

Tribhuvan University

**The Individual under the Repressive State: Political Consciousness in Charles
Dickens' *A Tale of Two Cities***

**A Thesis Submitted to the Central Department of English in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree
of Master of Arts in English**

By

Kali Bahadur Rawat

Central Department of English

Kirtipur, Kathmandu

July 2012

Tribhuvan University
Central Department of English

Letter of Recommendation

Kali Bahadur Rawat has completed the thesis, “**The Individual Under the Repressive State: Political Consciousness in Charles Dickens’ *A Tale of Two Cities***”, under my supervision. I recommend this thesis be submitted for *viva-voce*.

.....

Dr. Anirudra Thapa

Supervisor

Date.....

Acknowledgments

In addition to expressing my gratitude to my respected supervisor, Dr. Anirudra Thapa, lecturer at Central Department of English, without whose valuable comments, suggestions and guidance this research would never have been completed, I would like to thank several people: Dr. Amma Raj Joshi, Head, Central Department of English, without whose approval I would have not conducted this research; Badri Acharya, lecturer at Central Department of English, who encouraged to go for genuine research materials; Om Prakash Baral and Naveen Deep Khadka, whose suggestion provided main impetus to complete this research on time; Deepa Roka, Sroj Thapa, Dipak Roka and Manisha Rawat, for their help in copying my writing to be understood clearly; and Narayan Basnet, the owner of Resunga Computer Service, for his good will and unflinching effort towards quality service. Any remaining shortcomings are my own responsibility.

July 2012

Kali Bahadur Rawat

Abstract

This thesis, through Marxist perspective, especially Karl Marx's theory of class consciousness and George Lukacs' History and class consciousness, makes critical analysis of class struggle and class consciousness portrayed in Charles Dickens' *A Tale of Two Cities*. In the novel, the proletariats become conscious about their class, class-ideology and socio-economic condition because of their constant antagonistic relationship with the aristocrats and appalling poverty. It also exposes Dickens' anti-revolutionary view. Although Dickens has sympathy for the proletariats, calls for improving their pathetic condition and opines that the aristocrats should not exploit and suppress the proletariats, he ironically rejects the idea of granting freedom through revolution. Dickens concludes that the proletariats should create history by sacrificing their own lives to save the aristocrats. After conducting research on Dickens' *A Tale of Two Cities*, this thesis claims that Dickens, because of his first hand experience of poverty, suppression, exploitation and injustice, sympathises the proletariats, but, as a middle-class-man, he rejects the idea of granting freedom through revolution.

Contents

	Page No.
Acknowledgements	
Abstract	
I. Portrayal of Class Struggle in Dickens' <i>A Tale of Two Cities</i>	6
II: Ideological Consciousness Leads to Freedom	17
III. Dickens Disapproves the French Revolution	41
IV: Charles Dickens and The French Revolution	58
Works Cited	60

0I. Portrayal of Class Struggle in Dickens' *A Tale of Two Cities*

The thesis, "The Individual Under the Repressive State: Political Consciousness in Dickens' *A Tale of Two Cities*," deals with the class struggle and class consciousness portrayed in Charles Dickens' *A Tale of Two Cities*.

Charles Dickens, who was born on 7 February 1812, sets his novel, *A Tale of Two Cities*, in the years between 1780 and 1793. In the novel, there is struggle between two classes: the aristocracy and the working class. The Evremonde brothers belong to the then French aristocracy, and the other characters such as Madame Defarge, Ernest Defarge, Gaspard, the Vengeance,¹ the Jacques² and the Mendor of Roads, belong to the working class.

The poverty and pathetic condition of the workers move Dickens terribly. In the novel, he seems to be sympathetic to the workers and writes about the sorrows and hardship the workers face in their daily life. Dickens does not stand the exploitation of the proletariat in the hands of the aristocrats, and opines that the aristocrats should stop suppressing and exploiting the peasants to construct a society where both the aristocrats and proletariat can live peacefully. But he nowhere states that the proletariat should be empowered.

The Evremonde brothers, the representatives of the then French aristocracy, and Madame Defarge, Ernest Defarge, Gaspard, the Jacques, the Vengeance and the Mendor of Roads, the then French peasant workers, clash each other. The Marquis

¹ Jacques is not any particular name given to the specific character, but the name given to a revolutionary firebrand. Every revolutionary firebrand is Jacques.

² The vengeance is not the name of any person. It is the name given to a woman who is ruthless, heartless, bloodthirsty vindictive. It symbolizes all the vindictive and ruthless revolutionaries.

d'Evremonde, being guided by his philosophy of repression, exploits and suppresses the peasants to keep his aristocracy intact. For example, he rapes a young peasant girl to death, kills Graspand's son by his carriage and commits, with the help of the justice minister, Dr. Manette to the prison. Dickens criticizes the aristocrats for exploiting the workers.

In contrast to his sympathy to the workers, Dickens is not in favour of setting the proletariats free, thereby granting freedom. He has sympathy for the proletariats, but he belittles them when they wage war to uproot the exploiters. For example, Dickens portrays Madame Defarge, who has the mission to set herself and other workers free, as a revolutionary leader driven by the notion of revenge to convey the message that the French Revolution was nothing other than the outburst of chaos and terror caused by revenge, and his characterization of Sydney Carton, who chooses his own death to save Charles Darnay, only living member of the Evremonde family, Dickens exposes his anti-revolutionary view that the workers should die for the sake of their enemies.

I use Marxist perspective, especially Karl Marx's theory of consciousness and George Lukac's *History and Class Consciousness*, to study the class and class consciousness portrayed in Charles Dickens' *A Tale of Two Cities*.

Karl Marx interprets the human consciousness from the materialist point of view. To Karl Marx, the formation of ideas, conception and consciousness can never be independent of the material activity and the material intercourse of men. He writes: "Life is not determined by consciousness, but consciousness by life" (625). In line with Karl Marx, George Lukacs, in *History and class consciousness*, criticizes individual bourgeois philosophy of the subject which regards the subject as the voluntary and conscious; the exterior universal and contemplating subject, separated

from the object, contemplating based on Kant's epistemology, and gives the human consciousness the dialectical materialistic light as, "It is not man's consciousness that determines their existence, but on the contrary, their social existence that determines their consciousness" (283).

In *A Tale of Two Cities* too, the proletariats become conscious and fight against their enemies, and their consciousness is contextual as stated by Karl Marx and George Lukacs. In the novel, the proletariats— Malame Defarge, Ernest Defarge, Gaspard, the Jacques, the Vengeance and The Mendor of Roads— have antagonistic relation with the aristocrats, the Evremondes. The aristocrats exploit and suppress the workers or the proletariats. When the aristocrats exploit and suppress the workers, they become consciousness about their class and socio-economic condition.

The aristocrats exploit and suppress the proletariats. The proletariats are marred by poverty. They can do nothing without being reminded of poverty. After having their food snatched, the proletariats are compelled to eat the leaves of grass, spare-onions, and the like to satisfy their hunger. The poverty which they have been living with make them conscious about their socio-economic condition and energizes the proletariats to fight against the aristocracy.

In addition to exploitation, the oppression of the proletariats in the hands of the aristocrats renders the former to consciousness. When the aristocrats use their influence in the state mechanism and wealth extracted from common people through excessive tax and plunder to suppress the proletariats, the later become conscious about their class-ideology. For example, the peasant become conscious that they do not have state and they have to fight against and uproot the aristocracy to establish their own state when the justice minister, who represents the government agency in

the novel, helps the Evremonde brothers send Dr. Manette to the prison instead of punishing the Marquis.

Thus in Charles Dickens' *A Tale of Two Cities*, the proletariat's consciousness is dependent on their material activities, and their social existence determines their consciousness.

Different scholars and critics have analyzed, criticized and interpreted Charles Dickens' *A Tale of Two Cities* from different angles and perspectives. Some of them have accused Dickens of having biased views towards the working class and other have praised his artistic skill.

George Orwell and Harvey Chisic criticize Charles Dickens for exaggeration of violence and undermining the revolutionaries and revolution in *A Tale of Two Cities*.

George Orwell in his essay "Charles Dickens" opines that Charles Dickens exaggerates horror and terror caused by the revolution in his novel, *A Tale of Two Cities*. "Though he quotes no figure, he gives the impression of a frenzied massacre lasting for years, whereas in reality the whole of the terror, so far as the number of death goes was a joke compared with one of Napoleon's battle" (8) To George Orwell, "Dickens exaggerates the terror and horror of the revolution without referring to the real historical figure" (5). George Orwell states that Charles Dickens' *A Tale of Two Cities* is identical to the reign of terror. Whole novel is dominated by the mass butcheries, the injustice, the ever present terror of species, the frightful bloodlust of the mob, bloody knives and head bouncing into the basket. Dickens regards revolution as monster; it does not do good to the people. George Orwell opines that Dickens has misinterpreted The French Revolution by highlighting the drawbacks of the

revolution, whereas Harvey Chisic says that Charles Dickens does not have sympathy towards the revolutionaries and revolution in *A Tale of Two Cities*.

For Chisic, Charles Dickens does not have sympathy towards the revolutionaries because he portrays the revolutionary characters— Madame Defarge, Ernest Defarge, the Vengeance, The Jacques and the Mendor of Roads— as “ignorant, fickle, violent, brutal and vengeful in *A Tale of Two Citeis*” (275). The portrayal of the revolutionary characters and his treatment of revolution as “the outbreak of uncontrolled savage mob” (277) exposes Charles Dickens’ negative view towards the revolution and revolutionaries in his novel, *A Tale of Two Cities*, opines Harvery Chisic. Chisic is of the opinion that Charles Dickens exaggerates the violent aspect of the revolutionary without considering its causes. Chisic writes about the exaggeration of the violence committed by the revolutionaries as, “The description of the taking of the Bastille culminates in the murder of its commander, de Launay, the serving of his head by Madame Defarge, and seven heads on picks which seem immediately to have the price of the seven prisoners released” (275). The revolutionaries behead the commander and other seven officers as the price of the seven released prisoners. Dickens characterizes the revolutionaries as violent and vengeful, but he is silent about what makes the revolutionaries violent, and Harvey Chisic opines that Dickens writes that “the crowd is dangerous and headlong, but he does not tell why the crowd (of revolutionaries) is dangerous and headlong” (274).

In line with George Orwell and Harvey Chisic, this thesis states that Charles Dickens— in *A Tale of Two Cities*— exaggerates the horror and terror caused by The French Revolution. The critics write about Chrles Dickens’ exaggeration of horror and terror caused by the French Revolution, but they do not speak about Dickens’ intention behind the exaggeraton of horror and terror caused by the French Revolution

in *A Tale of Two Cities*. The thesis claims that Dickens exaggerates horror and terror caused by the French Revolution to belittle the peasant workers' revolution against their oppressors. Dickens criticizes hypocrisy, injustice and corruption pervaded in the society, and says that the aristocrats should not exploit and oppress the workers.

Charles Dickens fears the changes brought by the revolution; and because of the fear of the change, he disapproves the revolution and the revolutionary activities. He says that the pathetic condition of the workers should be improved but they should not get freedom by waging the revolution. Charles Dickens is against workers' freedom. He wants to deviate the workers from the idea of revolution. He intentionally creates the terror and horror to leave the false impression that if the workers wage war against their oppressors (aristocrats), it does not set them free but creates chaos, disorder and terror. Dickens takes Madame Defarge's life before the revolution gets completed. Through the death of Madame Defarge, he conveys the message that if the workers wage war (revolution) against aristocrats, their revolution does not exterminate the enemies, but it eliminates themselves. Charles Dickens, through the exaggeration of horror and terror caused by the French Revolution, demeans the revolution and the activities of the revolutionaries, thereby to deviate the workers from the idea of revolution so that they may not get chance to be free.

Other critics such as J.M. Rignall and Philip V. Allingham interpret Charles Dickens' *A Tale of Two Cities* from historical point of view.

Philip V. Allingham talks about Charles Dickens' artistic skill of making the French Revolution live in his novel, *A Tale of Two Cities*. Allingham states that "the French revolution exists in *A Tale of Two Cities* only in so far as Dickens' characters vivify it, live through it, react to it, and make its reality manifest to the readers" (488). For example, the rape and subsequent death of Terese Defarge's sister, the brutal

killing of the victim's husband and brother, and the imprisonment of Dr. Manette, refer to the crimes committed by the Evremonde brothers, the symbol of the French aristocracy. Similarly, Gaspard's attack on the Marquis d'Evremonde refers to the workers' retaliation against exploitation and suppression. Allingham opines that Charles Dickens makes the history (of The French Revolution) live in *A Tale of Two Cities* but J.M. Rignall says that Charles Dickens presents his own vision of history and the historical process in it.

J.M. Rignall, in *Dickens and Catastrophic Continuum of History in— A Tale of Two Cities—* states that the historical development is stated to be too deterministic “as oppression is shown to breed oppressions, violence to beget violence, evil to provoke evils” (575). In the process of historical development, the oppressed class ascends to power through violent means, and after ascending to power, it commences to oppress other class(es) which is (are) not in power. Again the oppressed class/es ascends/ascend to power through violent means. This process keeps on continuing. J.M. Rignall says that to solve this deterministic pattern of history, Charles Dickens presents his own vision of history. For Dickens, writes J.M. Rignall, “It is the Christ-like intervention of self-sacrificing individual that is the vehicle for a vision of a better world which seems to lie beyond time and history” (575). It's Charles Dickens' personal vision of history and the historical process that he presents to solve the deterministic pattern of history.

J.M. Rignall writes about Dickens' personal vision of history and the historical process in *A Tale of Two Cities*, but he does not examine the reasons behind Dickens' presentation of his personal vision of history. The thesis exposes the reasons behind Charles Dickens' presentation of his personal vision of history and the historical process in *A Tale of Two Cities*. It claims that great politics has been implied in

Dickens' personal vision of history and the historical process. In *A Tale of Two Cities*, Sydney Carton, a worker employed as an assistant of Stryver, makes sacrifice by choosing his own death to save Charles Darnay, the only living member of the Evremonde family, the symbol of the French aristocracy. Through the sacrifice of Sydney Carton, Dickens conveys the message that the workers should die to save the aristocrats. Dickens' personal vision of history exposes his anti-revolutionary view in *A Tale of Two Cities*.

Alligham too interpret Dickens' *A Tale of Two Cities* from historical point of view. He praises Dickens' artistic skill of making the revolution live in the novel, but Alligham does not examine Dickens' position on the peasant revolution. This thesis claims that Charles Dickens shows his sympathy to the aristocrats. He, through the death of Sydney Carton, opines that the workers should die for the sake of their oppressors, the aristocrats, and through the death of Madame Defarge, he leaves the false message that if the workers wage the war of freedom against the aristocrats, their war/revolution destroys themselves instead of setting them free and exterminating their enemies.

After conducting research on Charles Dickens' *A Tale of Two Cities*, the researcher found that Charles Dickens' ideas, in the novel, have been determined by his socio-economic condition; Dickens writes against the exploitation and suppression of the workers because of his first-hand experience of poverty, exploitation, suppression injustice, corruption and hypocrisy, but as a middle class man, he fears the workers revolution and their freedom.

Charles Dickens was born to Johan Dickens in the poor family. His father's earning was not enough for his family's upbringing. An unfortunate event came in Dickens' life when his father lost job and the entire family was taken to the Marshall

Sea Prison, Charles Dickens got an opportunity to observe the condition of the prison and prisoners. Because of the poverty and his father being in the debtor's prison, "Charles Dickens had to work 12 hours a day for 6 shilling a weeks" (Spooner 18). He was only 12 years of age when he had to work at a shoe blackening factory, and he was exploited and suppressed very hard. All these events make Charles Dickens sentimental towards the working class, and he is of the opinion that the aristocrats should not exploit and suppress the workers.

But Charles Dickens, as a middle class man, fears the peasant revolution and their freedom. In the novel, Dickens states that the aristocrats should not exploit and suppress the proletariats, for example, Marquis d'Evremonde should not have raped a young peasant girl; he should not have killed Gaspard's son; he should not have committed Dr. Manette to the prison, and the justice minister should have punished the Marquis instead of helping him. But Dickens is against their freedom. He does not condone the activities of the revolutionaries; he regards their revolution as the war fought for the revenge by the lunatics.

Above all, Dickens' characterization of Madame Defarge and Sydney Carton shows what sort of view he possesses towards the proletariats and their revolution. Madame Defarge has been characterized as a revolutionary leader deviated from the philosophy of revolution and driven by the notion of the revenge politics. Because of her preoccupation with revenge, she dies in a fight with Miss Pross before the revolution gets completed. On the other hand, Sydney Carton sacrifices his own life to save Charles Darnay. After analyzing the characterization of these two characters, we can claim that Dickens is in favour of the aristocracy although he criticizes the aristocrats for their excessive exploitation and suppression of the proletariats.

Thus, Dicken's class-ideology determines his views towards the proletariats in *A Tale of Two Cities*.

The thesis shall have the following chapters.

Chapter I: Portrayal of class struggle in Dickens *A Tale of Two Cities*: This chapter deals with the issues of class struggle portrayed in Charles Dickens' *A Tale of Two Cities*. In the novel, there is antagonism between the aristocracy and the working class. The Evremonde brothers, the representatives of the aristocracy, exploit and suppress the proletariats: Gaspard, the Jacques, the Vengeance, Madame Defarge, Ernest Defarge and The Mender of Roads. The proletariats become conscious about their class-ideology because of the appalling poverty and exploitation (by aristocrats). This chapter especially gives the introduction of the whole thesis.

Chapter II: Ideological Consciousness Leads to Freedom: This chapter shows how class consciousness leads to freedom. The proletariats have antagonistic relation with the aristocrats. The Evremonde brothers, the representatives of the French aristocrats, exploit and suppress the proletariats.

Poverty is another factor that makes the proletariats conscious about their class and socio-economic status. The aristocrats spend extravagant life; they organize grand parties in the luxurious hotel, where many servants are employed to serve them. But the proletariats are made destitute by over taxation. As a result, they have to starve to death. This sort of economic inequality makes the proletariats conscious that they must exterminate their food snatchers if they have to live.

The government in *A Tale of Two Cities* is discriminatory in its behavior: it blindly supports the activities carried out by the aristocrats no matter whether they are right or wrong, but it penalizes those who raises voice against the crimes committed by the aristocrats. For example, the state helps the Evremonde brothers punish Dr. Manette for the latter's protest against the Marquis d'Evremonde's rape of a young peasant girl. It indicates that the government has been formed to suppress and exploit the proletariats. This bitter reality teaches the works the lesson that they must sabotage the aristocratic government to form their own government.

After being conscious, the proletariat wage war against the exploitative and suppressive aristocracy and kill their enemies: Marquis d'Evrenmode, the symbol of the oppressive and exploitative aristocracy; king Louis XVI and Queen Marie Antoinette, the monarchs; and Charles Darnay, the symbol of less severe aristocracy. The proletariat get their revolution completed and they form their own government.

Chapter III: Dickens disapproves the French Revolution: This chapter endeavors to expose Dickens' intention of the exaggeration of terror and horror caused by the French revolution.

Dickens opines that the revolutionaries, Madame Defarge, Ernest Defarge, Gaspard, the Jacques, the Vengeance and the Mendar of Roads, are deviated from the philosophy of revolution and are guided by the notion of revenge, for example, Madame Defarge says that Charles Darnay, who is not involved in the crimes committed by the Evremonde brothers and has fought against the aristocracy by denouncing the aristocratic title, patrimony and inheritance, must be guillotined only because he is the surviving member of the Evremonde family, which has exterminated her family.

To Dickens, the proletariat revolution creates horror and terror; it does not set the working class free. Rather it destroys those who breed it. To convey this message, he takes Madame Defarges' life away before the revolution completes.

Dickens exaggerates horror and terror caused by the French revolution to leave the false impression of the activities of the revolutionaries and their revolution, and through Sydney Carton's death, he expresses his anti-revolutionary view that the workers should not fight against their enemies and should sacrifice their lives to save their enemies like Sydney Carton, who dies to save Darnay from being guillotined in the hands of the revolutionaries

Chapter IV:

This chapter deals with portrayal of The French Revolution in Dickens' *A Tale of Two Cities*. Dickens states that the appalling poverty, exploitation and suppression compel the proletariat to choose the revolution as their destiny. But, as a middle class man, he never condones the activities of the revolutionaries and their revolution.

II: Ideological Consciousness Leads to Freedom

In *A Tale of Two Cities*, there is class struggle between the proletariats and the aristocrats; the proletariats become conscious about their class identity and ideology of their class because of their constant antagonistic relationship with the aristocrats, and the consciousness enables them to overthrow the aristocratic government.

Charles Dickens sets his novel, *A Tale of Two Cities*, in the years between 1775 and 1793. In the novel, he deals with the socio-political order of the pre-revolutionary France³. Dickens selects the characters from different classes to depict the pre-revolutionary French society, for example, the Evremonde brothers and the monarchs belong to the privileged classes or Estates, whereas Madame Defarge, Ernest Defarge, the Vengeance, the Jacques and The Mendor of Roads belong to the Third Estate or Class.

As represented in Dickens's *A Tale of Two Cities*, Marquis d'Evreonde, who represents the Evremonde family, the symbol of the exploitative and suppressive French aristocracy, is an aristocrats. The Marquis has close relationship with the then government. The law of the state do not limit his crimes. The Marquis exploit and suppress the proletariats. He commits the crimes, and the state, instead of punishing him, makes his crime legal. The Marquis has also great influence in the state mechanism. His high-handedness becomes obvious when we read Dr. Manette's

³ Socio-political order of pre-revolutionary French society was divided into three Estates or classes: The First Estate, The Second Estate and Third Estate. The former two estates were the privileged Estates, which had privileges, for example, tax exemption, and had also access to high offices of the state administration. But The Third Estate did not enjoy any privileges. Rather they were exploited and suppressed by the government and the privileged classes. The political system of the pre-revolutionary French political system was absolute monarchy.

letter, in which he writes: “The Marquis took from his pocket the letter I had written, showed it me, burnt it in the light of lantern that was held, and extinguished the ashes with his foot” (283). The Marquis d’Eвреmonde rapes a young peasant girl to death. After having raped the girl, the Evреmonde brothers force Dr. Manette to cure the girl, but he can not save the dying girl. They try to bribe Dr. Manette with the Rouleau of gold. Dr. Manette, instead of accepting bribe, writes a letter to the justice minister demanding the culprit be punished. The justice minister should have punished the Evреmonde brother because he, after getting Dr. Manette’s letter, knows that the Evреmonde brothers have committed heinous crimes by raping a young peasant girl to death and trying to bribe Dr. Manette with rouleau of gold. The justice minister does not find them guilty; in his eyes, the crimes committed by the Evреmonde brothers are not punishable. Rather the justice minister hands over the letter to the Evреmonde brothers. It shows that the Marquis has great influence in the state mechanism (through the justice minister). The Marquis shows Dr. Manette the letter, which he had sent to the justice minister to humiliate, torture and to show that he has great influence in the state mechanism, thereby to oppress the potential protest against their crimes. The close relationship between the Evреmonde brothers and the justice minister reminds us of the close relationship that was between the privileged estates and the monarchy of the pre-revolutionary France.

Marquis d’Eвреmonde enjoys the privilege of tax exemption. His privilege of tax exemption refers to the complex relationship between the privileged classes and the absolute monarchy of the pre-revolutionary France. The monarchs had established their privileged status “through separate law codes for their members and by tax exemption” (McPhee 18). As stated by McPhee, the monarch had established their privileged status, but he had to depend on the privileged classes to keep his absolute

power enact and for his status. The monarch needed the support and good will of the privileged classes. The privileged classes had also to depend on monarch(s) to get privileges from the government, for example, tax exemption. As the price of their support and humble obedience, “the king accepted that the nobles would be at the pinnacle of every institution from the Church to the armed forces, from the judiciary to his own administration” (McPhee 18). The Marquis does not have to pay tax, but the proletariats of the village, to which he serves as the lord, pay tax to him. He has also been accepted to be at pinnacle of the judicial institution: “he is one of the great lord in power at the court” (87). After observing the Evremonde brothers’ influence in the state mechanism, their privileges of tax exemption and The Marquis’s position at the court, we can call them aristocrats.

Marquis d’Evremonde’s extravagant life style qualifies him as an aristocrat. He is indifferent towards the sufferings and miseries of the poor people. The Marquis, known as the Monseigneur among the peasants, lives in Chateau⁴ surrounded by the starving homeless peasants. The Peasants around his Chetan are starving, but the Marquis is indifferent towards their hunger and sufferings. Rather he is interested in organizing a grand party in his luxurious hotel in Paris attended by the noble gentleman. He has many servants to prepare food in his party. About the extravagant life style of the Marquis, Charles Dickens writes, “Monseigneur could swallow a great many thing with ease, and was by some few sullen minds supposed to be rather rapidly swallowing France; but his morning’s chocolate could not so much as get into the throat of monseigneur, without the aid of four strong men besides the cook” (87). Dickens, in this remark, states about the exploitative nature of the aristocrats. Dickens becomes angry when the aristocrats do not show their sympathy to the poor workers,

⁴ The magnificent luxurious building.

and speaks against them. Marquis d'Evremonde is a lord at the court, he does not have to obey the laws of state. Rather he can use the laws of state in his favour, i.e., the justice minister hands over Dr. Manette's letter to him. He has great influence in the state mechanism and misuses the state power. For example, he rapes a young peasant girl to death, and tries to bribe Dr. Manette to save his crime from being exposed. The justice minister hands over Dr. Manette's letter to him, which helps him to abduct and commit Dr. Manette to the prison. Here, he through the justice minister, uses the state power in his favour because of his influence in the state mechanism. The Marquis commits crimes and exploits the people, but nobody has courage to raise voice against the crimes committed by him. If anyone goes against him, he is abducted and sent to jail like Dr. Manette. The Marquis is a local lord of the village. The dwellers of his village are made destitute by over taxation. The peasants have nothing left to eat, but he organizes a grand party in his luxurious hotel in Paris. There is state, but the proletariats or the workers, because of its discriminatory behaviour, feel that they do not have state. The economy is dwindling, and the poor people are starving to death. But the Marquis is rolling in luxury and wealth extracted from the peasants through taxation. In this sense, Marquis d'Evremonde is swallowing France. The Marquis is the symbol of the suppressive and exploitative aristocracy of the pre-revolutionary France. To say the Marquis is swallowing France is to say the French aristocracy is swallowing France. But irony is that the Marquis, who could swallow whole France, cannot get his mornings' chocolate into his mouth without the help of his servants, for example, in a grand party organized by him, four strong men besides the cook help him get his morning's chocolate into his throat.

In addition to Marquis d'Evremonde's extravagant life style, his influence in the state mechanism and his position at the court, the title "Marquis or Monseigneur"

that is used to address him and his family members indicates that they are aristocrats. The title has great significance. It has connection with the power that the Evremondes possess. It separates them from the common people in terms of power and social status. The title symbolizes the power, privileges and the social status of the French aristocrats. There is close connection between the title and the aristocrats: an aristocrat can not remain (as) aristocrat if he is separated from the title, Monseigneur or Marquis. The title also establishes the hierarchy in the society and in the family as well. For example, Charles Evremonde also known as Charles Darnay, in his conversation with his uncle, Marquis d'Evremonde, says, "I would abandon it and live otherwise and elsewhere. It is little to relinquish. What is it but a wilderness of misery and ruin?" (105). Charles Darnay shows his great objection to the title because he thinks that their title is tainted with the blood and sweat of the proletariats. Charles Evremonde's view conveys the message that the title has close connection with the suppression and exploitation of the proletariats. To accept title, for him, is to accept to exploit and suppress the poor peasants. His views of the proletariats are quite different from his uncle's views. He is of the opinion that the aristocrats should not exploit and suppress the proletariats. In line with his view of the proletariats, he decides to denounce the title (Monseigneur or Marquis), patrimony (Evremonde) and inheritance (Charles Evremonde is the heir to the title and property of Marquis d'Evremonde, his uncle). After denouncing the title, patrimony and inheritance, Charles Evremonde changes his name from Charles Evremonde to Charles Darnay. Along with the abandonment of the title, patrimony and inheritance, and the change in his name, Charles Darnay changes into the common people from the man with special privileges. Now he works as a French tutor in England, he has lost the privileges, for example, tax exemption. Along with this separation from inheritance, patrimony and

title, Charles Darnay gets separated from the French aristocracy. Thus, the title “Marquis or Monseigneur” that is used to address the Evremondes indicates that they are the aristocrats.

And other Characters—Ernest Defarge, Madame Defarge, the Jacques, the Vengeance, Gaspard and the Mendor of Roads— are the proletariats or the workers in the novel, *A Tale of Two Cities*. Charles Dickens, in *A Tale of Two Cities*, deals with socio-political order of the pre-revolutionary French society. About the social status and the identity of the people of the then French Society Peter McPhee, in *The French Revolution: 1789-1799*, examines that “France in the 1780s was a society in which the people’s deepest sense of identity attached to their particular province or pays” (6). As stated by McPhee, the identity of the people in the then French society was based on the pay or tax. Those who enjoyed the privilege of tax exemption and paid only limited tax by their will were the nobles or aristocrats, and those who paid tax to the government and the privileged classes were the workers, who did not get any privileges from the government.

In Dickens’s *A Tale of Two Cities* too, the revolutionaries or the peasant workers represented by Ernest Defarge, Madame Defarge, the Jacques, the Vengeance and Gaspard, the dwellers of Saint Antoine and the dwellers of the village to which the Marquis serves as the lord are forced to pay tax to the government and the privileged classes. They have been made destitute by over taxation. About the poverty of the peasants, Dickens writes:

Expressive signs of what made them poor, were not wanting; the tax for the state, the tax for the Church, the tax for the lord, tax local and tax general, were to be paid here and to be paid there, according to

solemn inscription in the little village, until the wonder was that there was any village left unswallowed. (96)

The peasants are made destitute by the government. The peasants have to abide by the rules and regulation of the then government, according to which they have to pay tax to the government, to the local lord, to the agent of the king, to the Church, and to whom not. If they do not pay the tax, they are punished. The peasants work hard in the farm, but what they produce goes to the monarchs and the privileged classes. The nobles or the aristocrats are in the state power and the government has been formed to represent their interests. The aristocrats have formed the government to suppress and exploit the peasants. The peasants do not have any role in the government. The peasants labour hard, but their earning is snatched by the ruling class. As a result, they are separated from their own labour and they have to die of starvation. In this sense, the peasants or the revolutionaries are proletariats.

In contrast to the aristocrats, the peasant workers or the proletariats are made destitute by over taxation and exploitation. The proletariats work hard in the field, but what they produce goes to the ruling class, the aristocrats. The aristocrats plunder the houses of the peasant workers time and again. But they (the proletariats) can not retaliate against the nobles. Charles Dickens presents the picture of the dwellers of the small village, to which the Marquis serves as lord as:

All its people were poor, and many of them were sitting at their doors, shredding spare onions and the like for supper, while many were at the fountain, washing leaves, and grasses, and any such small yielding of the earth that could be eaten. (96)

Charles Dickens presents the poverty of the dwellers of the village to which the Marquis serves as the lord to show that the proletariats are not born poor, but they are

made poor by the exploitation and suppression. The dwellers of this village are so destitute that they take help of spare onions, grass, the leaves of the plants and other grass like plant to satisfy their hunger. They are poor because they have to pay tax to the agent of king, to the Church, to the government, to the local lord, to whom not. This is the rule of the village. Dickens presents the inequality persisted between the proletariats and the aristocrats, and shows that the very inequality compels the former to choose violent revolution.

The French aristocrats use power and wealth to suppress and exploit the peasants or the revolutionaries. They believe that they can keep their social status and their domination over the revolutionaries or the proletariats by suppressing and exploiting them. To suppress and keep the proletariats obedient to them, the aristocrats use power and wealth. The Marquis d'Evremonde is one of the powerful lords at the royal court, and he has influence in the state mechanism. He is able to keep close relationship with the state mechanism because of his class. The Marquis uses his influence in the state mechanism and his position at the royal court to suppress and exploit the proletariats or the workers. For example, the justice minister co-operates with the Marquis to abduct and commit Dr. Manette to the prison. Instead of punishing the Evremonde brothers, the justice minister, hands over Dr. Manette's letter to them, which the Marquis shows to Dr. Manette: "The Marquis took from his pocket the letter I had written, showed it me" (283). The Marquis d'Evremonde rapes a young peasant girl to death. Dr. Manette, in his protest letter, gives information about the Marquis' crimes to the justice minister. The justice minister does not show his concern to the victim, but he helps Evremonde brothers suppress Dr. Manette who raises voice against the crimes committed by the aristocrats. In this sense, the Marquis uses state power (through justice minister) to suppress the proletariats.

The Marquis and his brother use force and wealth to exploit the peasants and to suppress those who go against their crimes. The Marquis has raped young peasant girls to death; he has killed her family members in protest, but he does not show any concern to these dead. He treats them as if they are animals. Rather the Evremonde brothers are concerned about not letting their crimes to be exposed. As Dr. Manette is the only eyewitness of their crimes, they start intimidating him: “Dr Manette, the things that you see here, are things to be seen, and not spoken of” (280). “Things to be seen, and not spoken of” implies that the aristocrats have right to exploit the proletariats, and the proletariats, in turn, should feel their crimes, torture, suppression and exploitation, but they (the proletariats) are not allowed to go against the aristocrats’ actions whether they are right or wrong.

The Evremonde brothers also uses wealth extracted from the peasants through tax to suppress the protest directed against them when Dr. Manette seems not to be convinced by their intimation, the Evremonde brothers try to bribe him. It becomes obvious when we read Dr. Manette’s letter written in the prison. In the letter Dr. Manette writes:

Early in the morning the rouleau of gold was left at my door in a little box with my name on the outside. From the first, I had anxiously considered what I ought to do. I decided, that day, to write privately to the minister, stating the nature of the two cases to which I had been summoned, and the place to which I had gone in effect, stating all the circumstances. I knew what court influence was, and what the immunities of the nobles were, and I expected that the matter would never be heard of; but, I wished to relieve my own mind. (282)

Dr. Manette's letter exposes how the aristocrats misuse the wealth extracted from the sweat and blood of the peasants. The Marquis rapes a peasant girl to death, and forces Dr. Manette to take bribe. The Evremonde brothers leave the rouleau of gold at Dr. Manette's door to press him not to go against them. Dr. Manette writes a protest letter to the justice minister, but he says that the aristocrats have influence in the court and are granted immunities from punishment. Because of their influence in the court, the protest against the aristocrats is never heard in the court. It shows that the aristocrats misuse the state power and wealth to exploit and suppress the peasant workers, and there is no meaning in protesting against the crimes of the nobles because the state has granted them immunities from punishment.

The Evremonde brothers take help of terror to take entertainment. The Marquis regards the proletariat as his private toys to take entertainment; he has unique hobby to "see the common people dispersed before his horse and often barely escaping from being run down" (92). The Marquis has contemptible hobby to make these poor peasants suffer, and to laugh at their sorrows, difficulties, sufferings and miseries. The Marquis orders his men to drive his carriage very quickly in the narrow streets without footways so that the wretched people may hardly escape. When the peasants hear wild rattle and clatter of the Marquis' carriage, they become terrified and commence to disperse with loud cry of help. After seeing these people, the Marquis gets satisfied. The Marquis intentionally creates terror by his carriage to take entertainment. About the terror caused by Marquis' carriage, Dickens writes, "The carriage dashed through streets and swept round corners, with women screaming before it, and men clutching each other and clutching children out of its way" (92). To drive his carriage in the congested area is the Marquis' hobby. He orders his men to drive carriage very fast to create horror and terror in the peasant workers. The terrified

peasants' sufferings and miseries make the Marquis happy and complacent. In the passage, Charles Dickens explicates Marquis d'Evremonde's reckless driving and the common wretches' suffering and difficulties in escaping caused by his carriage. The Marquis drives with a wild rattle and clatter. The rattle and clatter of his carriage becomes so dreadful that the men and women with their children starts dispersing with loud cry and the cry of the terrified people make the Marquis complacent. After seeing the people being hurt and wounded by his carriage, the Marquis becomes cool and satisfied. Thus, the sorrows and sufferings of the proletariats become Marquis' source of entertainment.

The French aristocrats compare the human sentiment and feeling with money (wealth). They think that they can buy the lives of the proletariats. The aristocrats compare the proletariats' lives with money. The Marquis, the representative of the French aristocrats, throws a gold coin with contempt as the price of the child when his carriage runs over and kills Gaspard's son, and says, "Why does he make that abominable noise? It is his child?" (92). The Marquis is not disturbed by the death of Gaspard's child, but he is disturbed by the loud cry "dead" (94) of Gaspard. He does not check whether his carriage has killed the peasants. When he knows that he has killed Gaspard's son, he throws a gold coin to be picked up and spent by Gasparad. The Maruis does not pay attention to the sufferings and miseries of the bereaved Gaspard, who has lost his son. He compares Gasprad's sentiment and feeling with the money, and he thinks that the proletariats can forget their dead ones if they get money. He thinks that what Gaspard needs is money, but he does not understand Gaspard's sentiment.

For the Marquis, the proletariats are less valuable than animals. When he runs over Gaspard's son, he is not worried about the dead child and the bereaved father but

about the injury sustained by his horses: “You people cannot take care of yourselves and your children. One or the other of you is forever in the way. How do I know that injury you have done my horses?” (94). Marquis d’Evremonde complains about the reckless activities of the peasants and becomes angry with them because they are always seen in the street. The Marquis says that the peasants’ careless act of letting their children play in the road has disturbed him, and suggests them to be careful. But he does not think that he has made mistake by killing the innocent child, and he does not think that it is his duty to be careful while driving his carriage. Thus, he is very much worried about his horses, and does not spend a word to console the bereaved Gaspard.

The Evremonde brothers do not have sympathy for the peasants. They roll in luxury and wealth extracted from the sweat and blood of the proletariats through tax, and sometimes through the means of pillaging and plundering. The Evremonde brothers suppress and exploit the proletariats or the workers as much as they can. They do not do any work except exploiting the proletariats, but they accumulate wealth. The peasants are the source of their wealth, but the aristocrats do not think that it is, for them, necessary to console and help the peasant workers when they are in great trouble and distress. They are only concerned about their well-being and comfort. For them the peasant are born to work for them (the aristocrats). When the Marquis arrives in the small village to which he serves as a lord, a woman, who has recently lost her husband, presents herself to him, and says, “My petition is, that a morsel of stone or wood, with my husband’s name may be placed over him to show where he lies” (99). The husband of this wailing woman has died of “want” (99). “To show where he lies” indicates that many peasants have died of want, and it is impossible to distinguish one dead body from others, which lay under the heap of

poor grass. The word “Want” refers to the hunger of the proletariats. The proletariats died of want; the proletariats are dying of want, and the proletarians are about to die of want, but the ruling class pays no attention to their miseries. The wailing woman wants to make her husband’s grave marked or distinguished, and she asks for a morsel of stone or wood to make her husband’s tomb so that she can recognize which grave is her husband’s. But the Marquis d’Eвреmonde does not show his concern to the wailing woman’s sufferings and continues his journey to his chateau. Through the wailing woman, Dickens shows the aristocrats’ indifference towards the pathetic condition of the proletariats.

The monarchial government, in *A Tale of Two Cities*, is biased. The government seems to have formed to represent and safeguard the interests and rights of the monarchy and the privileged classes or the aristocrats. The monarchs and the aristocrats have rights to impose tax on the proletariats indiscriminately, and they enjoy the privilege of tax exemption. The ruling classes, the monarchs and the privileged classes spend extravagant life, but the proletariats are left to starve to death. There is inequality between these classes. The government has been formed to maintain this inequality. There is government, but the proletariats or the workers do not feel secure. Rather the proletariats are exploited and suppressed by the state. The state is just like what Louis Althusser writes in his book *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*:

The Marxist tradition is strict, here in the *Communist Manifesto* and the *Eighteenth Brumair* (and in all the latter classical texts, above all in Marx’s writings on the Paris Commune and Lenin’s on *State and Revolution*), the state is explicitly conceived as a repressive apparatus. The state is a ‘machine’ of repression which enables the ruling classes

to ensure their domination over the working class, thus enabling the former to subject the latter. (92)

According to Althusser, for the Marxist thinkers, state is a 'machine' of repression, which exploits and represses the working class. The organs of the state— the police, the court, the prisons, the army and the government administration— are used to repress the working class. The state enables the ruling class(es) to ensure their domination over the working class through coercive means.

In Dicken *A Tale of Two Cities* too, the state is repressive. The monarchs and the aristocrats are in the state power. The Evremonde brothers use the state power to exploit and suppress the peasants workers. The Marquis d'Evremonde himself is one of the powerful lord at the royal court, and he has also influence in the state mechanism. The state legalizes the crimes committed by the aristocrats. For example, the justice minister hands over Dr. Manette's letter to the Marquis which helps the Marquis abduct and commit Dr. Manette to the prison, the Bastille. Charles Dickens presents the horrible picture of Dr. Manette's abduction:

When I was clear of the house, a black muffler was drawn tightly over my mouth from behind, and my arms were pinioned. The two brothers crossed the road from a dark corner, and identified me with a single gesture. The Marquis took from his pocket the letter I had written, showed it me, burnt it in the light of a lantern that was held, and extinguished the ashes with his foot. Not a word was spoken. I was brought here, I was brought to my living grave. (283)

Dr. Manette is sent to the prison when he protests against the Marquis d'Evremonde's rape of the young peasant girl to death. The state does not punish the culprits: the Evremonde brothers. The state, through the justice minister, co-operates

with the culprits to punish Dr. Manette. The justice minister, after getting Dr. Manette's letter, in which he (Dr. Manette) demands the Evremonde brothers be punished because they have committed crimes by raping the peasant girl and trying to bribe him, should have punished the Evremonde brother. Instead, he hands over it to the culprits. The Evremonde brothers tie a black muffler over his mouth and pinion his arms, and abduct him. After his abduction, Dr. Manette is sent to prison. The state finds Dr. Manette guilty instead of the Evremonde brothers, who have raped a peasant girl, and sentences him to jail through the justice minister. The government legalizes the crimes committed by the aristocrats, and commits those who go against the crimes committed by the aristocrats to the prison. The government does not punish the Evremonde brothers because they are the member of the ruling class, the aristocracy.

The proletariats do not feel that they have government and the state to safeguard their interests and the rights. They have government, but it has been formed to exploit and suppress them. The state or the government has been a machine to crush the proletariats. The justice minister is not their justice minister, but the aristocrats. He does not judge on the basis of who is guilty and who is not but on the basis of who is from which class, for example, the justice minister does not find the Evremonde brothers guilty because they are aristocrats, but he finds Dr. Manette guilty because Dr. Manette is not an aristocrat, and he has raised voice in favour of the proletariats by writing a protest letter to him (the justice minister). The Evremonde brothers show Dr. Manette the letter, which he has sent to the justice minister, to convey the message that to go against the crimes committed by the aristocrats itself is crime and to exploit and suppress the proletariats is their right. Thus, the state is a repressive machine because it has been used to exploit and suppress the peasants,

thereby enabling the ruling class, the aristocrats, to ensure its domination over the workers.

Another example of the state's discriminatory behavior to its citizens is seen in the punishment of Gaspard, a peasant worker. The state does not behave equally to its citizen. There are different rules for different citizens. The state works in favour of some citizens and against others. It works to safeguard the interests and rights of the aristocrats and to exploit and suppress the peasant workers. If the aristocrats and the proletariats commit the same kind of crimes, the latter are punished for their crimes, but the formers are not punished. For example, both Gaspard, a peasant, and the Marquis, an aristocrat, get involved in murder. Though the nature of crime they have committed is different. The Marquis intentionally kills the peasant workers. He has killed many lives, for example, he has killed the peasant girl, her relatives and Gaspard's son. But the state does not find the Marquis guilty only because he is an aristocrat. Rather the justice minister co-operates with Marquis to abduct and commit Dr. Manette to the prison. After having killed Gaspard's son by his carriage, the Marquis shows no sympathy to the bereaved Gaspard. Instead of consoling Gaspard, he compares child's life with money by throwing a gold coin.

But Gaspard, in grief caused by the death of his son, stabs the Marquis to death. Then, the royal court finds Gaspard guilty, catches and puts him behind the bar only because he is a peasant worker. The royal court turns down Ernest Defarge's petition, "He was enraged and made mad by the death of his child" (145). The Defarge's petition is logical. To murder is crime, but Gaspard has murdered the murderer, who has murdered many lives. Gaspard has saved people from being killed by the Marquis; after the Marquis's death, there will be no death of innocent people. In this sense, Gaspard should have been acquitted, but the royal court finds him

guilty, and the government hangs him on “the forty feet high gallows and is left hanging” (146).

Marquis Evremonde states that oppression and exploitation should be the ideology of the (French) aristocracy. The Marquis sees the future of the aristocracy in the oppression and exploitation of the proletariat or the peasant workers. He opines that the aristocrats must exploit and suppress the working class to keep their aristocracy intact. Terry Eagleton defines ideology in *What is Ideology?* as: "Ideas and beliefs (whether they are true or false) which symbolize the condition and life-experience of a specific, socially significant group or class" (29). As stated by Terry Eagleton in *What is Ideology?* Marquis d'Evremonde belongs to the aristocratic class in France, and has specific beliefs and thinking about his class and the working class. To him, the aristocrats are superior to the peasants' workers. They have the right to exploit and suppress the proletariat. The proletariat should respect the aristocrats. The Marquis' thinking is that the proletariat or the peasants are born to be exploited, oppressed and humiliated. He is well aware that the workers or the lower class do not respect the aristocrats, but they should be compelled to do so: "Destiny of the high is the involuntary homage of the low" (104). It becomes obvious that the proletariat or the peasant workers do not support the aristocrats; they do not like suppression and exploitation done to them. They also love freedom.

But to the Marquis, if the aristocrats do not suppress and exploit the proletariat or the workers, the latter do not support the aristocratic government and go against it, and if the proletariat or the workers, do not support the aristocratic government and go against their (the aristocrats') rule, the aristocrats do not remain aristocrats. In line with his philosophy, the Marquis, in his conversation with his nephew, Charles Darnay, says that “repression will keep the dogs obedient to them”

(104). The Marquis teaches his nephew a lesson that only repression protects them and their aristocratic status.

The Evremonde brothers sexually exploit the tenants or the peasant workers. They regard the proletariats or the peasants as their private property but less valuable than their tamed animals. The aristocrats are allowed to exploit and suppress the peasant. They are not penalized by the state even if they commit the serious crimes. The aristocrats have right to have sex with their tenant girls, the shameful right. If they like the tenant girl no matter whether they are daughters, daughters-in-law, or mothers they may rape them. The aristocrats do not think that the tenant girls have prestige. They may rape the tenant girls even in front of their relatives. If the peasant girls deny to have sex with them and their relative refuse to lend the girls to them, their denial becomes cause of their own death. Charles Dickens writes about the agony of a peasant girl caused by the sexual exploitation as: “My husband, my father, and my brother one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten, eleven, twelve hush!” (280). These words uttered by the young peasant girl to Dr. Manette indicates her psychological breakdown. The Marquis rapes the peasant girl when she denies to have sex with him, and kills her brother and husband in protest. Because of humiliation and physical pain, she is emotionally hurt. She only utters the words, which are related to her rape and the killing of her family members. The numbers from one to twelve uttered by the raped girl refers to the pathetic condition of her husband, who, after being harnessed to carts, “sobbed twelve times, once for every stroke of the bell, and died on her bosom” (278).

The suppression and exploitation of the proletariats by the aristocrats make the former conscious about class, identity and socio-economic condition in Dickens *A Tale of Two Cities*. The proletariats become conscious about their class, identity and

social status; their consciousness is based on their material activity and their socio-economic existence as stated by Karl Marx in the *German Ideology*, and George Lukacs in *History and class consciousness*. Karl Marx writes: “Life is not determined by consciousness, but consciousness by life” (625). Marx opines that the production of ideas, conception and consciousness cannot be independent of material production of human beings and their material intercourse, but they are directly interwoven with the practical life process of human beings under definite condition. In line with Karl Marx, George Lukacs’s opinion about consciousness is that, “It is not men’s consciousness that determines their existence, but on the contrary their social existence that determines their consciousness” (15). Lukacs denies the individualist bourgeois philosophy of the subject, according to which the subject is regarded as the voluntary and conscious entity, and opines that the consciousness of subject is determined by the social context. In Dickens’s *A Tale of Two Cities* too, the proletariat characters— Ernest Defarge, Madame Defarge, Gaspard, the Jacques, the vengeance and the Mendor of Roads— are not self-conscious about their class and identity, but their social existence, their antagonistic relation with the aristocrats and appalling poverty, determines their consciousness.

The Marquis lives a extravagant life. He has magnificent house, Chatean, in the village to which he serves as the lord. He organizes a party in his grand hotel in Paris attended by the noble gentlemen. In the party, there are many servants to serve and care for him, for example, “his morning’s chocolate could not so much as get into the throat of Monseigneur, without the aid of four strong men beside the cook.” (87). On the other hand, the dwellers of the village are made destitute by over taxation. They are hungry, but they do not have anything to eat. They have to pay tax to the lord, to the agent of king, to the government and to the Church. What they produce

goes to the aristocrats, and they have to starve to death. About their poverty, Dickens writes: “many of them were sitting at their doors, shredding spare onions and the like for supper, while many were at the fountain, washing leaves, and grass, and any such small yielding of the earth that could be eaten” (96). After not having anything to eat, they take help of leaves of plants, grass and the like to satisfy their hunger. This sort of appalling poverty makes them conscious about their economic condition that until and unless they exterminate their food snatchers, they have to starve to death.

Suppression is another factor which renders the proletariat to consciousness. The Marquis says that “repression is the only lasting philosophy of aristocracy” (104). To him, the proletariat themselves do not love to be subordinated, and do not obey the aristocrats, but they must be repressed to be kept obedient to the whip. The Marquis is the man of action, he translates his word (his philosophy of repression) to action. The Marquis kills Gaspard’s son and compares Gaspard’s son’s life with gold coin. He throws a gold coin as the price of the child's life. He does not think that he has committed crimes after having killed the child. Instead of consoling the bereaved father, Gaspard, the Marquis complains to the workers about their carelessness, and says, “you people can not take care of yourself and your children” (94). The marquis also rapes a young beautiful peasant girl when she refuses to have sex with him, and the girl’s husband and brother are also killed in protest. The Marquis along with his brother commits Dr. Manette to the prison when Dr. Manette raises the voice against the crimes committed by the Evremondes. The Marquis is a murderer. To murder and to laugh at the sufferings of the workers is his hobby. He rapes a girl to death. He murder many lives, but he is not found guilty in the eyes of state. He should have been punished, and the state should have compensated the victims. The proletariat expect this from the state.

But the state is discriminatory in its behavior. For example, the royal court finds Gaspard guilty and the government executes him because he has committed the crime by murdering the Marquis. Up to this point, the state is right. The wrong should be punished. But the state does not find the Marquis guilty even if he has murdered many lives. Rather the justice minister helps the Evremonde brothers commit Dr. Manette to the prison. Both Gaspard and the Marquis are murderers. The state's discriminatory behavior is seen in executing Gaspard, and sparing the Marquis. This sort of injustice done to the proletariats from the state makes them conscious about the discriminatory nature of the state. The state makes the crimes committed the Evremondes legal through the justice minister, who, instead of punishing the Marquis after knowing that he is guilty, hands over the letter to the Marquis sent by Dr. Manette to him (Justice minister) demanding the culprit (the Marquis) be punished, and executes Gaspard because he has murdered an aristocrat, the Marquis. This social reality makes the proletariats conscious about their role in the state, and the state's responsibility to them. The proletariats know that the state is not their state, but the aristocrats'; the government is not their government but the aristocrats', and the courts are not their courts but the aristocrats'. They feel, they need to establish their own state.

After being conscious, the revolutionaries are committed to revolutionize and mobilize the mass. The Revolutionaries believe that they cannot conduct their revolution without agitating all the oppressed ones. Now the revolutionaries are at their work. Madame Defarge, the wife of Ernest Defarge and the sister of the raped girl, starts knitting. Her knitting includes the names of enemies to be executed. Ernest Defarge, the revolutionary leader, initiates the action against the aristocrats. He teaches the common peasants to fight against the government. He opines that the

aristocracy does not have sympathy for them. Its policy is to exploit and suppress the proletariats as much as it can, and the state-organs—the court, the police, the army, the jail, the head of the government and the administration of the state—are formed to oppress them. For example, when the Marquis runs over and kills Gaspard's son, Gaspard feels devastated, and he starts crying and wailing. To console Gaspard, Ernest Defarge says, "be a brave man my Graspard! It is better for the poor little playing to die so, than to live. It has died in a moment without pain" (94). Ernest Defarge's remark implies that killing of the proletariats is not a new story. The aristocrats are accustomed to torturing, oppressing, exploiting and killing the workers for no reasons. The aristocrats have been killing the peasants after long time's torture and exploitation. To have chance to die without pain is to be lucky! In this sense, Gaspard's son has been lucky. Defarge states that accidental death has prevented Gaspard's son from being tortured, humiliated, degraded and exploited. There is no difference between living and dying. He says that there is no meaning in crying and wailing. The aristocracy's hobby is to laugh at the sorrows and sufferings of the proletariats. Ernest Defarge succeeds in revolutionizing Geapard.

After listening to the revolutionary leader, Gaspard gets convinced and thinks it's better to die than not to fight against the crimes committed by the Defarges. Gaspard impersonates the revolutionary activist, the Jacques. Gaspard, who did not have courage to raise voice against the ruling class, lights the fire of revolution in his heart and vows to kill the people's enemies: the Marquis d'Evremonde. In his mission to take revenge on wrongs, Gaspard stabs the Marquis to death. After murdering the Marquis, Gaspard leaves a piece of paper to be attached with the knife upon which he writes: "Drive him fast to his tomb. This from Jacques" (109). Through his words written on the paper Gaspard convey the message to the aristocrats that the

revolutionaries are about to exterminate the aristocrats, and their (the aristocrats') days are over. Gaspard's action intensifies the antagonism between the aristocracy and working class.

Ernest Defarge, the revolutionary leader, intends to intensify the class antagonism. He believes that the more the aristocracy becomes exploitative and oppressive the faster the proletariat-revolution goes nearer to the decisive point. To Defarge, it takes long time for the proletariats to get revolutionized and organized if the aristocracy does not suppress the peasants ruthlessly. To intensify class struggle, Ernest Defarge violently throws back the coin, which the Marquis had thrown as the price of Gaspard's child to be picked up and spent by him, into the carriage of the Marquis d'Evremonde, which the Marquis had thrown to be picked up by Gaspard as his son's price. The Marquis becomes furious after knowing that someone has thrown back the coin into this carriage and shouts, "I would ride over any of you very willingly, and exterminate you from the earth. If I knew which rascal threw at the carriage, if that brigand were sufficiently near it, he should be crushed under the wheels" (95).

The Marquis thinks that he has been retaliated by the peasants and he takes the proletariats' retaliation as a great humiliation and shock. Through his remark he expresses his true color. He is worried about injury sustained by his horses caused by the coin thrown by the Defarge than the sorrows and sufferings of Gaspard caused by the death of his son. For him, animals, his horses, are valuable than the workers. He clearly says that he can willingly kill those who cause injury to his horses. If the Defarge had not thrown back the coin, the Marquis would not have exposed his true color and the proletariats would not have known him well. Ernest Defarge's act makes the Marquis more harasser in oppressing the workers. The more the Marquis becomes harasser, the faster the proletariats get polarized, organized and revolutionized.

The consciousness becomes the weapon for the proletariats to capture the state power. The aristocrats suppress, humiliate, degrade and exploit the proletariats, and the suppression and exploitation make the proletariats conscious about their identity, class and socio-economic condition. The poverty and suppression teach proletarians that until and unless they uproot the aristocracy, they cannot get justice and have to starve to death. When they become conscious, they get courage to fight against the suppressive aristocracy. For example, Gaspard stabs the Marquis to death, and Ernest Defarge revolutionizes the peasants. As the class antagonism gets intensified, the revolutionaries become organized and set the goal of revolution: Liberty, Equality and Fraternity.

After setting the goal of revolution, they are on the way to demolish the aristocracy from its root, thereby to establish their own government to represent their own interests. The revolutionary leaders— Ernest Defarge and Madame Defarge — give leadership to the frustrated and famished people. The revolutionaries— Ernest Defarge, Madame Defarge, the vengeance, Gaspard, the Mender of Roads and the Jacques—along with the mob of frustrated and famished people march towards the Bastille, the symbol of tyranny and torture for centuries and storm it. The storm of the Bastille makes the headway in The French Revolution. After the storm of the Bastille, the revolutionaries behead the governor of the Bastille, who refused to surrender, and the wealthy French man, Foulon, who asked the poor people to eat grass and the breadless woman to buy cake for her child. The revolutionaries are eager and furious to guillotine the people's enemies. Dickens writes about the revolutionaries' fury as: "The executioner showed the people the head of the king—and now it seemed almost in the same breath, the head of his fair wife which had eight weary months of imprisoned widowhood and misery" (233). To mark the victory over the aristocracy, the proletariats behead the monarchs, the last vestige of the French aristocracy. After the execution of the monarchs, the French Revolution gets completed.

Now the history has reversed. The proletariats, once suppressed and exploited, are in the state power.

III. Dickens Disapproves the French Revolution

In *A Tale of Two Cities*, Charles Dickens fears the change brought by the French Revolution; it brought many changes such as the empowerment of the marginalized people (the workers and women), "the abolition of the feudal rights and the slavery system, creation of equality in the society and the separation of the Church from the state" (Habib 352), and, because of his fear of the changes brought by the French Revolution, he demeans the revolutionaries and their revolution as well, and he never condones the activities of the revolutionaries.

Dickens, in *A Tale of Two Cities*, fears the empowerment of women, one of the remarkable changes brought by the French Revolution. He repudiates the woman who deviates from the conventional role, the ideal home companion. He is of the opinion that the women should not enter the world of man. If she does so, it is harmful to herself and the society. Dickens repudiates Madame Defarge because she does not confine herself to home, and she is not "a ideal home companion and a loving stereotype" (Hutter 457). Madame Defarge enters the world of politics, which is supposed to be the world of man. Madame Defarge is a member of the peasant family. Her whole family has been exterminated by the Evremonde brothers, the representatives of the French aristocracy. The appalling poverty and exploitation compel her to choose violent revolution as her destiny and she vows to fight against the aristocracy to set the French workers free.

Charles Dickens repudiates Madame Defarge because she is a revolutionary firebrand. Madame Defarge is one of the revolutionary leaders. All the revolutionary plans are chalked out by her to be executed by Ernest Defarge, her husband and revolutionary leader. The philosophy of their revolution is: Liberty, Equality and Fraternity, but Dickens opines that revolutionaries are deviated from the philosophy

of their revolution and are guided by the politics of revenge, especially Madame Defarge.

As characterized in *A Tale of Two Cities*, Madame Defarge's preoccupation with revenge has made her mad, in fact lunatic. She is determined to execute the republic's enemies, but she is unable to recognize who are guilty and who are not. Madame Defarge is adamant in executing Charles Darnay, who has protested against aristocracy by denouncing his patrimony (Eвреmonde), inheritance and title (Monseigneur or Marquis). She reasons that Charles Darnay must be executed because he is the member of the Evреmonde family. Not only that, she also opines that Lucie and her child must be executed as they are also the members of the Evреmonde family, which destroyed her whole family. She presents her reason of executing Charles Darnay and Lucie, and their child as: "That sister was my sister, that brother was my brother, that husband was my sister's husband, that unborn child was their child, that father was my father, these dead are my dead" (292). She reveals that the truth that the family that was eliminated by the Evреmonde brothers was her family, and now it is her turn to destroy Evреmonde family. Her reason is based on the politics of revenge.

Dickens repudiates Madame Defarge because she does not have the qualities which the conventional women are supposed to have. She is not a loving stereotype and the ideal home companion. Rather she is ruthless, revengeful, angry, determined, fearless, strong and shrewd. These qualities, which are supposed to be the man's qualities, create beauty in her, but Dickens states that her beauty is dangerous; it is destructive. Charles Dickens opines that her beauty increases her firmness and animosity of the aristocratic class, and her inveterate hatred of class, turns her into tigress. Albert D. Hutter in *Nation and Generation* writes: "Characteristically, Dickens

gives the French woman vitality, conveyed negatively as animalist ("Tigress") and denies his heroine these qualities" (457). As stated by Hutter, Charles Dickens gives Madame Defarge vitality by characterizing her as strong, determined, fearless and shrewd, but he denies Madame Defarge these qualities by comparing her with animal (tigress). Dickens opines that Madame Defarge's man-like qualities create beauty in her, which increase her firmness and animosity. Her firmness and animosity turn her into animal. So, vitality, for Dickens, is harmful to Madame Defarge.

For Charles Dickens, vitality is harmful to women. The women should not enter the world of politics. If they deviate from the conventional role and enter the world of man, it becomes the cause of their death. Because of the appalling poverty and exploitation, Madame Defarge turns into revolutionary. She has mission (revolution) to uproot the French aristocracy and to set the French Peasants free. She is determined in her mission, but her death before the completion of revolution conveys the message that the world of politics destroys the women. Madame Defarge dies, in a fight with Miss Pross, the servant of Lucie: "As the smoke cleared, leaving an awful stillness, it passed out on the air, like the soul of furious woman whose body lay lifeless on the ground" (315). Miss Pross is a loving and caring stereotype, who takes care of Lucie and says that she is ready to die to save Lucie from being executed in the hands of Madame Defarge, and she kills Madame Defarge, the revolutionary leader in their fight.

Thus, Miss Pross' victory over Madame Defarge is the victory of the conventional women over those (women) who deviate from the conventional norms and value of women. Through Madame Defarge, Charles Dickens conveys the message that the women should be confined to the conventional norms and value of the women, otherwise they kill themselves like Madame Defarge.

In contrast to Madame Defarge, Lucie Performs conventional tasks, whom Albert D. Hutter calls “the perfect Victorian female, the ideal home companion of loving stereotype” (457). Lucie does not enter the world of politics; she confines herself to the household chores and she is way from the notion of revenge. Rather she has profound power of love. Her love, states Dickens, has magic power: “Only his daughter had the power of charming this black brooding from his mind. She was the golden thread that united him to a past beyond his misery, and to a present beyond his misery and the sound of her voice, the light of her face, the touch of her hand, had a strong beneficial influence with him almost always” (66). When Lucie touches Dr. Manette with her profound sense of love and care, Dr. Manette is restored to life, to which Dickens call Dr Manette’s resurrection. Being saturated by her daughter’s love, Dr. Manette, who has forgotten that once he was a reputed physician and who says that his name is “One Hundred and Five, North Tower” (35), forgets his present and past miseries and recognizes that Lucie is his Daughter. After being united with his family, Dr. Manette becomes happy.

Lucie does not possesses the magic power as stated by Dickens what Lucie does is to love and wail when she knows that her father and husband are in danger. Because of her love, Dr. Manette is restored to life. It’s right. We all feel released from miseries and troubles if our relatives or family members love and help us in our miseries when we are in great trouble and distress. Lucie’s love is nothing more than this. If her love had magic power, she should have saved Charles Darnay. What she does for Charles Darnay’s release, when he is about to be guillotined, is to set “aside of his chair and his book and to pray of night for one dear prisoner” (235). She loves her husband very much and wants him to be released. For that, she pray at night, but she cannot take concrete action to release her husband.

After making critical study of Lucie and Madame Defarge, we conclude that Dickens loves Lucie because she is conventional in her view, and he repudiates Madame Defarge because she is politically empowered, revolutionary in view and fights against the French aristocracy to set herself and other workers free.

Charles Dickens demeans the revolutionaries. For Dickens, the revolutionaries wage the war with the Philosophy of liberty, equality, fraternity and freedom, the revolutionaries, opines Charles Dickens, are deviated from the Philosophy of the revolution. The proletariats or the revolutionaries themselves do not know why and with whom they are fighting. The Mendor of Roads shouts the slogan, "Long live the King, Long live the Queen, Long live everybody and everything" (148). The most amusing thing is that the Mendor of Roads, the diehard revolutionary, shouts the slogan as if he is the supporter of the monarchs when the royal procession passes across the Versailles. The Mendor of roads does not know who his enemies are and who are not.

The revolutionaries are sworn enemies of the monarchs, the aristocrats and the nobles. They are exploited, suppressed and degraded by the ruling class. The proletariats have been made the slaves of the ruling class. The revolutionaries think that they can not get their rights until and unless they uproot the aristocratic government. So they have resolved to fight against their enemies: the monarchs and the aristocrats. On the one hand, as a diehard revolutionary, the Mendor of Roads have resolved to fight against and exterminate the enemies of the people and republic, and, on the other hand, he has great love and sympathy towards the monarch. His great devotion of monarchs gets exposed when he, after seeing the royal procession passing across the Versailles, shouts the slogan very loudly as much as he can with great sentiment and weeps when he shouts the slogan. It becomes clear that the

Mendour of roads loves the monarchs, and he does not want to exterminate them. Rather he regards the monarch as the god descended from heaven to wipe out the common people's miseries and sorrows, and he has joined the revolution only because he loves chaos and violence. Dickens compares his (The Mendour of Road) views of the monarchs with Mdamé Defarge's.

Madame Defarge has quite different view about the monarchs and the aristocrats. She is determined to exterminate all the aristocrats and the monarchs no matter whether they are guilty or not. She does not differentiate the guilty aristocrats from the aristocrats who are not guilty. Madame Defarge, one of the revolutionary leaders, speaks of the king, Louis XVI, the queen, Marie Antoinette, and the aristocrats as so many rich and beautiful dolls waiting to be broken into pieces. Madame Defarge neither becomes eager to see the royal procession nor she becomes sentimental when the royal procession passes across the Versailles. Rather she regards the monarchs and the aristocrats as dolls to be exterminated in the hands of the revolutionaries and thinks about their extermination. There is contradiction between the views of the Mendour of Roads and Madame Defarge about the monarchs. The similarity between the Mendour of Roads and Madame Defarge is that they both are deviated from the philosophy of revolution. The Mendour of Roads shouts slogan in favour of the monarchs, the enemies of the people and republic, and Madame Defarge is determined to exterminate the enemies, but she is guided by the notion of revenge; for example, she demands Charles Darnay, Lucie, and their child be exterminated at any cost only because they are the members of the Evremode family. Charles Dickens has selected Mdamé Defarge and the Mendour of Roads like Characters to ridicule and humiliate the revolutionaries and their revolution. Through the Mendour of Roads and

Madame Defarge, Dickens opines that most of the French revolutionaries did not know the philosophy, significance and purpose of the revolution.

Charles Dickens regards the French Revolution as war fought for revenge. To Dickens, because of their pre-occupation with revenge, they are deviated from the philosophy of the revolution, and they do not know the significance of revolution. They are determined to exterminate the people's enemies, but their pre-occupation with revenge leads them to the wrong path. The main purpose of the revolution, opines Charles Dickens, has been to take the revenge on their enemies: the French aristocrats and the monarchs. While beheading their enemies, the revolutionaries do not discriminate between who are guilty and who are not. They simply believe that all the aristocrats and the monarchs are their enemies, and their enemies must be executed at any cost. Especially the execution of Charles Darnay and Foulon are based on the revenge policy.

Charles Darnay is not anti-revolutionary. He does not guillotine the people's enemies, but raises voice against the French aristocracy; it becomes clear when he, in his conversation with his uncle, says, "we have done wrong, and are reaping the fruits of wrong" (104). But the revolutionaries do not try to find out the reason of executing Charles Darnay also known as Charles Evremonde. The revolutionaries, especially Madame Defarge and the vengeance, are adamant in advocating the execution of Charles Darnay only because he is the only living member of the French aristocratic family, the symbol of repression. About the reason why Darnay should be executed, Madame Defarge, one of the revolutionary leaders, states: "That sister was my sister, that brother was my brother, that husband was my sister's husband, that unborn child was their child, that father was my father, these dead are my dead" (292). Madame Defarge refers to Dr. Alexander Manette's letter, as the strong proof to execute

Darnay. Dr. Manette's letter also known as the Bastille paper reveals that Dr. Manette was sent to jail as he raised voice against the crimes of the Evremonde brothers, who raped a young peasant beautiful girl to death, killed her husband and brother, and her father also dies because of the grief. Madame Defarge says that the peasant family that was exterminated by the Evremonde brother family was her family, and Charles Darnay must be guillotined because he is only the member of the Evremonde family, which has destroyed her family. Madame Defarge forgets the philosophy of revolution: Liberty, Equality, Fraternity and Freedom. She should not have advocated the execution of Charles Darnay after knowing that he has raised voice against the aristocracy and is not involved in the crimes committed by the Evremondes. Not only that Charles Darnay has also abandoned his patrimony (Evremonde), inheritance and his own country, France: "I would abandon it, and live otherwise and elsewhere" (105). But Madame Defarge wants to guillotine him only because she has to take revenge on the Evremonde family.

Madame Defarge observes Dr. Manette's "face to be not the face of a true friend of the republic and Lucie Manette's face to be the face of true enemy" (291). Dr. Manette has spent 18 years in the Bastille for protesting against the crimes committed by the Evremonde brothers. But Defarge opines that one can not be true friend of the republic by only raising voice against the aristocracy; to be true friend of republic, he must be ready to sacrifice anything for the sake of republic. For Madame Defarge, Dr. Manette should have been ready to sacrifice anything. By anything she means that Dr. Manette should have been ready to sacrifice his daughter and son-in-law for the sake of republic. Rather Dr. Manette has started a campaign to save the enemy of the republic and people: Charles Darnay. Once Dr. Manette had protested against the crimes committed by the Evremonde family. It is contribution to the

people's republic. But he has tarnished that face by advocating the release of Charles Darny, the enemy of people, opines Madame Defarge. To Madame Defarge, Lucie is the true enemy of the republic because she has come to Paris from England to save Charles Darnay, and she uses her effort to release Charles Darnay from the revolutionary tribunal who is about to be guillotined. She is insistent in executing the innocent child of Lucie and Charles Darnay. It is based on the revenge politics.

Another proof that the revolutionaries present to the revolutionary court/tribunal for executing Charles Darnay is Dr. Manette's letter, in which Dr. Manette denounces the Evremonde family: "I denounce them to heaven and to earth" (282). Yes, Dr. Manette has denounced the Evremondes for their crimes; and Charles Darnay is one of the denounced members of the Evremonde family. For the establishment of the People's Republic the punishment of the enemies is a must.

But the most contemptible and ridiculous thing about revolutionary courts is that they do not know who are their enemies and who are not because of their pre-occupation with the revenge politics. The revolutionary courts, tribunals and the revolutionary committees should have been understood the context in which Dr. Manette's letter was written. Dr. Manette wrote the letter in the prison. In the prison he was alone, and was tortured and degraded. Because of torture and degradation, he lost mental balance. So, in such condition, Dr. Manette did not know that Charles Darnay has protested against the aristocracy by giving up patrimony, inheritance and his own country, France. His letter seems to be guided by emotion rather than by reason. The revolutionary leaders do not make investigation about Darnay's case to know whether he is guilty or not, and the revolutionary court finds Charles Darnay guilty and decides to guillotine him; it bases Dr. Manette's letter written in the Bastille and Madame Defarge's secret (that sister was my sister, that brother was my

brother, that husband was my sister's husband, that unborn child was their child, that father was my father, those dead are my dead" (292) as its proof to execute the accused. It seems that the prisoners are already decided to be guillotined; they are produced to the revolutionary courts and tribunals only for the completion of formality. If not so, the revolutionary courts should not have decided to guillotine the accused, Charles Darnay, on the basis of the proofs presented by the revolutionaries without any investigation. Thus, Charles Darnay is executed only because he is the member of the Evremodne family, who are notorious for crimes, cruelties and suppression. The execution of innocent Charles Darnay is not based on the philosophy of revolution, but on the revenge politics. Through the execution of Charles Darnay, Dickens conveys the message that the French revolution was nothing more than the war fought for revenge.

The execution of Foulon shows the revolutionaries' preoccupation with revenge. After sabotaging the Bastille, the revolutionaries are on the way to execute the people's enemies. To punish the enemies is not wrong, but the way the revolutionaries punish the enemies shows that they are guided by the politics of revenge. The revolutionaries take Foulon, who had humiliated the famished people by suggesting them to eat grass, into their captivity and starts punishing him. One of the famished woman, who is there to Punish Foulon, utters her revengeful word:

Foulon told my old father that he might eat grass, when I had no bread to give him! Foulon told my baby it might suck grass, when these breasts were dry with want! O mother of (god, this foulon! O heaven our suffering! Here me, my dead baby and my withered father: I swear on my knees, on these stones to avenge you on foulon. (191)

The passage makes clear that the revolutionaries, because of their preoccupation with the politics of revenge, have forgotten the philosophy of revolution, and they are committed to take revenge on the wrong. The revolutionaries take revenge on Foulon by forcing sheaves of grass into his mouth and tying a bunch of grass on his back. Then the revolutionaries beat him to unconscious and hang to the lamp post. Of course the philosophy of the revolution was not to take revenge, but to bring freedom. If the revolutionaries have not been pre-occupied with the idea of revenge, they would have been different from the aristocrats, and they would not have forced sheaves of grass into Foulon's mouth. Charles Dickens, through the death of Foulon, opines that the French revolution was nothing more than the war fought for revenge and the revolutionaries were guided by the politics of revenge rather than the philosophy of revolution.

In *A Tale of Two Cities*, Dickens characterizes the revolutionary characters more savage, barbaric and cruel than the aristocrats. To Dickens, the revolutionaries are simply interested and devoted in creating chaos and terror. The way the revolutionaries execute the people's enemies and the number of the executed create terror and horror in the readers. While executing the people's enemies, the revolutionaries do not show a little bit sympathy. The execution of the monarchs is an example of such cruelty: "The executioner showed the people the head of the king and now, it seemed almost in the same breath, the head of his fair wife" (238). The monarchs, who exploited and suppressed the proletariat, should be punished. It is right. But the revolutionaries' act of beheading and showing the people the head of the monarch creates terror in the readers. The revolutionaries show that they have sabotaged the structure of the old regime, and are on the way to establish the People's Republic. But irony is that their act of establishing the republic creates terror and

horror in the people. To Dickens, the revolutionaries have been made mad by their preoccupation with mass butcheries. The revolutionaries execute the helpless prisoners in great number: “Eleven hundred defenseless prisoners of both sexes and all ages had been killed by the Populace” (230). The revolutionaries execute eleven hundred prisoners regardless of age and sex. Even the innocent children and the aged are executed no matter whether they are guilty or not. The execution of innocent people in great number terrorizes us. Through the exaggeration of the revolutionaries’ manner of execution and the number of the prisoners executed, Dickens succeeds in leaving the false impression of the French Revolution in the reader.

Dickens mocks the judiciary system of the republic government. Dickens, in order to demean the French Revolution and the revolutionaries, attacks the judiciary system of the republic government. Dickens is of the opinion that the revolutionaries have formed the revolutionary tribunals, courts and committees to torture the innocent people in the name of anti-revolutionaries. The revolutionaries have formed the revolutionary tribunals, courts and committees everywhere to snatch people’s freedom:

A revolutionary tribunal in the capital, and forty or fifty thousand revolutionary committees all over the land; a law of the suspected, which struck away all security for liberty or life, and delivered over any good and innocent person to any bad and guilty one; prisons gorged with people who had committed no offence, and could obtain no hearing; these things became the established order and nature of appointed things and seemed to be ancient usage before they were many weeks old. (233)

The passage shows that the revolutionaries have formed a network to snatch people's freedom by establishing the revolutionary tribunals, courts and committees in every corner of the land (France). With the establishment of the revolutionary tribunals, courts and committees, the revolutionary leaders and activists may suspect anybody under any circumstances as the people's enemy and submit to the revolutionary tribunals, courts and committees, thereby to render any good and innocent person to any bad and guilty one. The prisoners do not get chance to state whether they are guilty or not. Once they are caught, they are ordered to be guillotined; they never get released from the revolutionary tribunals, courts and committees. It has been the old law of the republic government. The formation and the way the revolutionary tribunals, courts and committees' functions terrify us and we look at the revolutionary tribunals, courts and committees with contempt. Through the revolutionary tribunals, courts and committees, Dickens demeans the revolutionary judicial system, thereby to devalue the French Revolution. Dickens's description of the malformation and function of the revolutionary tribunals, courts and committees is nothing other than the exaggeration.

Charles Dickens exaggerates the terror and horror caused by French Revolution in *A Tale of Two Cities*. Dickens intentionally creates terror and horror to demean the French Revolution. Dickens regards the French Revolution as a monster in *A Tale of Two Cities*. About the exaggeration of horror and terror of the French Revolution in Dickens's *A Tale of Two Cities*, George Orwell in *Orwell on Dickens* states that Charles Dickens's impulse in *A Tale of Two Cities* is to exaggerate the horror and terror of the revolution from a historical point of view. George Orwell writes: "Dickens gives no figure, but gives the impression of a frenzied massacre lasting for years" (8). As stated by George Orwell, Dickens exaggerates the

drawbacks of the French Revolution to demean the French Revolution and the revolutionaries. Through the bloody knives and the tumbrels rolling to and fro, Dickens succeeds in creating a special sinister vision in the mind of the readers. To Dickens, the revolutionaries are deviated from the Philosophy of revolution; they are simply interested and devoted in creating the terror and horror. The revolutionaries' love of violence gets exposed in their revolutionary dance, the Carmagnole:

There could not be fewer than five hundred people, and they were dancing like five thousand demons. There was no other music than their own singing. They danced to the popular revolution song. They advanced, retreated, struck at one another's hands, clutched at one another's heads, spun round alone, caught one and spun round in pairs, until many of the dropped. No fight could have been half so terrible as this dance. It was so emphatically a fallen sport: a something, once innocent, delivered over to all devilry healthy pastimes changed into a means of angering the blood, bewildering the senses, and stalling the heart. (238)

Through the Carmagnole dance Dickens shows that the revolutionaries' pre-occupation with mass butchering and executing the innocent people in the name of anti-revolutionary has madden them. The Carmagnole dance, the revolutionary dance, shows that the revolutionaries are witless savages—in fact lunatics. The revolutionaries dance to the revolutionary song and slogan in which they demand the blood, heart, soul and body of the republic's enemies be given to them. They use the sharp weapons, which are used for beheading and butchering the enemies, as the musical instrument. When the revolutionaries dance accompanied by revolutionary music (the revolutionary song and slogan) and shake their musical instruments, their

dance becomes so dreadful: “there could not be fewer than five hundred people, and they were dancing like five thousand demons” (238). The revolutionary dance is the celebration of success for the revolutionaries, but Charles Dickens can't stand the revolutionaries' success.

Dickens' main intention is to defame the revolution and revolutionaries. He says that the pathetic condition of the proletarians or the workers should be improved, and they should not be exploited by the ruling class. He never says that the revolutionaries should be free, and they have to be in the state power. To him, the proletarians should not be rulers. If the proletarians wage war against the oppressors, Dickens never condones their activities. The passage expresses Dickens' hatred for the proletarians. He compares them with demon. Dickens opines that the revolutions are deviated from the philosophy of revolution and are simply interested in creating terror and horror; they are violent and dangerous. The revolutionary song and dance make the revolutionaries more violent. The revolutionary song and slogan help the revolutionary leaders and activists to guillotine the innocent people in the name of the enemies of the People's Republic and people. Thus, through the revolutionary dance, the carnage, Charles Dickens despises the revolutionaries' activities.

Charles Dickens is of the opinion that the proletarians or the workers should make history of sacrifice by choosing their own death to save the aristocracy. Dickens is not in favour of setting the proletarians free, but he is in favour of improving their wretched condition. Carton is a worker employed as the assistant of Stryver, a lawyer. Sydney Carton does not have his own business: “Business! Bless you, I have no business” (68). His joblessness and the social estrangement make him aimless; his isolation from both social communities and his own labour render his life meaningless. Carton works hard, Stryver gets its credit: wealth and social reputation.

He seeks release from such a trap but finds no way of escaping. Being in such a wretched condition, Carton defines his social rank as “nowhere” (76). Charles Dickens should have characterized Sydney Carton as joining the peasant’s revolution to set himself and other suppressed proletariats free, but he makes Sydney Carton choose wrong path of getting freedom. Carton makes sacrifice by choosing his own death to save Charles Darnay, less severe or liberal aristocrat. But Sydney Carton’s sacrifice is not a sacrifice, which frees the workers from the chain of the aristocracy; it is just a release from the meaningless and tired life to the eternal end: death. The socio-historical circumstance, which had alienated Carton from social community, compels him to choose death. While dying, about his death, Carton remarks: “It is far better thing that I do, than I have ever done, it is far, far better rest that I go to than I have ever known” (321). Carton works hard, but Stryver gets its credit; he is a man of great intellectuality, but he, in society, is known as jackal. In such a tried and boring situation, Carton thinks that it is, for him, better to die than to live a meaningless life; he chooses death as a means of escaping from meaningless life. In this sense, Sydney Carton’s death is “the expression of a truly desperate desire for an ending” (Rignall 858).

Carton gets divinity before he dies “I am resurrection and the life, Saith the lord: he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall live and whoever lived and believeth in me shall never die” (320). Like Jesus Christ, Sydney Carton becomes immortal. Jesus Christ died for his love of human lives. Carton also dies for his love of Lucie and Charles Darnay, and their children. But Carton’s death does not free the proletariats because he dies to save the aristocracy represented by Charles Darnay. Before being guillotined, he teaches Seamstress (who is about to be guillotined before Carton) that she should not fear death because they are going to “the better land there is no time there, and no trouble there” (319). About his own vision of a better world, Carton says:

I see a beautiful city and a brilliant people rising from this abyss, and in their struggles to be truly free, in their triumphs and defeats, through long long years to come, I see the evil of this time and of the previous time of which this is the natural birth, gradually making expiation for itself and wearing out. (320)

In this passage, the better land Carton refers to is the immortal world, where there will be no poverty, greed, revenge and hatred. The people of the land will be brilliant; they will not be driven by the notion of revenge. Who gives birth to this timeless world? Of course, Sydney Carton and the people who believe in Carton. Carton compares himself with a phoenix.⁵ The timeless world, which he calls “better land” will emerge out of his ashes. Most remarkable point is that Carton chooses his own death to save Charles Darnay, the only living member of the Evremonde family. The Evremonde family is the symbol of the suppressive and exploitative aristocracy. But Charles Darnay is less severe or liberal aristocrat, who opines that the aristocrats should not exploit and suppress the proletariats. The world that emerges out of Sydney Carton’s ashes is the world of Charles Darnay.

Thus, the characterization of Sydney Carton exposes Charles Dickens’ latent view that the proletariats or the peasants are exploited, oppressed and dehumanized by the aristocrats, and their pathetic condition should be improved, but they should not get freedom by waging revolution. Rather the proletariats or the workers, Dickens opines, should make history of sacrifice by choosing their own death to save the less severe or liberal aristocracy represented by Charles Darnay.

⁵ Sydney Carton compares himself with phoenix, a magic bird that lives for several hundred years before burning itself and then being born again from its ashes. Sydney Carton gives birth to the world of Charles Darnay. After sacrificing his own life to save Charles Darnay, Carton becomes immortal.

IV: Charles Dickens and The French Revolution

Charles Dickens deals with the issue of French Revolution in *A Tale of Two Cities*. In the novel, Dickens depicts the pre-revolutionary French society to show what made the occurrence of the French Revolution inevitable.

The aristocrats possess land, and they have tenants to work in their farm. They do not work, but they own the means of production. Not only this the aristocrats have great influence in the administration of the state, and they use the state power and wealth to exploit and suppress the workers.

The aristocrats exploit and suppress the proletariats as much as they can; their philosophy of rule is to suppress the lower class because they think that until and unless the proletariats are suppressed, they (the proletariats) do not pay homage to the ruling class.

In line with his philosophy of repression, the Marquis d'Evremonde rapes young peasant girl, kills her relatives in protest. He also kills Gaspard's son by his carriage when he was intending in taking entertainment by driving his carriage in the congested area. Another atrocity committed by the Marquis is that he abducts Dr. Manette and sentences to prison when Dr. Manette stands in favour of truth. The government does not punish the marquis even if he has committed heinous crimes.

The state does not play protective role. There is not presence of the state when the proletariats are killed and exploited. Rather the state maintains inequality and encourages the aristocrats to suppress the workers. It becomes obvious when the justice minister does not punish the Marquis after knowing

that he has committed serious crimes. Rather the justice minister, instead of lacking action against the culprit, helps the Evremondes abduct and commit Dr. Manette to the prison.

Although Dickens opines that poverty, inequality and the state sponsored repression compel the workers to choose the bloody revolution as their only way of surviving, he criticizes them for their vision and activities. He is afraid of the peasant freedom, and aims to demean the revolution and revolutionaries as well. To do so, Dickens exaggerates the horror and terror caused by the peasant revolution. Through the exaggeration of horror and terror, Dickens succeeds in leaving the false impression of The French Revolution in the readers, thereby to distract the workers from their revolution directed against their enemies.

Works Cited

- Adock, Stephen. *The Political Order in France Before the French Revolution*. London: Cambridge University Press, 2009. Print.
- Allingham, Philip V. "The Portrayal of the French Revolution in Dickens' *A Tale of Two Cities*." *Modern Language Studies* 27.5 (1980): 439-87. *Jstor*. Web. 20 Oct. 2011.
- Althusser, Louis. *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*. Trans. Ben Brewster. New York: Monthly Review Press, 2001, New Delhi: Aakar Books, 2006. Print.
- Chisic, Harvey. "Dicken's Portrayal of the People in *A Tale of Two Cities*." *The European Legacy* 5.5 (2002): 645-61. *Jstor*. Web. 26 Jan. 2012.
- Dickens, Charles. *A Tale of Two Cities*. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Classics, 1993. Print.
- Eagleton, Terry. *Ideology: An Introduction*. London: Verso, 1991. Print.
- Habib, M.A.R. *A History of Literary Criticism: From Plato to the Present*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2005. Print.
- Hutter, Albert D. "Nation and Generation in *A Tale of Two Cities*." *Modern Language Association* 93.3 (1978): 448-62. *Jstor*. Web. 28 Feb. 2012.
- Lukacs, George. *History and Class Consciousness*. Trans. Rodney Livingstone. New York: International Publishers, 1967. Print.
- Marx, Karl and Frederic Engels. *Selected Works* Vol. 1. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1969. Print.
- McPhee, Peter. *The French Revolution: 1789-1799*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001. Print.
- Orwell, George. *Inside the White and Other Essays*. London: GB, March 11, 1940. Print.
- Rignall, J.M. "Dickens and the Catastrophic Continuum of History in *A Tale of Two Cities*." *The Johns Hopkins University Press* 51.3 (Autumn 1984): 575-87. *Jstor*. Web. 9 Dec. 2011.
- Spooner, Alan. "An Blindness and Inevitability in Charles Dickens' *A Tale of Two Cities*." *Modern Language Association* 52.4 (2007): 14-93. *Google Scholar*. Web. 29 May 2012.