonia tries to protest about it when she is linked with Raskolnikov.

Tsarist government sent Raskolnikov to Siberia to spend punishment of his crime. The place was very difficult. There was not fixed punishment for the criminal. Tsar rulers could pardon the crime. Prisons do not have needed goods. Prisoners have to spend in bad situations. Prisoners were given very bad food. Social system was injustice and criminals are not treated as human being. As narrator says:

And what was the food to him the thin cabbage soup with beetles floating in it? In the past as a student he had often not had even that. His clothes were warm and suited to his manner of life. He did not even feel the fetters. Was he ashamed of his shaven head and parti-colored coat? (455)

They couldn't rebel against Tsarist rulers. They are trapped by the rule of bourgeois. Raskolnikov was spending his days in prison .Sonia also went there and started minor works. Poor people can't get goods works. They don't have means of production. They are only labor of minor works. Capitalistic society makes works high and low. She was in works as narrator says:

About herself, Sonia wrote that she had succeeded in making some scarcely a dressmaker in the town, that she did sewing, and, as there was indispensable person in many houses. But she did not mention that the authorities were, through her, interested in Raskolnikov; that his task was lightened and so on. (455)

Raskolnikov wages war against inhumanity. Therefore, he is a rebel and an advocate of new values which he has created before committing murder. In the very beginning

of the novel, Raskolnikov says, " Ah, well, man holds the remedy in his own hands, and lets everything go its own way, simply through a cowardice that is an action"(5)

Furthermore, in terms of the structure of the novel, it can be divided into various parts. First part is the description of crime that Raskolnikov committed, who has the good intention of serving the society. Then, parts II to VI, which contain the description of character's mind, the investigation of crime by the attorney general, Porfiry, and Raskolnikov's aggressive mentality

Raskolnikov does not only feel responsible for himself but also for his family and for the whole of human beings. There are examples which justify his help for Marmeladov family, gallant conduct to save a child from a fire, his attempt to help a helpless girl who has been chased by a stranger. He believes in his own acts, his own freedom and feels responsible for all human beings. He further says, "I have no desire to neglect a starving mother, and clutch the money, have by me, on the pretext that someday or other everybody will be happy" (193). He has a clear motive to help others too.

He is not ready to accept that he has killed a human being. He says," It was not a human being; it was a principle I destroyed! The principle I have destroyed, but I could not step over it, I am no father no than before" (193). Raskolnikov does not agree with other people that he has committed a crime. He says:

What crime say you?" he retorted to porphyry in an angry tone. Is it a crime to have killed some vile and noisome vermin, an old usurer that was obnoxious to all, and a vampire living on the life of the poor?

Why, murders of that kind ought to make up for many a crime! I do not even give it a thought. (379)

Raskolnikov believes that courage generated power. He desires power and dares to be courageous. He denies false values, and has created himself a revolutionary proud and active rebel. Raskolnikov does not agree with the magistrate because he thinks killing a Vermin is not a crime. He does not like to live the life of misery. He wants truth; he dares to live a full and courageous life. He says:

Power is only given to the man who dares stoop to pick it up. Nothing more is needed, except courage. From the moment this truth had dawned upon me a truth as clear as the light of the sun. I longed to dare, and I committed murder. All I wanted was to do some daring thing, Sonia; that was my sole motive. (306-307)

Power is a way to exploitation. Ideology gives power. In capitalistic society bourgeois creates false Ideology and through its rules ruled over poor people. Tsarist regime created power through wrong tradition. All the people dominated to the power. Powerless class is hated by everyone. Raskolnikov is neglected by power oriented classed society. Narrator presents:

There were some Russians who were just as contemptuous, a former officer and two seminaries. Raskolnikov saw their mistake as clearly. He was disliked and avoided by everyone; they even began to hate him at last why he could not tell. Men who had been far guiltier despised and laughed at his crime. (453)

After murdering, Raskolnikov didn't get food and was ill. She was helped by Nastasya. Poor people helped poor. Upper class people didn't help poor. Same social class helped each other as narrator says:

No one has been here. That's the blood singing in your ears. When there's no outlet for it and it gets clotted, you begin fancying things [...]. Will you eat something?' He made no answer. Nastasya still stood over him, watching him. She went downstairs and returned with a white earthenware jug of water. He remembered only swallowing one sip the cold water and spilling some down his neck.(121)

Raskolnikov helps own class that given money to Marmaladov's widow to expanse ritual activities of death. He has Marxist belief. He sees equality. He wants to support the people who have problems. He advocates equals means to everyone. He is not selfish. He thinks that there must be equal reach in material to rich and poor in the society. All people must be equal. There should be classless society.

Money is given focus in classed society. Money is thing of happiness. And the things are measured by money in bourgeois society. In classless society money is thought as only medium. This is happened by the cause of money oriented capitalistic system. As Raskolnikov says:

[...]. I'll take the money and go and take lodging. They won't find me!  
 [...] Yes, but the address bureau? They'll find me, Razumihin will find me. Better escape altogether [...] to America, and let them do their worst! And take the IOU [...] it would be use there [...]. What else shall I take? They think I am ill. (111)

Material condition is main cause of all division in the society. It is the base for murder and other crimes that destroy humanity and social disorder. Materialism brings selfishness in the society. Bourgeois reality taught people how to earn money and to

become rich. Raskolnikov is suffered by the harm of material problem. As narrator says:

No, not a commonplace! Hitherto, for instance, if I were told, "Love thy neighbor", what came of it?' Pyotr Tetrovitch went on, perhaps with excessive haste. 'It came to my tearing my coat in half to share with my neighbor and we both were left half naked. As a Russian proverb has it, " Catch several hares and you don't catch one." Science now tells us; love you before all men, for everything in the world rests on self-interest. You love yourself and manage your own affairs properly and your coat remains whole. Economic truth adds that that the better private affairs are organized too. Therefore in a acquiring wealth solely and exclusively for myself, I am acquiring , so to speak, for all, and helping to bring to pass my neighbor's getting a little more than a torn coat, and that not from private personal liberality, but as a consequence of the general advance. The idea is simple, but unhappy it has been a long time it would seem to want very little wit to perceive it [...]. (129)

Exploitation is main norm of capitalistic society. People were exploited under Tsarists regime in Russia. People were divided superior and inferior by the cause of materialism .Inferiors are exploited as physically and mentally. Material makes division. All try to hold material so that there is competition. Power holds more material and powerless get less. Exploitation begins, and then inequality comes in the society as it is said:

[...] that it's somewhat arbitrary, but I don't insist upon exact numbers.

I only believe in my leading idea that men are in general divided by a

law of nature into two categories: inferior (ordinary), that is, so to say material that serves only to reproduce its kind, and men who have the gift or the talent to utter a new world. There are, of course, innumerable subdivisions, but the distinguishing features of both categories are fairly well marked. The first category, generally speaking, are men conservative in temperament and law abiding: they live under control and love to be controlled. To my thinking it is their duty to be controlled, because that's their vocation, and there is nothing humiliating in it for them. The second category all transgresses the law; they are destroyers or disposed to destruction according to their capacities. That law, of course, is unknown at present, but I am convinced that it exists, and one day may become known. The vast mass of mankind is mere material, and only exists in order by some great effort, by some mysterious process, by means of some crossing of race and stocks, to bring into the world at last perhaps one man out of a thousand with a spark of independence. (222-224)

Upper class people think that poor people are bad. They do murder. Class division makes social unhappiness. Class conflict begins by division. Upper class and lower class people hate each other. Tension is always remained among them. Murder is not for hate people and it is come by inequality in material condition. Means of production are distributed indiscriminately. It is said in talking about poor people:

Not to speak of the fact that crime has been greatly on the increase among the lower classes during the last five years, not to speak of the cases of robbery and arson everywhere, what strikes me as the

strangest thing is that in the higher classes, too, crime is increasing proportionately. (281)

In capitalist society everyone wants to be rich. People can be rich by exploitation. Means of production are controlled by higher class people. As Marx says, "Workers can not get correct wage of their labors, factory owners don't work but they get profit." (72). Profit is come by exploitation to workers. Factory owner motive to be rich is guided by profit motive ideology in bourgeois society. So happened in Russian society as narrator expresses:

'What answer had your lecture in Moscow to make to the question why he was forging notes? "Everybody is getting rich one way or another, so I want to make haste to get rich too." I don't remember the exact words, but the upshot was that he wanted money for nothing, without waiting or working. (131)

Historical matters make impact in the society. History is action oriented. History is written for supporting the power as Foucault said. Material conditions determine to write history. Social condition and power are dominating force to write history. Humanity is also impacted by historical condition, as:

They don't recognize that humanity, developing, by a historical living process, will become at last a normal society, but they believe that social system that has come out of some mathematical brain is going to organize all humanity at once and process! That's why they instinctively dislike history "nothing but ugliness and stupidity in it. ", and they explain it all as stupidity! That's why they so dislike the living process of life; they don't want a living soul! The living soul demands



life, the soul won't obey the rules of mechanics, the soul is an object of suspicion, the soul is retrograde. (219)

Serfdom was dominated in Russia. It was abolished in law but practically it was not abolished in society. Svidrigailov is rich who exploited poor peasant in the village. He did very bad activities for poor. He exploited Dounia. His wife was killed by his cause. He was the evil of capitalistic society as he said:

I have friends here, Svidrigailov admitted, not replying to the chief point. 'I've met some already. I've been lounging about for the last three days, and I've seen them, or they've seen me. That's matter of course. I am well dressed and reckoned not a poor man; the emancipation of the serfs hasn't affected me; my property consists chiefly of forests and water meadows. The revenue has not fallen off. (242)

Bourgeois society will be destroyed by it own cause. Bourgeois Ideology created cruelty to human beings. Svidrigailov committed suicide by his own fault. As Marx says, "capitalist society will be destroyed by its own fault and Marxist society will be flourished which will be class less and having perfect humanity" (98). Like Svidrigailov capitalist system, exploited system and classed system will be destroyed itself. As he says:

Nothing, brother, good-morning,' answered Svidrigailov. This isn't the place. I am going to foreign parts? To America? Svidrigailov took out the revolver and cocked it. Achilles raised his eyebrows. I say, this is not the place for such jokes! Why shouldn't it be the place? because it isn't. Well, brother, I don't mind than. It's good place. When you are

asked, you just say he was going, he said, to America. He put the revolver to his right temple. You can't do it here, it's not the place, cried Achilles, rousing himself, his eyes growing bigger and bigger. Svidrigailov pulled the trigger. (430)

Socialism is needed for better society. Dostoevsky believes perfect socialism. It is seen that even capitalists also believe socialism. Final stage of capitalism will be socialism. In socialism, all people live with harmony. In capitalist, people can not live properly because of competition and selfishness. Power and Ideology can create a lot of harms in the society. Svidrigailov believes in conviction. He says that conviction has great impact on human life. Conviction is base for all activities of human beings. Social and cultural consciousness and function are guided by conviction. Svidrigailov says:

If I were a socialist, I would certainly continue to live, because I would have something to do. No people have more conviction [than the socialists, and the chief thing in life is after all conviction]. Try to shake his conviction. He'll feel that he's losing the very stuff of life. For him the important thing is conviction. What does the conviction consist of? The chief thought of socialism is mechanism. Man is socialism becomes a stranger to himself. The living soul is cut away. It's clear that one can be peaceful. (194)

Dounia compares favorably with Sonia, who is placed under similar circumstances. Sonia has taken to prostitution in order to support her family in the same way as Dounias works for Svidrigailov in order to support Raskolnikov's university education. Dounia is quite willing to sacrifice her youth, beauty and charm in the larger interests of her family by agreeing to marry the middle aged but prosperous

Luzhin. In this manner, Sonia and Dounia are cast in the same cloud. Raskolnikov knows that Dounia is sacrificing herself for her family. He urges her to seize the first opportunity to refuse Luzhin, "Do you hear, sister" he says, 'this marriage is an infamy, let me act like a scoundrel, but youth mustn't and though I am a scoundrel, I wouldn't own such a sister, it's me or Luzhin"(336).

Dounia is ready to marry with Luzhin to support Raskolnikov. She has known that society has evil. She can not move away from the society. She tells Raskolnikov about her forthcoming marriage to Luzhin, "In fact, I am marrying Luzhin because of the two evils I choose the less. I intend to do honestly he expects of me, so I am not deceiving him" (336).

Division of property is basic situation in capitalistic society. Marxism doesn't advocate division of property. It says there should be equal reach in means of production by all class people. Class system must be avoided from the society. Division of property makes people do unrelated socio economic activities in the society. Human beings change from higher to lower and lower to higher within short period by economic cause. Katerina Ivanovna is suffered by upper class ideology. At first she was rich later she became poor by the cause of class system. Class division makes people superior to inferior and inferior to superior as narrator says:

The chief element was that particular man's pride. Which compels many poor people to spend their last savings on some traditional social ceremony, simply in order to do like other people and not to be looked down upon, It is very probable, too that Katerina Ivanovna longed on this occasion, at the moment when she seemed to be abandoned by everyone, to show those wretched contemptible lodgers that she knew how to do things, how to entertain, and that she had been brought up in

a genteel, she might almost say aristocratic, colonel's family and had not been meant for sweeping floors and washing the children's rags at night. Even the poorest and most broken-spirited people are sometimes liable to irresistible nervous craving. (378)

Thus, misery of society, freedom of serf, exploitation, superiority and inferiority are examples of unfair acts of capitalistic Ideology. Proletariats characters resist for these situations. Rich and poor characters tussle for their own rights .They want to continue their own class's values and traditions. They challenge for opposing forces. Class consciousness of proletariats opposes to upper class people that brings conflict in society by which proletariats try to take power over means of production. Rich people have means of production and poor people are deprived by them so that they are aggressive towards rich people and class struggle is always occurred in society.

#### **IV. Conclusion**

Social, historical and economic conditions make Raskolnikov commit crime which is needed to accomplish his motive to challenge in economic and social level. It is his resistance for exiting social and economic structure of Tsarist Russia He has no other means to rebel in the society. He is an expelled student of university. His sister Dounia is ready to commit wrong deal to earn money. His mother is very worried about the future of her children under classed society. Raskolnikov has to protect them from any harm. His class consciousness tells him murder for economic motive so that exploitation of upper class would be destroyed. Social structure pushes him up to rebel in the society. Marmeladov, Katrina, and Sonia are also facing bad faith in Bourgeois society. Marmeladov is died by capitalistic apparatus. Sonia is engaged in prostitution to fulfill physical goods to her and her family. She does not have other ways to survive. Bourgeois ideology teaches her that poor girl must be in prostitution. When, she is linked with Raskolnikov and her consciousness is increased .Unification makes her courageous and tries to rebel for capitalistic social structure. She is ready to continue life with Raskolnikov.

Means of productions are not in the reach of poor people. Dounia has to stay at Svidrigailov's house to earn money. She is thought as sexual object. Svidrigailov tries to seduce her. She doesn't have any sexual interest in him. She moves away but he follows her. Dounia is going to engage with Luzhin due to pressure of social structure that praises materials. She doesn't like him. She feels that she is in trap in bourgeois claws. All proletariat characters are exploited by any means. Rich class people are enjoying over poor class. Pawn broker woman is exploiting poor people. Raskolnikov calls her worm, louse and vampire of society. She is protected by capitalistic class structure. Social status makes her high in society. She is respected by her power of

money. Raskolnikov breaks the wall of capitalistic society by killing her. Luzhin follows Dounia. He makes trick over poor girl Sonia. He accuses Sonia of stealing money. He thinks that poor people have no value. They are thief and objects of rich people. Rich people can play over them. They are not successful to get their aim by resistance of lower class people. Svidrigailov is main advocator of capitalistic ideology, who is saved by society. He is powerful in economic status. He plays over villagers and innocent girl Dounia. He wants to marry her. His wife is also died by the cause of him. He feels that personal interest must be fulfilled and Self satisfaction is great thing in the society .He wants to make his mind peace by seducing Dounia. She would not marry with him He cannot survive and he suicides himself when he was resisted by Dounia .His death is a symbol of death of capitalistic social and economic structure.

Proletarian characters are alienated from Bourgeois society. They want to move ahead to make their life better. However, it is not possible and socioeconomic bondage breaks them to go forward. Raskolnikov breaks the social bondage. He felt sense of alienation, isolation and frustration because of his experiences of encountered various capitalistic mal practice prevalent in his society. He believes in class conflict and kills bourgeois woman. Proletariats feel disintegration on socioeconomic status of their society and they try to keep paces in the society .They are made to do wrong works by capitalistic ideology.

Proletarians Characters' acts show class struggle in society which is known as social realism. Raskolnikov believes in potentiality of human being. He believes in utopian concept that life will be better in future. He advocates ideology of proletariat. He believes equality and mutual cooperation even in classed society. He thinks that he can correct bad economic and social practice of the society. Poverty makes him to

start any action against exploitation. His consciousness tells him to protest for upper class people. He does as to his class consciousness suggest him. He revolts for traditional social and economic conventions. He believes that class consciousness is needed for revolution which brings fair society. He reckons that power can be seized through class consciousness. Ideologies would be created by class consciousness and power. Ideologies are illusions that are made only to continue power into existence. Pawnbroker woman and Svidrigailov exploit lower class people through these ideologies. Bourgeois capitalistic society always makes ideologies to continue the system. Consciousness of proletariat makes marxist ideology which can solve the problems of people and social malpractices would be removed from the society.

Raskolnikov's progressive activities make lower class people conscious to rebel for upper class people. Activities of the proletariat characters bring out the socio-economic reality of nineteenth century Tsarist Russia where people were divided into various hierarchies and different hostile camps. Class consciousness of proletarian characters pushes up to be hostile to upper class characters. Class conflict is existed by resistance of proletariats against upper class people.

## Works Cited

- Adorno, Theodor W. "Message in a bottle". *Mapping Ideology*. Ed. Slavoj Zizek. New York and London: Verso, 1994.
- Althusser, Louis. "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses." Ed. Zizek 100-140.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. "Dostoevsky's Dialogue." *Soviet Authors on Dostoevsky*. Moscow: Writers' Union of the USSR, 1971. 118-112.
- Dostoevsky, Fyodor. *Crime and Punishment*. Trans. Constance Garnett. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Classic, 2000.
- Eagleton, Terry. *Ideology*. London: Verso, 1991.
- . -. *Literary Theory: An Introduction*. London: Oxford, 1993.
- . -. *Marxism and Literary Criticism*. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Eagleton, Terry and Milne Drew. *Marxist Literary Theory: A Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 1996.
- Forgacs, David. *Marxist Literary Theory: Modern Literary Theory*. Ed. Ann Jefferson and David Robey. London: Batsford Ltd, 1986.
- . -. *Modern Literary Theory: A Comparative Introduction*. Ed. Ann Jefferson and David Robey. Second ed. London: B.T. Batsford Limited, 1978.
- Lukacs, George. *History and Class Consciousness*. Trans. Rodney Living Stone. London: The Merlin Press, 1971.
- . -. *Record of a Life: An Autobiographical Sketch*. Trans. Rodney Livingstone. Ed. Istvan Eorsi. London: Verso, 1993.



- - - . *The Historical Novel*. Trans. Hannah and Stanley Mitchell. London: Merlin Press, 1965.

- - - ."The Ideology of Modernism." *Critical Theories Since 1965*. Ed. Hazard Adams and Leroy searle. Tallhassee: Florida State UP, 1968. 292-297.

Slaughter, Cliff. *Marxism, Ideology and Literature*. London: Macmillan, 1980.

Tyson, Lois, *Critical Theory Today*. New York and London: Gardland Publishing Inc, 1999.

Yermilov, V. *Dostoevsky*. Moscow: Foreign Language Publishing House, 1973.

Zizek, Slavoj. *Mapping Ideology*. New York and London: Verso, 1994.

- - - . "The Spector of Ideology." Ed. Zizek 1-30.