Literature appeared at the dawn of human society. Initially it was directly intertwined with labour. It is a form of labour and labour is an activity peculiar to mankind. Thus Marx defined labour in these words:

"The labour process is purposive activity for the fitting of natural substances to human wants; it is the general condition requisite for affecting and exchange of matter between man and nature; it is the condition perennially imposed by nature upon human life and is, therefore, independent of forms of social life, or, rather it is common to all social forms.

So to this day art has preserved this character. One of the primary distinction of art is to seek out "the beautiful" in life, to generalise it, typify it, mirror it and bring it to the masses, satisfying their aesthetic emotions, but in the framework of reality. Mere naturalism as that of Zola is condemnable.

"The central category and criterion of realistic literature is the type, a particular synthesis which organically binds together the general and the particular both in character and in situations. What makes a type a type is not its average quality, nor its mere individual being, however profoundly conceived; what makes it a type is that in it all humanity and
socially essential determinents are present at their highest level of development, in the ultimate unfolding of the possibilities latent in them in extreme presentation of extremes - rendering concrete the peaks and limits of men and epochs". 

A few points out stand themselves in Lukacs statement; first, lukacs is much concerned about social content (or external, dimention of literature as baptised by Hall, though he himself does not define externalism as distinguished from internalism.). Second point is even more important, that the social context must be perceived in totality, not in form of isolated pieces of reality.

It will not be out of place to call attention to Lukacs proposition that literature transcends from particular to general. Throug Lukacs only hints at it, Fischer is more vivid and candid:

"Man is more than an individual. He feels that he can attain wholeness only if he takes possession of experiences of others that might potentially be his own. Yet what a man apprehends as his potential includes everything that humanity as a whole is capable of. Art is the indispensable means for this merging of individual with the whole. It reflects his infinite capacity for association for sharing experience and ideas."

Since literature deals not with isolated individuals, but presents the social reality in totality, hence, the principle of aesthetic appreciation of literature can not be limited to "Art for
Art's sake". Rather the horizon will have to be broadened to take humanity in its folds. So humanism becomes an essential of aesthetics as it is an essential dimension of human existence. Karl Marx was the first to point it out, though the German Democrats of 19th century tried to reduce it to mere economism interpreted from a reformist point of view, that ignores its philosophical essence. Karl Kautsky saw in Marxism only a specific conception of society, and not a philosophy, and hence, reducing Marxism to nothing but bones of simplistic economic and political theory. Marxism had to be fleshed out with the borrowed philosophy called in to explain the existence of realm of human values to which art belongs. In this way the problems of art and literature were left out in cold, exiled from Marxist discourse, their analysis put in the hands of an idealist philosophy, usually Kantian derivation, used to fill the gaps left by historical materialism. German Democrats like Kautsky and Bernstein thought that the only contribution Marxism could make to the field of aesthetics was the explanation to the influence of economic factors on art and literature. But in this quirk the central thesis of historical materialism on the determining of economic relations was, in final analysis, interpreted in such a way that the real significance was lost and consequently whole discussion came out as a juxtaposition.

Western academicians have been, so far, synomissing Marxian theory of literature with Plekhanovian Sociology of literature, and
are using those arguments against it, which Marxism itself has put forward against sociologism.

Plekhanov followed Paul Lafargue and Franz Mehring with an attempted distance. Lafargue attempted vehemently to establish relationship between art and society and class interests, but unfortunately he got trapped into class subjectivism, and consequently lost track of specific mode of reflecting reality, while underlining the ideological character of a work of art. Similarly, Mehring stressed the class character of literature and denounced the so called 'pure' art as it existed nowhere. Yet he sustained fondness for certain Kantian thesis which he considered as essential complement to Marxism. On the one hand, he conceived art as a social phenomenon and a part of the superstructure; in that sense he saw that it is conditioned by class interest and is capable of reaching a total universal plane, on the other hand, he attempted to free art from conditioning with Kantian formalistic aesthetic i.e. an analysis of context, causing him to waver between sociological schematism and Kantian formalism. Thus, his theory is placed at fork of two roads.

Western philosophers blame Marxism for water tight compartmentisation of literature in sacrificing the 'Autonomy of Art' on the altar of social determinism (For this very reason they support structuralism with their heads and tails as it recognises the Autonomy of Art; so what if it forgets, or consciously avoids
the content i.e. social phenomenon of literature). Plekhanov, of course, understood the relationship between art and class struggle. He attempted to overcome the contradiction between social determinism and autonomy of art. In a series of concrete studies, he understood the intimate relationship between art and class-struggle, at the same time he showed the relativism of the concept of beauty and he pointed out the unity of content and forms as well as the determining role of ideological content. However, he did not, always, establish the social nature of art and that of the aesthetic sense. He acknowledged and existence of psychological laws in the historical development of art and society, and fell into a kind of biological determinism in speaking out of the sense of beauty. Hence, Plekhanov failed to resolve the problem of relative autonomy of art. It is no accident that Plekhanov's work gave rise to a tendency that reduced Marxist aesthetics to a Sociology of Art, overlooking the relative autonomy of art which Marx and Engels had already emphasised. Engels did so in his letters during 1890's. Marx had so emphasised while suggesting the importance of Greek literature, that the explanation of this lays in nostalgia exhibited by men of later stages of their childhood.

The autonomy devoid of its social pretext is much more dangerous and devastating compared to, even, Plekhanovian sociologism. As for as the Marxist theory of the relative autonomy of art and literature is concerned, the issue, has long been settled for those who
believed in reason. Engel's letter to Bloch (Sept. 1890) made it crystal clear in so many words.

"According to the materialist view of history, the ultimately determining element in history is the production and reproduction of real life. More than this neither Marx nor I have ever asserted. Hence, if somebody twists this into saying that the economic element is the only determining one, he transforms the proposition into a meaningless, abstract, senseless phrase."

Lenin made it more clear in his essay on 'Party Organization and Party Literature.'

"Literature is, least of all, subject to the mechanical adjustments or leveling, to the rule of majority over minority. There is no question, either, that in this field greater scope must undoubtedly be allowed for personal initiative, individual inclination, thought and fantasy, form and content."

It is a known fact that there were some differences between Lenin and Gorky at one stage as to the strategy of revolution. Gorky did not accept Lenin's subtle fight and Lenin, in his place, denounced Gorky's softness, but he considered him much authentic in field of creative literature. This he wrote to Gorky in one of his letters:

"I accede to this idea that you are the best judge in the
matter of art and literature. Besides this, you can make such conclusions from your artistic experience and philosophy, that can be of a great importance and much beneficial for a proletariate party".

This letter of Lenin fully establishes the Marxist attitude towards relative autonomy of literature, but still the slogan of 'complete freedom' for art and literature is a capitalist stunt. Generally three allegations are leveled against Marxism: ONE, Marxism is relative only in the field of politics and economics and not for art and literature. TWO, Marxism binds the author in a military discipline, which, in turn destroys the authenticity of creation. THREE, Marxism lacks humanism.

The first charge is, of course, an important attempt to confuse the dialectical relationship between base and superstructure. This slogan like allegation is backed by the protagonists of 'Pure Art', and it has already been discussed that the isolated pieces of realism is rather an attempted rape of realism. 'Victory of Realism' can only be achieved by understanding the dialectical relationship between base and superstructure, to say, the economic pattern of society and literature which is a part of a super-structure.

The second charge: they try to prove by putting forward the theory of reflection, consciously synonymising it with the scientific reflection; thus plugging the creative freedom. Marxists
do hold that writer is a medium of reflecting the social reality but he is a living medium not a stagnant and dead mirror, hence his worldview is a reality. While reflecting reality the writer reflects himself, and in the process his time and class as well. Though literature has an ideological content and it, therefore, plays a social and educational role, but still art and politics operate at two different levels, but of course for a similar goal. Lenin himself was of the view that every great writer surpasses his/her ideological limitation while revealing truth, so he proved while declaring Tolstoy 'the mirror of Russian Revolution', or when Marx praised Balzak inspite of the reactionary leanings of his.

As for as the third charge in concerned, it will be suffice to say that the only philosophy that is humanistic in the true sense of the term is Marxism, as it is meant for the uprising of humanity as such.

"Marxism is Zero without man, because theoretical and practical frame work of Marxism is for the rise of Man".

The autonomy of art was preluded by the theory of L'art pour L'art (Art for Art's Sake). This slogan originated in France, and the Kantian presumption that the beauty is a goal in itself, and ceases to be beyond this, inspired these aesthetists, supplemented by Edgar Allen Poe's theory of pure poetry, which held that "Poetry is a rythmatic recreation of beauty and poetry should not mean but be". This theory was latter on extended to the whole stretch of
literature, but when this theory started taking ground, while in argument with the materialist philosophy, the principle of L'art pour L'art was reduced to say that literature is a microcosm, sowing the seeds for future structuralist theoreticians.

The theory of 'autonomous art' as put forward by the protagonists of pure art, was actually an intellectual treason to undermine the relation of art and society. Since art is a human activity, there can be no separating between art and society and the dialectical relation can not be negated, for art itself is a social phenomenon: First, because the artist, however unique his primary experience might be, is a social being; Second, because his work, however deeply marked by his primary experience and however unique and unrepeatable its objectification or form might be, is always a bridge, a connecting link between the artist and other members of the society. Third, because a work of art affects other people - it contributes to the reaffirmation of, or devaluation of their ideas, goals or values and is a social force which, with its emotional or ideological weight, shakes or moves people. No body remains the same after having been deeply moved by a true work of art. Art and society are necessarily inter-connected; no art has been unaffected by social influence and no art has failed in turn to influence the society. No society has renounced its right to possess its own art and its consequent right to influence art. Art is almost as old as man himself. that is, almost as old as society. It is the fundamental principle of Marxism that existence of man only
influences his consciousness. Our feelings and values are influenced by the practical situation of class struggle, hence, to seek 'pure art' is not only illogical but also a treacherous attempt in the field of literary scholarship.

Almost two diametrically opposed points of nature of art have developed. According to one, aesthetics constitutes a science concerned only with the laws of artistic development and nature of artistic creativity. Viewed from that angle, aesthetics is no more than the general theory of art. Those who approach it from other angles, proffer the view that aesthetics and general theory of art are two separate sciences. It is precisely the theory of art which is concerned with the laws of artistic development and nature of artistic creativity, while aesthetics they assume, is just a science of the beautiful, both in real world and art. Clearly neither of these two approaches is acceptable, since both are one-sided. Aesthetics is concerned both with the study of the beautiful in its manifold forms and also with the elucidation of the nature of art and the laws of its development.

So logically it will be a right taking off to hold that man's aesthetic perception of the real world is a broader sphere of activity than art itself. It involves not only artistic creativity but also other manifestations of man's aesthetic relationship with reality. In tune with this synthesis, Marxism holds, art as manifestation of man's social consciousness and world. This
important tenant of Marxist theory of art and literature was formulated on the basis of dialectical materialist analysis of art, and in particular, its social essence.

Jonathan Cullar suggests that literature is something in itself with its own qualities and not merely a sociology. So when the marxists were trying to rationalise the theory of literature, the structuralists came with a very interesting but of course a negative theory to study the literature. Cullar argues that structuralism is to be understood as an approach to the literariness of text based on linguistics.

"The notion that linguistics may be useful in studying other cultural phenomena, is based on two fundamental insights: first, that social and cultural phenomena are not simply material objects or events, but the objects or events with meaning and hence signs; and second, that they do not have essences, but are defined by a network of relations, both internal and external."

Cullar feels that actual meaning of text can be established with reference to the standard of literary competence that the reader may be expected to attain.

Structuralism holds that there need be no concern with author as such, since it tends to be argued that language is put into operation by author rather than the author control's the language.
"A book is the product of a different self from one we exhibit in our habits in the society or vices", as it is quite clear that the knowledge of the author need not be equalent to the acceptance of the truth of his statement.

It is further held that literature is an institution of its own right with its own internal laws - a concept of inter-textuality, which argues simply that literature is best read as a comment on other texts rather than on society (as examplified by kriesteva that Proust cannot be understood without knowledge of Balzac). Structuralists fall in line with Oscar Wilde's comments in his limpid essay on "The decay of lying":

"Art never expresses anything but itself. It has an independent life, just as a thought has, and develops purely on its own lines. It is not necessarily realistic in an age of realism, nor spiritual in an are of faith. So far being the creation of its time, it is usually in the direct opposition to it, and the only history that is preserves for us is history of its own progress".

The structuralist stress on "Absolute Autonomy of Art" puts forward a well timed question as to the effects of literature. The formulation that literary development is just an internal development, is a paradox in itself, but of course, a sweet morning dream - "a bird does fly without wings". Structuralism, this way, is
a utopian anarchy in the field of literary criticism. For them, the realism is only a CONVENTION among others; the illusion of this theory is that it is an illusion of the Marxists that realism is real. Kermode demonstrates that literature cannot be reality since it must order in having an ending. This is not, as he puts it to deny that there are discreet convention of realism. Cullar christens it Draisemblence.

Basically it was Marxism that initiated a structuralist study, but certainly in a different and healthy context, and a broader horizon. This school of philosophy is first and the only one to suggest that society should be studied in its totality while taking in view its socio-historical structure. Marxism introduced inter-structural relationship while the structuralism tried to isolate the sub-structures situated in super-structure, from its base, by introducing intra-structural analysis, that is to say that structuralism is, in fact, distortion of structuralist study.

Structuralist insistence on the conventional quality of art has been accepted by the so called Marxist structuralists, whose leader is undoubtfully Louis Althusser:

"Art (I mean authentic art, not works of average or mediocre level) does not give us knowledge in the strict sense; it, therefore, does not replace knowledge (in the modern sense: scientific knowledge) but what it gives, does nevertheless,
maintain a certain specific relationship with knowledge. This relationship is not one of identity but one of difference. Let me explain. I believe that peculiarity of art is to "make us perceive", "make us feel", something which alludes reality... what art makes us see, and therefore, gives us in form of 'seeing 'perceiving' and 'feeling' (Which is not form of knowledge) is the ideology from which it is born, in which it bathes, from which it detaches itself as art, and to which it alludes... Balzac and Solzhenitsyn make us perceive (but not know) in some sense from the inside by an internal distance, the very ideology in which they are held".

Althusser is suggesting that world is made of different realms, namely; the economic, the ideological, the scientific and the artistic, and that the latter three realms have a measure of autonomy and that science (i.e. Marxism) provide us with truth. Althusser seems to suggest that art is not as bad as pure ideology since its very use of ideology allows the reader to stand at some distance from absolute immersion into socially accepted habits.

Eagleton has put it more plainly and without any camouflage. He argues that the proper manner of interpreting literature depends upon realising that the text is decentred. All that is meant by this is that the different elements of various ideologies are likely to be in conflict with one another, and that the manner of such conflict will provide information, but only as it were secondary,
about society. Added to this is the belief that in certain circumstances determinate absence will be obscured in the text, the state of society will, in other words, prevent certain types of resolutions being made.

Here the problem is same as with the earlier Marxists such as Mehring, Lafargue and Plekhnov. The difference is that they stressed only the social determinent factor of literature, overlooking the relative autonomy; while the structuralists illuminated autonomy, forgetting the Socio-Historical character of literature altogether. Thus it will be quite unhealthy to adopt either of these two views in the present work, rather a harmonious touch will have to be evolved by hammering out the conflicting views which exist in the conceptual frame work of theory.

Reductionism, for instance is one of the most controversial theoretical knots in the field of sociology of literature. Reductionism has two relevant meaning in connection with literature. One: something may be said to be reduced if it is impoverished, or two:, if it can be shown to be something else. The sociology of literature is not reductionist in the first sense, but the fear that it might be in the second is what that, in fact, explains the extremes the discipline at present attaches. The possibility of reduction in its powerful sense is looked upon with horror.

Marxists are possibly the most adamant and out spoken critics of
reductionism as a synonym of sociology of literature. Now, they do accept it as the function of the subject, but they still cannot help it, only it is that their reduction has a much much broader base as compared to structuralists' naked reductionism i.e. literature as operational side of language; or absured Semiotic analysis, study of language of the art as a specific sign system does not justify any broad conclusions reducing the essence of art to a specific code of signs. Far it be from us to under-estimate semiotic methods of artistic analysis, or the sign formation of the artistic text. From the semiotic point of view art is a language and should be analyzed precisely in that capacity. Aesthetics makes use of semiotic methods to study the language of art, but the concept of 'art is language' and "language of art" should be properly demarcated. The importance of semiotic methods of analysis for investigating the nature of artistic means of communication is considerable, when these methods are being used in a particular domain, but they do not and cannot answer the question: what is the nature of art? In case of Marxism better it would be to replace the word 'reduction' with 'comparative study' i.e. inter-structural study, perceiving society in its totality. Thus the true reductionist in the real sense of the term are structuralists or semiologists with their devices like intra-telligence and convention.

It was too late that the structuralists realized the lacunae in their satanic jugglary of theoretical puzzles, and hence, they came
with a further modification to soothen the criticism against them that this school completely ignored the human element of art. At this stage they pretended to turn its attention to analyse the structure of human mind, to analyse the social codes. This can be put more vividly by saying that structuralism accepted the Hermeneutic insistence that men are not dead atoms, but sentient beings whose creation of meaning should provide the centre of investigation for sociological knowledge. Therefore, the position is best called structuralist-Hermeneutic. But this again was clever attempt of hinting at the mechanical schematism of Marxism as already put forward by the earlier structuralist. By including the so-called human element in structural theory of literary criticism they apparently wanted to establish themselves as vanguard of humanism against the 'dry and mechanical' economics of Marxism.

One more viewpoint which has out stood itself in the field of literary scholarship, also demands considerable discussion, i.e. Sartrian viewpoint as it may be called, as differentiated from the existentialist viewpoint, as Sartre was not fully in tune with the existentialist pessimism and denounced many of the existentialist leanings while discoursing on the nature of literature. Existentialist theory of art and literature can be best put in the words of Heidegger. He suggests that the appearance and existence of aesthetic theories, like all synthesised attempts to define artistic practice and relate it to the process of man's perception...
and apprehension of the world, are the result of artificial and, more often than not, harmful activities of reason. He sees in theory some kind of would be organising" rational fantasies" incompatible with the truly human world of irrational artistic creativity. Hence Heidegger's train of thought is utterly in keeping with his existentialist point of view. This view is, however, similar or closely related to the conception of writers, whose work is not directly linked with philosophy of irrationalism.

Neo-positivist aesthetics for instance, while excluding from its theory criteria drawn from socio-historical experience and rendering absolute semantic approach to the facts of arts seen as a specific sign system, without even raising a question as to the possibility of penetrating into the nature of art itself. From the standpoint of logical idealism adhered to by the new-positivists, and also of irrationalists, the essence of art is seen as something that cannot be expressed in theoretical terms. This particular brand of aesthetic agnosticism is the most salient feature of contemporary idealist aesthetics.

Through Sartrian putting of the things forward is typical existentialist but he is not one, as for as his approach to literature is concerned. David Caute has christend his viewpoint as Marxist existentialist philosophy of literature.

At the heart of Sartre's theory of literature, lies a commitment
to freedom. The treatment of freedom in earlier 'Being and Not. .ingress. ris descriptive and phenomenological. Here three modes of consciousness are proposed. Being-in-itself, Being-for-itself and Being-for-other. Being-for-itself implies the process whereby man places himself at a distance from the 'otherness'. This gap is freedom, it provides the possibility of the free choice and conscious action. But the gap also entails an emptiness and a sense of anguish. Man wishes to be the sole subject of universe, to absorb the world into himself, and never to be an object. But for other men he is inevitably an object. Hence man pretends that he is a being-in-itself, that he is complete, and other men have no claim on him, or, he may evade the responsibility of freedom by assuming the identity of being-for-other. Thus for Sartre freedom exists, but it 's nevertheless a mode of life and consciousness which has to be seized. The notion is invested with a social context, to be complete, one man's freedom depends on the freedom of other, on the recreation of society which is free from exploitation and oppression.

Thus for Sartre, literature is a powerful tool of achieving this goal. Sartre argues that literature is alienated when it forgets or ignores its autonomy and places itself at the service of temporal power, dogma and mystification. Literature must hold the reader to make himself a full and free man in and through history. Sartre deplores the plays and novels which try to reconcile man with his
environment or which encourage him to escape from life. Literature should not be a sedative but an irritant, a catalyst provoking man to change the world in which they live, and in so doing, change themselves.

Sartre's rejection of avant grade and experimental writing is well fused with his philosophy. His historical perspective suggested that art for art's sake was a diversionary manoeuvre patronised by bourgeoisie, who preferred to have themselves denounced as philistines than as exploiters. Literature is presented by Sartre as a form of social action. Sartre demanded a literature of praxis, capable of becoming essential condition for action, the moment of reflective consciousness, hence adopting the perspective of socialist humanism, and in proclaiming that the modern proletarian, as producer and revolutionary, is the true subject of literature of praxis. Sartre had obviously absorbed a large segment of Marxist ideology in so doing. The historical situation drives us to join the proletariat in order to construct a classless society. Genuine freedom depends upon such action. Sartre went so far to affirm that literature could realise itself fully in a classless society, because only in such a society would the reading public be identical with concrete universe.

The issues on which Sartre and the Marxists differ are substantial for discussion. Sartre had always maintained that Marxism has traditionally failed to explain the individual psychology
ana consciousness. He argued that by any truly materialist analysis, the scope of consciousness must be limited to a mechanical reflection of the outer world. Marxism claimed to be a materialist philosophy, but also emphasised the active role of consciousness, its capacity for anticipating, planning and determining events. Sartre regarded this a contradiction in terms. In his opinion Marxists were perfectly justified in laying stress on active role of consciousness, but simply because they adhered to the materialist philosophy, they have failed to explore the phenomenology of mind which alone could explain its role. So it is quite apparent that Sartre shuttles between petty-bourgeois concept of freedom of art, and appreciation of Marxian rationale. Sartre's deviation is certainly a sad demise of a brilliant mind.

Even the Marxist thinkers have so far looked upon the sociology of literature, as if it were some prohibited area, and out of their venegance, they vehemently criticised the whole subject without ever considering the massive scope that this subject could open for reasonable and scientific study. In fact, they lost the initiative. This happened because of their wrong notions about sociology itself, as a bourgeois invention of theoretical alternate to Marxism. Sociology is a subject which studies the social relations, hence is the most appropriate stage for Marxist interpretation. The argument put forward against sociology of literature by Marxists are similar as were put against formalism and structuralism. In fact, the real
situation is this that the reigns of the subject were put into the hands of bourgeois theoraticians.

The real course could be proper debate, criticism of wrong trends that were being introduced in the subject and to provide the subject with appropriate theoretical guidelines; instead of this Marxists synonymised the sociology of literature with Sociologism and empiricism and turned arch enemies of Sociology of Literature.

Usually Marxists put forward three arguments against sociology of literature. One, that instead of staunch efforts of formalists, the masses are getting attracted towards the social aspect of literature and 'Art for Art's sake' is losing ground, hence, to devoid literature of its revolutionary urge, it was necessary to camouflage the actual relationship between society and literature, lest it should become a revolutionary weapon in the hands of masses; two, that as the feudal interpretation of relationship between society and literature is on the verge of defeat, and it is logically feared that this might be replaced by revolutionary thinking, so the bourgeois academicians think it proper to divert the flow of thinking, in the name of scientific thinking, in such direction that the revolutionary character of literature should not surface; three: that the upper class is using the Marxist jargon to shadow their own mean motives — so the Sociology of Literature must be criticised.

But one big fact still remains that Sociology of literature is
progressive movements, the authenticity of his poetry increased. The viewpoint of sociologists can be baptised reductio ad absurdum.

Sociologism takes literature as a social document, social evidence, a social fact or a social institution. In the process it explains literature as mirror of society that reflects reality in a mechanical way. Sociologist reflectionism or determinism does not explain dialectical relations of literature and society; and the role of literature. The complex dialectical relations between society and literature, reality and imagination are to be understood. The fact remains that sociologist determinism negates the creative freedom of author and dynamics of literature. Sociologism is unable to explain creative process. Some structuralist sociologists do not take literature as a social tradition but try to propound every writing as a complete autonomous unit, which frustrates the very purpose of literature.

The mistake that the Marxists commit is that they accepted the explaination of Sociology as noted above, and unleashed a vehement criticism, when the real course of things was to negate the wrong trends in the subject, not the subject itself.

So it is clear that the must effort has been to flout the issue instead of conscientious effort to provide it with some genuine outlook.

It is better to say, though it would be a bit categorical, that
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