

I. Bram Stoker: Life and Works

The present research work focuses on Bram Stoker's widely discussed novel *Dracula*. It studies *Dracula* as the symbolic representation of the human spirit in the Victorian period. The study further examines how Stoker's novel has a complex consciousness, marked by a shifting, complex dialectics of opposites in which personae create a dramatic dialogue of ideas. The researcher focuses on Stoker's treatment of Victorian society in the face of Capitalism.

Most of the people who know nothing about Bram Stoker (1847-1912) have read, heard, or seen the movie of *Dracula*. As the literary history tended to marginalize the 18th century Gothic novel, critics thought it simply a late Victorian Gothic novel. The novel has been praised, interpreted, appreciated, and criticized within the framework of Gothic traits: various supernatural manifestations, old castles, evil villains, charnel houses, abbeys, vampires, blood sucking and so on. The present study differs from other approaches in the sense that there are many critics who have already studied this novel from the point of view of psychoanalysis, gothic, etc. But being different from other approaches the present researcher concentrates on the Marxist element that is "economic panic" which are dominantly presented in *Dracula* making it a representative of it.

Dracula, a late Victorian novel, was published in 1897. Abraham Stoker was the actual name of the author who was born at Dublin in Ireland in November 8, 1847 in the house of a middle class civil servant. He was a prolific writer. He is known as a famous Irish novelist and a short story writer. The tumultuous events of his life as well as his intellectual upbringing must have had deep influences in his literary career. His works were basically focused on all classes and different types of people as youth,

child and so on. He has written especially for the children and some biographies, and some for cinema goers.

After ten years in civil services at Dublin Castle, during which he was also an unpaid drama critic for the Dublin Evening Mail, he made acquaintance with his idol, the actor, Sir Henry Irving from 1878 until Irving's death. Twenty seven years later, he acted as his manager. His interest in art and literature continued to increase since 1878, after Stoker was made the Manager of Irving's 'Lyceum Theatre' London, Stoker travelled through America and Canada many times in course of managing Irving's theatre. Daniel Farson opines in his work: *The Man Who Wrote Dracula: A Biography* (1975):

... due to his working experiences in the field of drama and theatre he got great influence towards drama. So many impressions and references of popular drama of Shakespeare and his own travel experiences appear in his works including *Dracula*. (157)

Although, Stoker's reputation as an author stands almost wholly in his novel *Dracula*, it is not the only novel he wrote. Stoker is also the author of the books like: *The Duties of Clerks of Petty Sessions in Ireland* (1890); *Crooken Sands* (1894), *The Water's Moll* (1894); *The Man from America* (Lecture 1894); *The Shalldet of Shorta* (1895); *The Glimpse of America* (Lecture 1886); *Dracula* (1897); *Miss Betty* (1898); *The Mystery of the Sea* (1902); *the Jewel of Seven Stars* (1903), *The Man* (1905); *Personal Reminiscence of Henry Irving 2 Vols.* (1906, 7), *Lady Athyne* (1908); *The Gates of Life* (1908); *Sonobound: The Lady of the Shroud* (1909); *Famous Impostors* (1910), *The Lair of the White Worm* (1911) as well as a number of short stories. Except his master creation *Dracula*, Stoker's other works are now largely forgotten; and despite of the fact that his works fit the rest of all classes of the reader – from

children to the scholars. One of his writings *Under the Sunset* is mainly written for the children. He has written biography of Henry Irving, a person who was the great pioneer of his own life, Henry Irving entitled *Personal Reminiscence of Henry Irving*. Thus, it is known that Bram Stoker was very intimate with Henry Irving. He always respected him and loved him. Henry Irving was the person, a precursor who influenced, made Bram Stoker very famous in the field of English literature. They had spent lot of their time together. Similarly, many works of his life deal with Ireland and the Irish people. Stoker was a nationalist; he loved his nation as his mother. He was always busy in promoting, studying about his nation and people of his nation. He had positive thinking towards his nation. So we find him as a true nationalist. He wrote many novels in which he has shown the clear picture of the socio – political and economic condition of his country.

Bram Stoker is remembered solely as the author of *Dracula*. He was also a theoretical personality, barrister and critic who lived at the hub of late Victorian social and artistic life. His friends who belonged to this exclusive circle include prominent writers like Oscar Wilde, Walt Whitman, Mark Twain, Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, Whistler, Glad Stone and Tennyson. Although they had good friendship, the beautiful but dowry – less Florence Balcombe; first courted by Oscar Wilde, became his wife. Yet it was tragic that success eluded Bram Stoker as husband, father, novelist, playwright, and entrepreneur. Real life characters inspired his major characters in his works. So, Abraham Van Helsing, repository of worldly wisdom, doctor, barrister, and psychic detective was appropriately named after Stoker's father and himself. Daniel Farson in his book *The Man who Wrote Dracula: A biography of Bram Stoker* is of the view that:

... Jonathan Harker was the alter ego i.e. an extension of his personality of the author cultivated for literary purposes, the passionless solicitor who heroically achieves manhood when he slits Dracula's throat. Mina Harkin was the epitome of stoker's mother, who was brave and loyal in nature. While the frivolous and fragile Lucy, yearning to marry al her suitors echoes Stoker's socially ambitious fiancé, Florence Balcombe. Stoker projected himself into all the *Dracula's* major character: there is a little of him in each of them.

(165)

So, the novel *Dracula* manifests some autobiographical element as well.

Stoker's writing in *Dracula* cannot be confined to a particular style. *Dracula's* language, idea, theme and other features in the presentation have made it distinct from other novels especially belonging to the nineteenth century realm. The style of presenting the story is quite peculiar and interesting, which is presented in the form of diaries, letter, journals, and news items. Though the novel seems to be a heap of these personal writings, these narratives items have been arranged so powerfully and skillfully that it has made the flow of the plot natural. The credit of the popularity of the novel goes to the simplicity of the language and the vitality of its presentations of multiple points of view create a degree of interpretation possible. Such presentations of multiple points of view create a degree of indeterminacy of meaning in the text.

Being a late Victorian novel, *Dracula* bears some ethos of that period. Though *Dracula* is mainly a story about vampires, after a careful reading it is possible to argue that the moral and sexual strictness of the Victorian society is embodied in Stoker's text. In his working note Stoker had said:

It is a story of vampire, the old medieval vampire, but recrudescing today [...] the book necessarily full of horror and terrors but I trust that these are calculated to cleanse the mind by pity and terror. At any rate, there is nothing base in the book, and though superstition is fought in it with the weapons of superstition, I hope it is not irreverent. (qtd. in Befold 76)

Victorian age was really Puritanical age in relation to its sexual and moral concerns. Victorians considered sex only as a means reproduction between non- incestuous couple, and disregarded sex as source of pleasure and satisfaction.

It was precisely a century ago that one of the masterpieces of Gothic horror fiction – and of European literature as whole – was published in Britain: the novel *Dracula*, written by Bram Stoker, a relatively unknown ex-civil service Irishman and tour manager of the great Victorian actor Henry Irving. *Dracula*, now over hundred years old and never out of print since its publication in 1897, has always been given free rein over the popular imagination. *Dracula*, a fearsome but fascinating character was poised to attract the attention of film – maker and of the common readers. The readers took it only as a Gothic horror tale that is why the novel was not in the mind of common readers and the critical readers. The novel *Dracula* has begun to attract much serious critical attention from a wide variety of theoretical perspective after the 25 years of its first publication. Due to its quality, presentation, plot and so on it has become popular not only among the children but also among the elders. Many films have been made with the help of this story and depending particularly on it too.

Many critics have observed *Dracula* from the different aspects. Accepting its effects of horror and popularity, A. N. Wilson in the introduction to the novel observes:

For every ten people who have actually read *Dracula*, you could find a thousand who could tell you what it is about. The ten would have had an experience which was much stronger than the thousand; such in the power of the book. Stoker did his work well, and I, for one, can never read his pages without a Shudder of terror and disgust, compulsive in its guilty awfulness. (xvii)

Critics have also observed the novel *Dracula* from the point of view of Gothic Transgressions. It produces not only pleasure but simultaneously anxiety and fear by projecting an uncontrollable and overwhelming power which threatens the loss of sanity, honor, property or social standing. Even more than fear and anxiety, transgression produces horror. Glennis Byron in "Introduction" notes the critical performance that associates with the Gothic:

Dracula early belong to the Gothic in its association with the disruption and transgression of both social and psychic limits and boundaries. The count himself, confounding all categories, can be seen as the ultimate embodiment of transgression: as shape-shifter he has no stable fixed identity, as 'vampire' he straddles the boundaries, between life and death; as 'un-dead' he is both absent and present. (2)

Great many critics have paid their attention to the novel approaching it from a variety of critical perspective. Among them, Christopher Craft in his influential essay " Kiss Me with Those Red Lips" focuses upon the fear which is expressed by an aggressive female about sexuality, the threat of the new woman and her rejection of conventional feminine roles. Craft talks about the events which are not represented in the text that *Dracula* will seduce, drain another male, penetrate and this desire finds

evasive fulfillments in an important series of heterosexual displacement. He puts forward his arguments that Dracula represents displaced homosexual desire thus:

This essay therefore offers not a reading of monstrosity in general but rather an account of Bram Stoker's in particular articulation of vampire metaphor in Dracula, a book whose fundamental anxiety an equivocation about the relationship between desires and gender, repeats within a monstrous difference, a pivotal anxiety of late Victorian Culture. (94)

He further adds:

The novel, nonetheless, doesn't dismiss homoerotic desire and threat, rather it simply continuous to diffuse and displace it. Late in the text, the Count himself announces a deflected homoeroticism when he admonishes the crew of light. Thus [...] everywhere in this text such desire seeks a strangely deflected heterosexual distribution, only through women may men touch. (98)

In the essay, " Historic and Obsessional Discourse: responding to Death in Dracula" Elizabeth Bronfen draws upon Lacanian Psychoanalysis, semiotics, and deconstruction to consider Western representations of the dead feminine body. Vampire lore becomes the trope for western attitude towards death. The vampire, an undead body, disseminates an uncanny state of living death with each bite. The responses to that death, Bronfen argues, can be discovered in Lacanian terms into hysteric and obsessional discourse. Hysteric discourse, unusually encoded as feminine, is associated with a celebration of duplicity and a fluid relation to the unconscious obsessional decreases, unusually encoded masculine, is embodied to vampire hunters. Aiming to fix the disruption of the symbolic by the semiotic, they

strive to erect clear division in order to repress the void of death which is, in Lacanian terms, the end of motivating principle in life, the end of desire. Their mission to stake the vampire becomes a trope for the fixing of the fluid ambivalent body to a stable signifier. Talking about hysteric Bronfen observed:

The hysteric recognizes a lack or void in the symbolic order of laws and knows her non-existence [...] the vampire can be read as trope for the hysteric relation to that radical otherness beyond the social, the acknowledged of the void of death as one of her points reference. (56)

The novel has been approached from a variety of critical perspectives but none have analyzed the text from Marxist perspective. Hence, there is a need to analyze the text from the Marxist perspectives. In researcher's view, Dracula is a final aristocrat, the tyrant seeking to preserve the survival of his house. While the vampire hunters embody the bourgeois family with the entire solid reasonable and moral values – of middle class Victorian society. And similarly, there can be seen class struggle too. In the researcher's observation of the novel *Dracula* From the point of view of Marxism the focus is on the class struggle where the capitalist is rich and always wants to be rich by sucking the sweats and labor of the poor. Always he wants to be powerful, rich, respected in the community. Similarly Morretti in his essay writes about *Dracula* thus:

Capital is dead labor which, vampire like, live only sucking living labor, and, lives the more, the more labor it sucks. Marx's analogy unravels the metaphor. As everyone knows, the vampire is dead and yet not dead: he is an un-dead a 'dead' person who it manages to live to the blood he sucks from the living. Their strength becomes his

strength. The stronger the vampire becomes, the weaker the living become: the capitalism get rich, not like the miser, in proportion to his personal labor... and compels the worker to renounce all the enjoyment of life. (45-46)

Among the critics paying their attention to the novel *Dracula*, Howard P. Lovecraft gives an account in his essay, "The Weird Tradition and the British Isles" from the Marxist point of view. He indicates the standard modern exploitation of the frightful vampire myth and further asserts that:

But best of all is the famous *Dracula*, which has become almost the standard modern exploitation of the frightful vampire myth. Count *Dracula*, a vampire, dwells in a horrible castle in the Carpathians, but finally migrates ... with fellow vampires. How English fares within *Dracula*'s stronghold of terrors, and how the dead fiend's plot for domination is at last defeated, are elements which unite to form a tale new justly assigned a permanent place in English Literature. (78)

Bram Stoker's *Dracula*, up to this date has been the subject of discussion as it has never failed to provide critics with raw materials for their reading. The references from the various critics lead the researcher to conclude that how a minor – novel which in the course of time, comes forth as an interesting novel.

Project like this may require a vast study and research. Due to the time constrains and the limited availability of resources and materials, the research may not be able to get into the depth of the subject as it might require. In my interpretation of *Dracula* from Marxist perspective, my focus has been exclusively on this particular novel among the other texts written by Stoker. The researcher has used the available reference materials and criticism on *Dracula* as supporting documents.

The thesis is divided into four chapters. That first chapter presents a brief introductory outline of the work. In addition, it gives hawk eye view of the entire work. The second chapter tries to verify, explain the theoretical modality that is applied in this research work. It discusses Marxism and its types. On the basis of the theoretical framework established in the second chapter, the third chapter analyzes the text at a considerable length. It analyzes Stoker's novel *Dracula*. It sorts out some extracts from the text as evidence to prove the hypothesis of the study – *Dracula* was the outcome of the class struggle in the Victorian period. The fourth chapter is the conclusion of this research work.

II. Marxism: A Theoretical Modality

Marxism is a highly complex subject, and Marxist literary criticism is no less so. Towards the middle of the 19th century, Karl Marx in association with Frederic Engels invented radical economic, social and political theories. Views of Marx and Engels on art and literature have been drawn upon differently by various scholars and interpreted and developed in different ways. The theories, which are known as Marxism today, Marx formulated, the most revolutionary and scientific theories in the time of tremendous socio-economic changes from the scientific discoveries and establishment of large scale production industries. His theories clearly disprove the bourgeois, economic, social and political system establishing the philosophy of proletariat, the lowest stratum of the society. They initiate the movement of the proletariat, against those who possess abandoning amount of wealth. The emancipatory movement initiated by Marxism aims at abolishing the concentration of wealth in the hands of tiny minority by seizing political and legal power from the hands of bourgeois class. Thus, Marxism is a political theory that advocates class struggle of the proletariat against the ruling class until the political power is seized and socialist emancipatory society is established.

Marxism brought significant change in the bourgeois ideology. It challenged the old view point of philosophy itself. As Marx himself clearly stated that "philosophers have only interpreted the world in various ways; the point is to change it" (qtd. In Selden, 24), and explain life and world from quite a different perspective. His theories that aim at intensifying the inevitable process of change brought considerable change in the concept of art and literature as well.

Marxism treats literature as expression of socio- economic life and judges it on the basis of how far it has fulfilled this function. Its struggle stresses literature should

be useful to life. Although Marxism is primarily a theory of social, economic, political and revolutionary activities, it treats art and literature with special care. Disapproving the early concept of then Marxist theoreticians, they have developed their own theories, which are known as Marxist theories of art and literature. Majorities of these theoreticians believe that literature has social as well as political implications and it must be committed to the cause of people. It should be used for advancement of society.

Although, Marx and Engels didn't propound any systematic theories concerning art and literature, they are found to raise some basic questions about them in relation to their discussion about base and superstructure. According to Marxism base affects the superstructure and with the change in base, superstructure also automatically gets changed, especially, to say the change in socio-economic relations brings change in ideology, politics, religion, art and literature as well. They believe that each economic structure e.g., feudalism, capitalism or socialism of society leads to its own type of social organization and production of its own literature, art, culture and religion. So, a basic characteristic of literature and art is determined by socio-economic factors. Orthodox Marxist theoreticians, therefore, are of the opinion that the origin, development and success or failure of a literary work should be examined on the basis of its relation to socio-economic life of the contemporary society. However, such relation is quite complex and contradictory. Development of art and literature even when socio-economic life was in quite a backward stage has proved their autonomy to a certain extent. The achievement of art and literature, have been found perpetually occupying their dominant position even after complete revolution in socio-economic situations. Most of the Marxist critics are aware of this fact and recognize their partial autonomy; therefore, they do not entirely neglect the literary

values despite their emphasis on sociological aspects. They are of the opinion that literature can lay active role in the development of human understanding and beside its aesthetic purpose; it can be used as vehicle for non-literary ideas. Though their development is rather an independent phenomenon, they are capable of influencing each other.

Marxist criticism examines how far a literary work embodies ability in altering human existence and leads it in the path of progress, prosperity and emancipation. Marxism aims at revolutionizing the whole socio-economic life establishing new political system led by proletariat. Orthodox Marxist literary theory strongly insists that a work of literature should reflect the class relations and be committed to the cause of working class. A writer's success or failure should be judged on the basis of his works which exhibit his insight of the lower class by the upper class. So, literature instead of rendering outward superficial appearance of reality, successfully, an author needs to have deep intellectual power and penetrating vision of the historical forces of the period. Outward superficial depiction of the things like that of naturalism and modernism which bracket off all the inner causes can never lead to reality. Literature, for Marxist critics, should be an auxiliary in spreading ideology of working class.

Marxist literary criticism analyzes literature in terms of the historical conditions which produced it; and it needs, similar to be aware of its own historical condition outside it. As a matter of fact, it was quite safe and rather conventional to treat literary works as something referring to a reality outside them. For Marx, the external reality is prior to ideas in mind, and that the material world is reflected in the mind of man and translated into forms of thoughts.

George Lukacs, one of the most important Marxist critics, doesn't see literature as a reflecting reality in the way mirror does. Reflection of reality is the key

idea of his theory of art. Art for him is socio-historical phenomenon. But the reality in literary works and the reality in the actual world need not have one to one correspondence. Artistic representation is not photographic as the artist is not a machine. A photographic machine presents everything indifferently as it can't react, whereas, an artist is a sensitive mind of the author. The previous experience and his own liking and disliking influence his interpretation of the world. For Lukacs, the world is chaos from where an artist picks up the required materials. During this process of selection he may give priority to one aspect of reality neglecting the others. Similarly, the objective external reality is mingled with the artists' feeling and emotions which are purely subjective. In the process of creating work of art, the objective reality which lies in the chaotic state is given form and arranged in sequence. David Forgacs in his book *Marxist Literary Theories* observes thus:

To be reflected in the literature reality has to pass through the creative form giving work of the writer. The result, in the case of correctly formed work, will be that the form of the literary work reflects the form of the real world. (171)

Thus, for Lukacs, literary creation is a process of putting selected matters together. This process of selection and combination imposes bound to the chaos of objective reality. Forgacs says, in Lukacs' view form is "the aesthetic shape given to content, a shape manifested through technical features such as time and the interrelationship of characters and situation in work" (Forgacs 171).

Lukacs denounces the romantic concept of art that separates it from social realities and its utility. For romanticists art has no more scope and aim than expressing the purest feelings of the creator. For Shelley, a poet is a nightingale who sits in darkness and sings to cheer its own solitude with sweet sounds. For

Wordsworth, the creation of poetry is nothing more than "spontaneous overflow of powerful feelings, emotions recollected in tranquility" (qtd. in Daiches 887), hence romantic poetry is less about mankind, more about nature. In Lukacs' view, the poems that are about mankind are quite subjective. Thus, the romanticism that entirely excludes the mimetic and pragmatic function of art was clearly a reactionary movement.

Lukacs doesn't only reject romanticism; he criticizes naturalism that attempts to reproduce photographic picture of life. For him, Naturalism which appears to be more realistic in its depiction of life is unmediated. In his view naturalist writers, are alienated from comprehensive social problems. They possess superficial visions of life and dismiss the inner and constant antagonism between classes. They are unable to apprehend the basic historical truth. Similarly, Lukacs disapproves the modernist writers as Joyce, Beckett, Woolf, etc. of going too far in the direction of subjectivity. In his opinion, the modernist writers try to make their works life like, what they have depicted is not endowed with reality as it excludes the inner causes that have made the life worthless. The tremendous change brought by the modernist writers in technique, theme and especially in treatment of time is not acceptable to him. The personalization of the standard of significance that is the private interpretation of value and loss of confidence are more objective reality and is determined by it. As a true Marxist, he criticizes the modernist literary practice of spreading individual from social process.

For Lukacs, the concept of type or typicality is a central component. The type is not a mere statistical 'average' but the character or the situation in the literary work which brings together the general movement of history and a number of unique, individual trails. In, *The Historical Novel*, he follows Marx in admiring Balzac, but

goes further in suggesting that Balzac's achievement is made possible by his ability to depict types. As he writes:

The central category and criterion of realistic literature is the type, a particular synthesis which organically binds together the general and the particular both in characters and in situations [...]; what makes it a type is that in it all humanity and socially essential determinations are present at their highest level of development, in the ultimate unfolding of the possibilities latent in them in extreme presentation of their extremes rendering concrete the peaks and limits of men and epochs.

(Lukacs 6)

Thus, Lukacs insists that only the use of types allows social reality to be properly described. A true artist, in Lukacs's view, is the one who is successful in depicting the social and historical reality objectively via his literary works. Art, therefore, is a special form of reflecting reality which is the sum total of socio-historical phenomenon. He argues that scientific thought as well as our everyday thinking possesses reality but art differs from them because the impression of reality in art is mixed with individual reaction. Thus, he strongly rejects the emotive theory of art. In *The Historical Novel*, he argues that the creation and appreciation of art is not unique and mysterious kind of knowledge, as it is neither created in vacuum nor received so.

Time and again he stresses the fact that art directly corresponds to outside reality. At the same time he states that though it is closely connected to the reality. The socio-historical situation of specific period; it is not reality in itself. It is only the knowledge of reality. Art is totality and reflects totality. Nevertheless, he insists that "the novel must be faithful to history despite its invented hero and imagined plot"

(Lukacs 252). Here he means to say that the thematic must be realistic whatever the description is. According to him, "the novel's aim is to represent a particular social reality at a particular time, with all the color and specific atmosphere of the time" (Lukacs 250).

Though Lukacs demands an artist to portray reality in his works, he draws attention to the fact that is not possible to portray reality as it exists. According to Lukacs;

Reality as a whole is always richer and more varied than even the richest work of art, no detail, episode, etc. however exactly copied, however biographically authentic, however factual, can possibly compete with reality. (302)

He argues that an artist, however, should endeavor to portray an all round and comprehensive picture of his time. The universality of such picture depends upon the variety of the characters depicted in a work. A true artist should attempt to include even such characters who are felt to be "the bearers of hostile principles" (330). All the characters, whether good or bad, should be "portrayed as living many sided human beings and not as poser like creatures" (330).

In Lukacs's view, reality reflected in a literary work should be similar to the one reflected in human consciousness and it is the duty of a critic to examine whether it is translated correctly or not in a literary work; and to judge whether a literary work is realistic or not. Lukacs always emphasized that there must be some formal correspondence between the literary work and "dialectical totality". Not only Lukacs, the Marxist philosophy itself insists that literature closely corresponds to reality. It is explicitly stated that literature belongs to the superstructure as politics, religion and philosophy which are based on socio-economic base. Thus, art from Marxist point of

view is original in the society and it must have some social significance. However, this reproduction of reality can't be always indifferent. It also carries the artists' attitude towards it.

Lukacs who has tried to interpret art from Marxist realistic perspective is rather severe in his treatment. For him all interesting writings can't be work of art. To be a literature it must be straightforward in its imitation of immediate truth along with literary characteristics. The only measurement of the successful artist is touch to reality. Whatever the language, style, uses of images, construction of plot is, if it doesn't copy the life faithfully, Lukacs doesn't allow it to be entitled a work of art. Regarding the duty of Marxist aesthetics, he observes that its duty is "not only to explain his impoverishment and inadequacy in a social genetic ways but also to measure them aesthetically against the highest demands of artistic reflection of reality and to find them lacking" (334). Thus, Lukacs views that it is the duty of the critics to evaluate whether the historical reality is properly reflected or not.

In opposition to Lukacs, the "Frankfurt School" of German Marxists, especially Theodor Adorno and Marx Horkheimer, lauded modernist writers such as James Joyce, Marcel Proust and Samuel Beckett, proposing that their formal experiments by the very fact that they fragment and disrupt the life they "reflect", establish a distance and effect a detachment which serve as an implicit critique or yield a negative knowledge of the dehumanizing institutions and processes of society under capitalism. Adorno's theory of literature is markedly different from others as it openly criticizes them in favor of modernism. Frankfurt school which he belonged to criticize the formal laws of literature and argues that the reality in the world is formless. Unlike Lukacs and Macherey, Adorno sees literature as alienation from reality. Adorno, regards literature, as negative knowledge of the real world, and give

definite value to the works of the modernist authors. Interior monologue or the stream of consciousness as literary technique was much criticized by Lukacs. Adorno, however, emphasized "the interior monologue, far from cutting the reality work off from reality, can expose the way reality actually is" (Forgacs 188). But, for Adorno this reality is not photographic as for Lukacs and at the same time the duty of the author is not to give to the objective reality pre-existing in the society. However, according to David Forgacs, Adorno by negative knowledge "doesn't mean no-knowledge, it means knowledge which can undermine and negate a false or reified condition" (Forgacs 189).

Thus, Adorno emphasizes the negative and critical role played by the works of the modernist writers as Proust, Kafka, Beckett, Joyce, etc. As stated by Forgacs, Adorno "opens up modernist writing to Marxist theory by showing that a different kind of relationship between the text and reality is possible" (Forgacs 190).

Ramon Selden observes the theory of Adorno in *Contemporary Literary Theory*, states that for Adorno "literature unlike the mind doesn't have a direct contact with reality" (34). Adorno is of the opinion that art and reality are not alike. Inverting the reflection theory of Lukacs he claims "art is set apart from reality; its detachment gives it its special significance and power" (34).

Bertolt Brecht a maverick German Marxist critic, supported modernism and non-realistic art. He has had considerable influence on non-Marxist criticism. Brecht's experimental epic theatre was for not merely to change the political content of art, but it's very productive apparatus. In, *Marxism and Literary Criticism* Terry Eagleton quotes the point already raised by Walter Benjamin, "Brecht succeeded in altering the functional relations between stage and audience, text and producer, producer and actor" (59). Brecht dismantling the traditional naturalistic theatre, with its illusion of

reality, he produced a new kind of drama based on a critique of the ideological assumptions of bourgeois theatre. At the centre of his critique is his famous 'alienation effect'. His best known theatrical device, the alienation effect is partly derived from the Russian formalist concept of 'dehumanization'. In his critical theory, and in his own dramatic writings, Bertolt Brecht rejects what he calls the Aristotelian concept of a tragic play as an imitation of reality that has a unified plot and a universal theme.

According to Brecht "the task of theatre is not to reflect a fixed reality, but to demonstrate how character and action are historically produced, and so how they could have been and still can be different" (Eagleton 60). He further remarks "the play, therefore, becomes a model of that process of production. It is less reflection 'of' than a reflection 'on' social reality" (Eagleton 60).

For Brecht, an author primarily produces analogous to any other maker of a social product. He opposes the romantic notion of the author and "creator" as the God-like figure who mysteriously conjures his handiwork out of nothing. Brecht's bourgeois theatre aimed at smoothing over contradiction and creating false harmony. But George Lukacs regards the literary work as a 'spontaneous whole' which reconciles the capitalist and abstract individual and social whole. In overcoming these alienations, art recreates wholeness and harmony. But, Brecht regards this view of Lukacs as a reactionary nostalgia. Art, for Brecht as Eagleton points out:

[...] should expose rather than remove those contradictions, thus stimulating men to abolish them in real life: the work should not be symmetrically complete in itself but like any social product should be completed only in the act of being the act of being used. (65)

Hence, Brecht means that a product fully becomes a product only through consumption.

Walter Benjamin, a notable German Marxist Critic, was briefly associated with the Frankfurt school. In his essay, *The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction*, Benjamin argues that in order to resist the influence of bourgeois art such as cinemas, telephone, radio, television etc., revolutionaries have to "become producers in their own artistic sphere" (qtd. in Selden, 37). According to Selden, Benjamin "rejects the idea that revolutionary art is achieved by attending to the correct subject matters" (37). Benjamin is of the opinion that revolution in art can be achieved as revolutionizing to the technique itself. For, Benjamin Selden observes:

The artist need to revolutionize the artistic forces of production of his time, and this is the matter of technique. Nevertheless, the correct technique will arise in response to complex historical combination of social and technical changes. (37)

Eagleton in his book *Marxism and Literary Criticism* further puts Benjamin's concept:

Art, like any other form of production, depends upon certain techniques of production certain modes of painting, publishing, theatrical presentation and so on. These techniques are part of the productive 'forces' of 'art' the stage of development of 'artistic' production, and they involve a set of social relations, between the artistic producer and his audience. (57)

Hence, Benjamin views that art like any other form of production also depends upon technique. Even for Marxism, the stage of development of a mode of production

involves certain social relations of production, and the stage is set for revolution when productive forces and productive relations enter into contradiction with each other.

For Benjamin, the revolutionary artist should not uncritically accept the existing forces of artists' production but should develop and revolutionize those forces. In doing so, artists create new social relation between artist and audience.

In the last few decades there has been a resurgence of Marxist criticism, marked by an openness, on some level of literary analysis to other current critical perspectives; a flexibility which acknowledges that Marxist critical theory is itself not a set of timeless truths but at least some degree an evolving historical process; a subtilising of the concept of ideology as applied to literary content and a tendency to grant an increased role to non-ideological and distinctively artistic determinants of literary structure.

In its distinctively Marxist use, the ideology that is dominant any era conceived to be ultimately the product of its economic structure and as the result of class-relations and class interest. Marx represented ideology as a 'superstructure' of which the contemporary socio-economic system is the 'base'. According to Friedrich Engels ideology is "A false consciousness" (qtd. in Abrahams 242).

In the 1960 the influential Marxist critic Louis Althusser assimilated the structuralism then current into his view that the structure of society as a whole is constituted by ideological state apparatuses including religious, legal, political and literary institutions. In his famous essay entitled *Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses* Louis Althusser remarks Marx's notion of ideology:

An imaginary assemblage, a pure dream, empty and vain, constituted by the 'Days' residues from the only full and positive reality, that of the concrete history of concrete material individuals metrically

producing their existence [...] represents the imaginary relationship of individual to their real condition of existence. (153)

Althusser develops - ideology as an imagined representation of reality; it is false, distorted by definition. He means that art cannot be reduced to ideology: it has, rather, a particular relationship to it. Ideology signifies the imaginary ways in which men experience the real world, which is of course, the kind of experience literature gives us too what it feels like to live in particular conditions, rather than a conceptual analysis of these conditions. In the same essay, Althusser remarks that ideology is bound up with the constitution of the subject that man is an ideological animal by nature – meaning that people constitute or define themselves ‘as human’ through ideology. As he writes, "the category of the subject is constructive of all ideology in so far as all ideology has the function of constituting concrete individuals as subjects" (160).

The implication of this idea is enormous because it means that ‘ideology goes to the heart of the personal identity of how we conceive ourselves as subjects in the world and all that this involves. Althusser avoids a reductive opposition of ideology and reality by suggesting that ideology makes our reality in constituting it as subjects. Ideology, Althusser argues, "hails or interpellates concrete individuals as concrete subjects" (162). For Althusser, the functions of Art is, as he remarks in *A Letter on Art*, "to make us see, and what it allows us to see, what it forces us to see, is the ideology from which it is born" (204). What is most terrifying and compelling about this is the fact that being a subject feels so real, so natural-and yet, as Althusser remarks, "This very reality or ‘naturalness’ of being a subject is itself an ideological effect" (204).

For Poststructuralist critics, the notion of ideology is fundamentally suspect, since it appears to rely on a classical opposition of true and false, of reality and false consciousness which such critics would question. Hence, by this view, ideology appears too easily as a master term for totalizing readings of literary texts.

Etienne Balibar and Pierre Macherey, in the important essay *On Literature as an Ideological Form* argue "literary texts produce the 'illusions of unity' and that a 'material analysis' needs to look for signs of contradictions which appear as unevenly resolved conflicts in the text" (87). Hence they mean that, literature begins with the imaginary solution of 'implacable ideological contradictions'. "Literature is there because 'such a solution is impossible'" (88). In capitalistic society, literature itself is an 'ideological form' both produced by and producing ideology. They further argue that the task of the critic would be to look beyond the unity that the literary text' strives to present, and forcefully to explore the contradictions, embedded within it.

In the book *Literary Theory*, Hans Bertens observes Tony Bennett's view:

A thorough going Althusserian criticism would not simply restore or reveal the contradictions that are already in texts: rather, it would read contradictions into the texts in such a way that it would affect a work of transformation on those forms of signification which are said to be ideological. (163)

Hence, in this respect, an ideological criticism is not that understands the reality of a text of better, rather it is a criticism that changes the text. Hans Bertens further remarks Bennett's view "there can be no notion of 'the text' underlying any reading: texts have historically specific functions and effects [...] change is time, and what changes them is reading" (163).

Literary texts however do not simply or passively ‘expresses’ or reflect the ideology of their particular time and place. Rather, they are sites of conflict and difference; places where values and preconceptions, beliefs and prejudices, knowledge and social structures- all the complete formations of ideology by which history articulates itself- may be produced and, finally, transformed.

Pierre Macherey, a French Marxist theoretician, rejects literature to be reflection of outside reality. In his essay, *Literature as an ideological Form* written jointly with E. Balibar, writes:

Literature is not fiction, a fictive knowledge of the real, because it cannot define itself simply as figuration, an appearance of reality. By complex process, literature is the production of certain reality, not intended [...], an autonomous reality, but a material reality, and of a certain social effect [...]. (66)

Hence, he views literature as not able to produce realistic picture of the given society, however, the text produces ‘reality-effect’. He opposes the concept of fiction and realism and also presupposition of outside reality as the ‘anchoring point’.

For Macherey, the author of any text does nothing more than working out with already existed materials such as language, genres, ideology etc. The production of literature, for him is inseparable from social practices. Macherey is of the opinion that creation of literature basically is a linguistic phenomenon. Macherey with E. Balibar remarks:

Literature submits to a threefold determination; ‘linguistic’, ‘fictive’ and pedagogy [...]. There is a linguistic determination because the work of literary production depends on the existence of a common language codifying linguistic exchange, both for its material and for its

aims in so much as literature contributes directly to the maintenance of a 'common language'. (63)

According to Macherey literature produces ideological effect and the material for literature are the 'ideological Contradictions' which are political, religious, etc. As he states that the fundamental material for literary text is "contradictory ideological realization of determinate class positions in the class struggle" (68). Regarding the effect of the literary text, Macherey states that it provokes "other ideological contradictions which can sometimes be recognized as literary ones but which are usually merely aesthetic, moral, political, religious discourses in which the dominant ideology is realized" (68).

David Forgacs in his essay *Marxist Literary Theories* discusses Macherey's theory of literary production under the Production Model. According to Forgacs the specialty of his theory lies in the concept of ideology. For Macherey, ideology, as it enters the text and settles with other elements, it loses its proper meaning. For Macherey, as Forgacs observes "a text contains gaps and silences; and writing is necessary a partial or incoherent reading of reality" (181). In his opinion the texts are incomplete and the reader has to bring to the theoretical knowledge the text and its author didn't possess (180). Thus, in his theory the role of the readers or critics is of great importance. For him reading of any literary text is not interpretation of what a text already contains but the critics task is to seek out the principle of its conflict of meanings, and to show how this conflict is produced by the work's of text's relation to ideology.

Ramon Selden examines Macherey's and Althusser's theories of literary production under the title *Structuralist Marxism*:

Literary critic is not concerned to show how all the parts of the work fit together, or to harmonize and smooth over any apparent contradictions. Like a psychoanalyst, the critic attends to the text's unconscious-to what is unspoken and even inevitably suppressed. (40)

Thus for Macherey, the gaps and silences are of great importance than what is in the text but not obvious for an ordinary reader.

Raymond Williams, a dominant British Marxist, doesn't believe in structuralist and post structuralist theories, he positively responds to the late 20th century developments in art and literature. He doesn't approve the general concept that realist novels have ceased to exist and literature has made departure from reality. He insists that 20th century novels whether it is of Woolf or any other authors still hold to reality.

In his penetrating work *The Long Revolution* William writes:

No human experience is entirely subjective or objective. It is both because we can't see things as they are apart from any creation; it is inseparable processes so it is wrong to relate science to object or physical reality and art to subject or emotion [...] the conscience is part of the reality and reality is the part of consciousness, in the whole process of our living organization. (23)

According to him, there is much similarity between art and ordinary day to day communication. As every day, an artist perceives things and interprets these sensory information with the help of previous knowledge. However, the efforts to describe the new experience are very important on the part of an artist. Such efforts are made not only by the artist but also by everyone and it is the part of ordinary social process. William clearly describes and states, "What is called an art is one of a

number of ways commonly used as dance from gesture, poetry from speech" (24). He further says "[...] the arts are certain intense forms of general communication, in which artist and spectators or readers participate actively" (25). Art, in his views, is active, powerful expression of human experience and what is often called creative imagination is the capacity to find and organize new descriptions of experience, and is common to all, therefore, an artist's work becomes art only by his extraordinary skill in transmission of this experience. According to him, "the 'creative' act of any artist is in any case the process of making a meaning active by communicating an organized experience to others" (32). It is the artists' power to communicate on which the value of art depends.

Explaining artistic creation from Marxist perspective he clearly justifies the inseparable relation between art and ordinary experience. He says that art cannot be excluded from serious practical concerns. Neither art can be dismissed as unpractical or secondary nor can it be distinguished from ordinary living.

William insists that art like other communication is social activity and it can't be set apart from reality. It is obviously a part of our social organization. As he writes:

It is totally wrong to assume that political institution and conventions are of a different and separate order from artistic institutions and conventions. Politics and art together with science, religions, family life and the other categories we speak of as absolutes, belong in a whole world of active and interacting relationships which is our common associative life. (39)

Hence each activity should be studied in relation to the whole, the abstraction results in suffering.

The Long Revolution contains quite a valuable discussion regarding the contemporary novels under the title *Realism and the Contemporary Novels*. Williams divides the whole literary tradition into three phases, in the first phase there developed literature with concentration on heroic, romantic or legendary subjects related to invisible supernatural power. And it was centered on the upper class. However, with the rise of middle class contemporary, ordinary, everyday activities were set against the above subjects and the attention was gradually shifted to the ugly poor aspects of everyday reality. Naturalism developed parallel to realism however; it is different from realism as it is simple, technical reference to subject for it is straight forward depiction of observed reality. Describing the features of contemporary novels he observed that 19th century tradition of realistic novels is replaced by psychological novels and the apprehension of psychological states, the consciousness of the characters, has been its fundamental characteristics. He observes, "...realism as an intention in the description of these states (i.e. psychological states), has been widely abandoned" (227). Though, he seems much positive towards the new developments, he is not fully satisfied with them as they are not able to embody reality in the way realist works should. He points out, "there is the formal gap in modern fiction" (278). For him a realist novel is the one, which creates and judges the quality of a whole way of life in terms of the qualities of persons. Thus, aspects of general life should be embodied in personal life and individual character should be drawn in relation of society.

For Williams, it is not that realist tradition has disappeared in the modern fiction but what has actually disappeared is the integration between individual's circumstances in favor of rendering impression. There has been polarization of styles. The earlier novels were object realist and the modern are subject impressionist i.e. the

social and personal novel. According to him a social novel generally offers the accurate observation and description of the general life, the aggregation, on contrary the personal novel offers the accurate observation and description of process and units. However, none of them are perfect portrayal of reality. Contemporary novelists are not able to apprehend the reality that personal experience is formed on the background of general way of life as each individual is a unit of society. Their attempts to separate an individual from the society neglecting the impacts of socio-economic as well as political situation on him, is erroneous.

William views that 20th century is characteristics for individual right and absolute freedom. Everybody is happy in separating him/her in order to preserve freedom and identity. As Williams observes, these things have actually happened in the society and they existed in reality before they made their way to literature. The change in real socio-economic life has resulted in the change in both literary technique and content. The new trend has powerfully threatened the old and it's impossible to remain responsive to its pressure. In such a situation, it is only foolishness to try to grip hold to the old and dismiss powerful emergence of the new. William says; "time has come to explore the new definition of realism in order to break out of the deadlock and find a creative direction" (287). Thus, in contrary to other Marxist critic and theoreticians, William responds positively to the new trend in fiction and observes, "the contemporary novel has both reflected and illuminated the crisis of our society [...]" (287). For him the fundamental problem in modern literature is extrication of individual from the whole social process and the only solution to it is to put efforts in setting back the fragments into whole.

A leading Marxist theorist Terry Eagleton has expanded and elaborated the concepts of Althusser and Macherey in his view a literary text is a special kind of

production in which ideological discourse described as any system of mental representations of lived experience is reworked into a specifically literary discourse.

Ramon Selden in his book *Literary Theory* observes Eagleton's view that:

Like Althusser criticisms must break with its ideological prehistory and became a 'science'. The central problem is to define the relationship between literature and ideology because in his views texts do not reflect historical reality but rather work upon ideology to produce an 'effect' of the real. (42)

Hence, Eagleton means that the text may appear to be free in its relation to reality, but it is not free in its use of ideology. Ideology here refers not to conscious political doctrines but to all those systems of representation which shape the individual's mental picture of lived experience. In *Marxism and Literary Criticism* Eagleton writes:

Ideology is not in the first place a set of doctrines; it signifies the way men live out their roles in class. Society values, ideas and images which tie them to their social functions and so prevent them from a true knowledge of society as a whole. (15)

Here, he means that any work of art should show a man making sense of his experience in ways that prohibit a true understanding of his society, ways that are consequently false.

Eagleton rejects Althusser's view that literature can distance itself from ideology; it is a complex reworking of already existing ideological discourses. As he writes:

In any society ideology has a certain structural coherence. Because it possesses such relative coherence [...] and since literary texts 'belong'

to ideology, they too can be the object of such scientific analysis. A scientific criticism would seek to explain the literary work in terms of the ideological structure of which it is a part, yet, which it transforms in its art; it would serrate out the principle which both ties the work to ideology and distance from it (18).

Eagleton means that literature and ideology both are the object of scientific interpretation. Because science gives us conceptual knowledge of a situation; art gives us the experience of that situation, which is equivalent to ideology.

He argues that such attempts to disengage art and culture from socio-economic determinants lead them to unprivileged humble position. Art becomes nothing more than production of any other commodity. Regarding the anti-representationalistic nature of modern and post modern art, Eagleton views:

If art no longer reflects, it is not because it seeks to change the world rather than mimic it, but because there is in truth nothing to be reflected, no reality which is not itself already image, spectacle, simulacrum, fiction, etc. (387)

Here he means that in contemporary society truth itself has been subjected to power and performativity instead of reason. Nevertheless, the attempts to disintegrate art from reality erase the influence of history on present and create art on culture devoid of all political and historical contents is nothing more than metaphysical illusion which can never be successful. For him the vital fault of modernism in breaking off the real social world, establishing a critical negating distance between itself and the ruling social order is its bracketing off the political forces which seek to transform that order.

In, *Literary theory: An Introduction* 1983, Eagleton discusses that in the present world of nuclear power everything has been politicized, and literature is not exception to it. It has been in the literary theories from the earliest time. Regarding the history of modern literary theory he observes that it is part of the political beliefs and ideological values. He further writes that it is not an indifferent phenomenon, so pure literary theory devoid of all historical, social and sexual relevance is entirely impossible as he writes that literary theories without any relevance to socio-economic situation is "only an academic myth". According to him, "literary theory has a most particular relevance to this political system. It has helped wittingly or not to sustain and reinforce its assumptions" (196).

Regarding the utility of studies, he observes "perhaps literary criticism and literary theory just mean any kind of talk about an object not the method, which distinguished and delimits and discourse" (197). Nevertheless, the object or literature itself is not stable as he states, "the unity of object is as illusory as the unity of the method" (197). Therefore, attempts to put boundaries to the study of literature, whether it is in terms of method or its object is liable to be misleading.

In Eagleton's view the relation between literature, literary criticism or its theory and politics is inseparable. As he writes:

... all criticism is in some sense-political [...] socialist criticism and feminist criticism are of course, connected with developing theories and methods appropriate to their aims: they consider questions of the relations between and sexuality or of text and ideology, as other theories in general do not. (212)

A common accusation of Marxist approach to literature is that they are insufficiently attentive to the form of literature. Here is also a residual suspicion

among Marxist that the aesthetic and the political are somehow antithetical- that to ‘tell the truth’ in literature is to refuse the excesses, the performativity, the exuberance of poetry.

In his book, *The Political Unconscious Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act* (1981), Fredric Jameson, remarks that this suspicion is itself the product of a capitalist culture which has appeared to split the poetic and the political. As he writes:

... one of the determinants of capitalist culture, that is, the culture of the western realist and modernist novel, is a radical split between the private and the public, between the poetic and the political [...]. We have been trained in a deep cultural conviction that the lived experience of our private existences is somehow incommensurable with the abstractions of economic science and political dynamics. Political in our novels, therefore is according to Stendhal’s canonical formulation, a ‘pistol shot in the middle of a concert’. (69)

Here, Jameson renews earlier debates within Marxism concerning the relative merits of classic realism and modernism. In place of ‘Lukacs’ rejection of modernism as an anti-political aestheticism, Jameson takes modernist text for their repressed political contents.

Jameson views that narrative is a ‘socially symbolic act’ so now Marxist readings need not read literature merely as a reflection of its particular context. It is not a matter of learning something of the historical context and then reading the text off against that as a form of ‘background’.

Jameson refutes the idea that historical subtext is ‘extrinsic’ to the work, something which he, not the text, brings to bear upon it. As he writes:

A definition we think of as paradoxical only because such theoretical strategies have tended to be situated as oppositional to one another. Formal patterns in the work are read as symbolic enactments of the social within the formal. (77)

Jameson's readings are thus attempts to combine heuristic with deductive procedures. His initial approach to the work is a moment description of its formal and structural properties. It is deductive in so far its hunt for formal contradictions are motivated by its aims of transcending the purely formalistic; it stimulates intention of relating these contradictions to history as the subtext of the work. And such contradictions will enable a political analysis in its widest sense. Jameson draws upon such Marxist theorists as Althusser and Macherey (Structuralist Marxist) and Sartre and Lukacs (Hegelian Marxist) and combines their approaches with those of psychoanalysis, structuralism and post structuralism.

Within these parameters, Marxist approaches to literature are surprisingly varied, and there is no programmatic way of applying Marxist ideas. Of course, Marxist critics will continue to discuss such issues as class struggle, commodification and alienation of labor and so on, but their shared concerns have not entailed that Marxist readings are always identical in approach, or even that their conclusions will be the same.

In the following chapters, this present research work seeks to explore the class struggle which is apparent in Bram Stoker's novel *Dracula*. The researcher explores how the major characters are exploited under capitalism and it studies the alienation caused in the life of the major characters by its influence.

III. Economic Panic in *Dracula*

Gothic economy is a condition in which the logic of capitalism transforms even the most supernatural of images into material images of capitalism itself. Academic studies of nineteenth century British economics as well as literature also assume that in the Victorian period economics fashion fictions, and fiction produces economic reality. In this study the researcher proposes that gothic tropes register, manage and assess the intense panic produced and elided by the unstable Victorian economy. The researcher aims to juxtapose nineteenth century economic discourse with other form of panic through Gothic or supernatural means.

With the rise of capitalism and the concomitant demise of the household as the center of the economy, the subject became fragmented and compartmentalized, a self haunted at home as well as at work. Responding to this situation Fredric Jameson suggested that the new economy created the ghostly haunting in which "the opposing classes necessarily carry the other around and are thus traumatized by this 'foreign body' that it is impossible to exorcize" (215). Capitalist compartmentalization produced haunting of psychic superstructure.

Nineteenth century Gothic novels paralleled references to the Victorian bourgeoisie as the uneasy classes, haunted not by the gothic novel but by the gothic marketplace and the household it had consumed. Victorian novel is informed by many panics and anxieties about race, class, gender, sexuality, and empire; these have been richly studied to great and continuing effect. The researcher finds traces of panic that are a hallmark of nineteenth century British fiction and capitalism.

Like every monster from Grendel to King Kong, Dracula is, of course, monstrous. He is, moreover, a particularly patriarchal monster, a rapist, invented by a male imagination. Many of his worst qualities seem to result from psychosocial

projection: unlike Grendel or King Kong but like the nineteenth century British bourgeoisie, Dracula wants to conquer and control. If we are to understand the effectiveness and function of a monster story in the society that produced, published and read it, however, we must overlook the inevitable monstrousness of the monster and inquire about values. What values are destroyed with the monster and by what opposing values?

Stoker adopted the folk image of the vampire and attached it to a medieval nobleman renowned for his cruelty. The connection is not difficult because the vampire of folklore is a mystified image of the lord of the manor, who sucked the serfs' lifeblood metaphorically and occasionally carried off their daughters. Like the vampires, the lords were often foreigners, as in the English case of Norman nobility over Anglo-Saxon serfs, enforcing their domination by superior strength. The vampire's power is magical, not military, and he does literally by night what the lords did figuratively by day. Stoker's Dracula is from the aristocracy, but in a historical period when that aristocracy is no longer the ruling class. In *Dracula*, progressive bourgeois men defend their women and their society against a reactionary irrational force which threatens their dominance of the planet.

Stoker's tale figures two incorporated entities: Dracula and his vampire and Van Helsing and his followers, competing to the death for a complete monopoly on circulation and consumption. In both group the focus is not on the individual desiring subjectivity but on the meaning and power of the consolidated group. Indeed, Dracula is not only the name of an individual shareholder but also the designation of his corporation, as it were. The term "Dracula" is itself an amalgamation, naming an individual person; an amalgamated corporation of Vampires of which he is the brains; a process or procedure of infinite circulation especially the commodity of blood in the

novel; and the extensive group of accountants who attempt to bankrupt the artificial personality of the incorporated Dracula.

The context for Harker's business visit to Transylvania has everything to do with the fact that London was the world's banker and that its commerce had increasingly to do with banking exchanges of abstract foreign credit while relying less and less on material commercial or industrial ventures such as the building of railways and the production of textiles. Harker comes to court Dracula to encourage and facilitate his economic exchanges, consumption, and accounting in London. Dracula, the foreign investor who attempts corporate overthrow of competing entities, does exactly what is supposed to do according to Victorian economic predilections.

Dracula was a genuinely perverse count who tortured and killed upwards of a hundred thousand people. His perversion follows from the black magic he used to avoid his natural death, a sin simultaneously against Christianity and against scientific rationalism. He is represented as dangerous because he is a force from the past seeking to restore the old order. Dracula portrays impulsive primitive forces of the blood and the body rising in revolt against the socialized mind, against the brain. The savage seeks to overthrow the civilized, emotion to undermine thought. At the most abstract level, it is the old battle of chaos against order. Sexually, the vampire is a rapist who not only invades the bodies of his victims and uses them for his own purposes, but takes permanent control.

All the irrational lunatics, children, (uneducated) workingmen and, of course, women are Dracula's victims and dupes. His conquerors are wealthy, rational men. Stoker writes:

Chief among these the Father is Van Helsing, a doctor and lawyer, a scientist of iron nerve and icy temper, with indomitable resolution and

self-command, clean-shaven, well-balanced, poised, a specialist in the brain with thought power so strong that his broad forehead is said actually to repel the sensuality of his own red hair. (121).

He is aided by four younger men, who supply money, courage, connections, and youthful vigor, and by Mina, who has a man's brain and a woman's heart (241). She is temperamentally closer to Dracula.

Marx's assertion has something to do with the vampiric association. He subliminally affirmed when he says: "Capital is dead labor and that vampire like, only lives by sucking living labor, and lives the more, the more labor it sucks." (79). The modern world for Marx is peopled with the undead; it is, indeed, a gothic world haunted by specters and ruled by the mystical nature of capital. He writes:

Capital posits the permanence of value by incarnating itself in fleeting commodities and taking on their form, but at the same time changing them just as constantly [...] but capital obtains this ability only by constantly sucking in living labor as its soul, vampire –like. (646)

While it is fascinating to note the coincidence here between Marx's description of capital and the power of the vampire, it is not enough to say that Marx uses Gothic metaphors. Marx, in fact, is describing an economic system, capitalism, which is positively Gothic in its ability to transform matter into commodity, commodity into value, and value into capitalism. And, Gothic capitalism, like the vampire, functions through many different, even contradictory, technologies.

Dracula is associated with wild animals: bats, wolves, owls, rats, moths and foxes. He is himself part beast, having hair on the palms of his hands and on his face. He moves in night and fog, storm and thunder. In him the blood rules the brain: his eyes are red. He is aided by gypsies, lunatics, women, and wolves by all beings whose

brains do not rule their actions in the light of rationality. Dracula, however, wishes to reverse the "rational order," to establish the rule of tyranny over reason, impulse over will.

Western civilization defends itself against eastern "superstition," bourgeois "order" against medieval "disorder," knowledge and culture against animal impulses. In the most extremely abstracted archetypal forms-life against death, order against disorder. Van Helsing and the other men have emotions, even "base" emotions like lust. Of his encounter with the vampire women, Jonathan writes, "I felt in my heart a wicked, burning desire that they would kiss me with those red lips" (46). Van Helsing, facing the same women, is not immune either:

Ah, I doubt not that in old time, when such things were, many a man who set forth to do such a task as mine, found at the last his heart fail him, and then his nerve . . . till sunset come, and the Vampire kiss. . . .

Yes, I was moved, Helsing, with all my purpose and with my motive for hate I was moved to a yearning for delay which seemed to paralyze my faculties and to clog my very soul. (373-4)

Van Helsing, of course, overcomes this voluptuous lust because he feels a rational, non-sensual love for Mina, a love which is consonant with the rule of the mind. It is this love for Mina, a concern especially for her immortal soul that makes rational the risking and even sacrifice of life to destroy Dracula after he has fled England.

The most striking anomaly for the modern reader is the significance of money in the tale. Workingmen must be bribed before they will give any information. Mina writes of "the wonderful power of money! What it cannot do when properly applied" (360). Even Dracula, his very existence at stake, pauses to grasp a handful of money to pay his passage out of England. If we see a little of the financial doings of the

English and American characters, it is certainly not because they are not interested in Dracula's finances and property. Harker worries that Dracula will invade "the city itself" (229), the London financial center that Lucy Snowe idolizes.

A careful reading of the text – that is filled with an array of the most terrestrial of business discourse, including bills, wills, receipts of service, and legal descriptions of parcel of land, and references to money supports that Van Helsing becomes an obsessed with tracking Dracula's paper trail as he is with avenging Dracula's bloody deeds. Certainly his pursuit of Dracula conceals the inroads he makes for personal property. In attempting to bring about Dracula's downfall, Helsing worries about the many houses Dracula has purchased. He notes that, "he will have deeds of purchase," "cheques," "paper," and other belongings that needs to be tracked down (225).

The text also associates Dracula's very body with money. When Van Helsing and Crew pursue Dracula on one of the states, Harker lunges at the Count with his Kukri knife, puncturing not the vampire's skin but his outer garment, instead. Bizarrely, the Count gushes money: "the point of the knife just cut the cloth of his coat, making a wide gap whence a bundle of bank-notes and a stream of gold fell out" (266). Immediately after this, the narrator describes how in the midst of fleeing his pursuers, the Count fumbles to retain his cash:

The next instant, with a sinuous dive he swept under Harker's arm, ere his blow could fall, and, gasping a handful of the money from the floor, dashed across the room, threw himself at the window. The Count tumbles into the flagged area below, two noises stand out: the sound of the shivering glass and ting of gold, as some of Dracula's much scrambled for sovereigns, fell on the flagging." (267)

Subdued by the need for cash itself, Dracula looks like a bumbling keystone Cop rather than a supernatural genius, and his fiscal humiliation begins his unraveling.

In this ludicrous sequence, after Dracula runs from the scene with the moneys he is able to retrieve, van Helsing pockets the rest of the cash, titles, and deeds, because, he says, it will stop Dracula from having the resources he needs to continue his horrific plans. The novel never mentions these financial assets again, and one has to wonder if Van Helsing has appropriated them as a finder's fee for having, in multiple ways, bankrupted the Count. At least, Van Helsing proves to be as savvy and persistent a consumer as Dracula.

The incident is over determined to say the least. The creature who lives on a diet of blood, bleeds gold when wounded; at a time of critical danger, the vampire grovels upon the floor for money, and then his departure is tracked by a 'ting' of the coins that he drops during his flight. Obviously, the metaphoric import of this incident is to make literal the connection between blood and money, and to identify Harker's band with a different and more mediated relation to gold. Harker and his cronies use money and they use it to protect their women and their country: Dracula hoards gold and he uses it only to attack and seduce.

The novel illustrates that the life blood of the nation is money that circulates eternally. Stoker's novel demands his readers along with every character in the novel that in order for the fictional personality of Dracula to exist they must bank on his business – his production and consumption of blood, the commodity that endlessly circulates – and keep and reread compulsive account of the frenzied circulation and panic he produces amongst the English *homo economicus*. The terrifying Count named Dracula whose consumption is over determined may be a synecdoche for the consumption and accounting that dominate the lives of the English characters.

Harker's comic obsession with consuming and keeping track of Transylvanian cuisine and customs, Lucy's coy pleasure in counting her suitors, and Mr. and Mrs. Harker's thinly disguised efforts to enter a higher station through their superb accounting skills end up being projected onto the foreign consumer Dracula.

In the novel the gothic is amalgamated with the economic. Essentially, the structure of the novel is itself is a strict accounting, and its reliance on shorthand is similar to the accounting format that Stoker recommended for clerks of petty sessions. In any case, the novel encourages keeping an account of a Count who is obsessive about keeping a count of his property in order to protect it from economic interlopers. As Van Helsing tells Sewad:

Take then good note of it. Nothing is too small. I counsel you, put down in record even your doubts and surmises. Hereafter it may be of interest to you to see how true your guess. Always jotting down something, Renfield keeps a little notebook in which complete pages are filled with masses of figures, generally single number added up in batches, and then the totals added in batches again, as though he were focusing some account, as the auditor puts it. (69)

The most orally consumptive, anal retentive, hysterically accounting human in the novel, Renfield, is in other words, a model and touchstone for "vitiating economic man."

A novel whose horror, in part, is the result of the monomaniacal consuming practices of its eponymous protagonist, *Dracula* incorporates the reader into a mode of subliminal panic about the yearning for amalgamation and centralization, paralleling those same processes occurring in the economy at the end of the nineteenth century. From the beginning of the novel, the financial is the actual ground

of all meaning, for as Harker remarks, despite the frightening places he must travel to in order to do his job, "there was business to be done, and I could allow nothing to interfere with it" (13). This attitude accommodates the paradigm shift in nineteenth century England – a transition towards individual being constituted within "all engrossing" economy.

A gothic economy also complies with what we might call the logic of capitalism, a logic which rationalizes even the most supernatural of images into material images of capitalism itself. To take the remarkable image from *Dracula* as an example, readers may recall the scene in Transylvania at Castle Dracula when Jonathan Harker, searching for a way out, stumbles upon a pile of gold:

The only thing I found was a great heap of gold in one corner – gold of all kinds, Roman, and British, and Austrian, and Hungarian, and Greek and Turkish money, covered with a film of dust, as though it had lain long in the ground. None of it that I noticed was less than three hundred years old. There were also chains and ornaments, some jeweled, but all of them old and stained. (49)

This image of dusty and unused gold, coins from many nations and old unworn jewels, immediately connects *Dracula* to the old money of a corrupt class, to a kind of piracy of nations and to the worst excesses of the aristocracy.

Dracula lets his plundered wealth rot, he does not circulate his capital, and he takes but never spends. Of course, this is exactly the method of his vampirism: *Dracula* drains but it is the band of English men and Van Helsing who must restore. This can be called as instance of a Gothic economy because the pile of gold both makes *Dracula* monstrous in his relation to money and produces an image of monstrous anti – capital, one distinctly associated with vampirism. Money, the novel

suggests, should be used and circulated; vampirism somehow interferes with the natural ebb and flow of currency, just as it literally intervenes in the ebbing and flowing of blood.

In this light, the emphasis on money has added significance because it is money that allows the standardization of value and thus the rationalization of capitalist exchange relations. As Kenneth Burke notes, "money is not a mere agency, in our civilization, but is a rationalizing ground of action" (Grammar 113). Under capitalism, money ceases to be a simple intermediary facilitating the exchange of commodities. Thus on a variety of levels the rationalized control embodied by Stoker's heroes and especially its manifestation as money is part and parcel of the digitalized rationalism that dominates *Dracula*. Bourgeois rationalism demands the digital control of the analog.

The emphasis on money and its power to control grows out of the nineteenth century Victorian society. Had he written a vampire story, *Dracula* would have been the hero, a peasant or gypsy acting out of the eroticism of the blood, with no urges to conquer but a refusal to be mastered. It would have been everybody but bourgeois men and their dupes, everyone whose indoctrination in bourgeois rationality had been less than full, who would have been responsive to the hero.

Stoker's heroes have careers; they are businessmen, lawyers and doctors: thus they represent the economic rationality of business and industry, the political rationality of the law, and the intellectual rationality of science. They share the usual bias of this mode against anything that cannot be counted or predicted i.e., quantified and regularized. They are stern with hysterical servant women and with lunatics; they are condescending with workers and foreigners. Van Helsing lists science, the

potential for coordinated action, and unselfish devotion as their strengths. Always they are more concerned with hard data than with relative tonalities.

The men who use their wealth and rationality to defeat Dracula are defending a particular order. In the same sense that Sherlock Holmes represents the super rational individual whose mental acuity guarantees the safety of bourgeois life, liberty and pursuit of property, so Van Helsing represents a particular masculine bourgeois rationality defending that same society against various sensual inefficiencies. The mode embodied by Dracula is more accurately described as analogical.

Dracula must be placed in both its social and its formal logical contexts; and then it should be understood as one of a set of cultural artifacts that functioned to prevent some of those oppressed by the dominant ideology from correctly perceiving that ideology, its values, or the potential alternatives. Placing Dracula thusly can also give us insights both into the text and into the nature of our world (in this case, especially into the relation of technology as applied by capitalism to humanness).

There is a fight to the death between emergent and residual, the world shaking struggle between the best of humans, the English, and Dracula's amalgamated corporate personality constituted by his vampire underlings. As Dracula's increasing power over England's metaphorical and literal blood supply causes increased panic amongst Van Helsing's tight-knit followers, they recognize that they can deter his access to banking, money, and landed property before they can deter his access to their English bloodlines. By merging their forces, Van Helsing and company form a kind of corporate personality that acts in fiduciary power for all of England against Dracula's company of vampires.

Like Frankenstein's monster, Dracula's design upon civilization is read by his enemies as the desire to father a new race. Harker fears that Dracula will "create a

new and ever – widening circle of semi- demons to batten on the helpless" (54). More than simply an economic threat, then, Dracula's attack seems to come from all sides, from above and below; he is money, he is vermin, he is the triumph of capital, and the threat of revolution. Harker and his cronies create in Dracula is an image of aristocratic tyranny, of corrupt power and privilege, and of foreign threat in order to characterize their own cause as just, patriotic, and even revolutionary.

In *Dracula*, vampires are precisely a race and a family that weakens the stock of Englishness by passing on degeneracy and the diseases of blood lust. Dracula as a monster parasite feeds upon English wealth and health. He sucks blood and drains resources; he always eats out. Jonathan Harker describes the horror of finding the vampire sated in his coffin after a good night's feed:

The cheeks were fuller, and the white skin seemed ruby-red underneath; the mouth was redder than ever, for on the lips were gouts of fresh blood, which trickled from the corners of the mouth and ran over the chin and neck. Even the deep, burning eyes seemed set amongst the swollen flesh, for the lids and pouches underneath were bloated. It seemed as if the whole awful creature were simply gorged with blood. He lay like a filthy leech, exhausted with his repletion. (54)

Harker is disgusted not simply by the spectacle of the vampire but also by the thought that when the count arrives in England he will want to "sate his lust for blood, and create a new and ever-widening circle of semi-demons to batten on the helpless" (54). At this juncture, Harker picks up a shovel and attempts to beat the vampire into pulp.

Certainly the rhetoric in the gothic horror story *Dracula* shares a code with economic text. Van Helsing's rhetoric about man brains and child brains, the brain of the corporate personality, combines the gothic and the evolutionary to describe an

amalgamated, increasingly powerful entity. For instance, Van Helsing's describes Dracula thus:

All though there are signs of his advance not only of his power, but of his knowledge of it [...] in him the brain powers survived the physical death; though it would seem that memory was not all complete. In some faculties of mind he has been, and is, only a child; but he is growing, and some things that were childish at the first are now of man's stature. He is experimenting and doing it well; and if it had not been that we have crossed his path he would be yet – he may be yet if we fail – the father or furtherer of a new order of beings, whose road must lead through Death, not life. (263)

In Stoker's *Dracula*, a colossal corporate personality has exponentially magnified powers.

Furthermore, over the centuries Dracula has expanded and concentrated his power. As Van Helsing explains, "this vampire which is amongst us is of himself so strong in person as twenty men; he is of cunning more than mortal, for his cunning be the growth of ages" (209). Van Helsing also reminds Mina that Dracula's emigration from Transylvania to England represents the "work of centuries." "Dracula is always going at it; with persistence and endurance," says Helsing, "their nemesis comes again, and again, and again to find the place of all the most of promise for him" (278, 279).

Thus, Stoker has provided us to see Victorian society from the perspective of Marxist outlook. The gothic has been blended with the economic to represent the economic slackening of the Victorian period. The vampire is the invader over the English people, economy, circulation of capital and the national trade and business.

Dracula as a monster parasite feeds upon English wealth and health. He sucks blood and drains resources; he always eats out. Dracula is an image of aristocratic tyranny, of corrupt power and privilege, and of foreign threat in order to characterize their own cause as just, patriotic, and even revolutionary. As Dracula's increasing power over England's metaphorical and literal blood supply causes increased panic amongst Van Helsing's tight-knit followers, they recognize that they can deter his access to banking, money, and landed property before they can deter his access to their English bloodlines.

IV. Conclusion

Dracula, the epitome of capitalism and its repercussion, buttresses the ethos of Nineteenth century's economy. Though *Dracula* is mainly a story about vampires, after having perusal on it, it is possible to argue that Stoker's text comprises economic panic of the Victorian society. The Victorian society is presented in a continuous battle with the foreign investments and the shifting of the power of economy from their hands to the invaders like Dracula. The Victorian society is shown combating and striving in the face of Capitalism.

With the crescendo of capitalism and the concomitant demise of the life and blood of people, the subject became fragmented and compartmentalized. Responding to this situation Fredric Jameson suggested that the new economy created the ghostly haunting in which "the opposing classes necessarily carry the other around and are thus traumatized by this 'foreign body' that it is impossible to exorcize" (215). Capitalist compartmentalization produced haunting of psychic superstructure of the Victorian society.

Dracula is a final aristocrat, the tyrant seeking to preserve the survival of his house. While the vampire hunters embody the bourgeois family with the entire solid reasonable and moral values – of middle class Victorian society. And similarly, there can be seen class struggle where the capitalist is rich and always wants to be rich by sucking the sweats and labor of the poor. Always he wants to be powerful, rich, respected in the community.

The vampire of folklore is a mystified image of the lord of the manor, who sucked the serfs' lifeblood metaphorically and occasionally carried off their daughters. Like the vampires, the lords were often foreigners, as in the English case of Norman nobility over Anglo-Saxon serfs, enforcing their domination by superior strength. The

creature who lives on a diet of blood, bleeds gold when wounded; at a time of critical danger, the vampire grovels upon the floor for money, and then his departure is tracked by a 'ting' of the coins that he drops during his flight. Obviously, the metaphoric import of this incident is to make literal the connection between blood and money, and to identify Harker's band with a different and more mediated relation to gold. Harker and his cronies use money and they use it to protect their women and their country: Dracula hoards gold and he uses it only to attack and seduce.

Thus, the panic is created in the society as there is fear of vampire metaphorically overpowering the English economy. It is a continuous battle between the foreigners i.e. the bourgeois ruling class and the local serfs i.e. the proletariat. The fear in the novel is the psychological pressure of the Victorian people of being controlled or restrained by the growing foreign investment in England.

Works Cited

- Abrams, M.H. *A Glossary of Terms*. New Delhi: Harcourt, 2001.
- Adams, Hazard. *Critical Theory Since Plato*. New York: Harper Collins, 1992.
- Althusser, Louis. "Ideology and Ideological State." *Lenin and Philosophy, and Other Essays*. USA: St. Martin's, 1969.
- Angeles, Peter A. *The Harper Collins Dictionary of Philosophy*. New York: Harper Collins, 1992.
- Astle, Richard. "Dracula as Totemic Monster: Lacan, Freud, Oedipus and History." *Substance* 8.4 (1979): 98-105.
- Benjamin, Walter. "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction." *Critical Theory Since Plato*. New York: Harper Collins, 1992.
- Bertens, Hans. *Literary Theory*. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Classics, 1993.
- Byron, Glennis. Introduction and ed. *The Casebook of Dracula*. London: MacMillan, USA: St. Martin's, 1999.
- Case, Sue Ellen. "Tracking the Vampire." *Differences* 3.2 (Summer 1991): 1-20.
- Coe, Richard M. "It Takes Capital to Defeat Dracula: A New Rhetorical Essay." *College English* 48.3 (Mar., 1986): 231-242.
- Craft, Christopher. "Kiss Me With Those Red Lips: Gender and inversion in Bram Stoker's *Dracula*." *Speaking of Gender*. Ed. Elaine Showalter, New York: Routledge, 1989.
- Daiches, David. "The Victorian Novels." *A Critical History of English Literature*, New Delhi: Allied Publishers Private Limited, 1996.
- Day, Gary. "The State of Dracula: Bureaucracy and the Vampire." *Rereading Victorian Fiction*. Ed. Alice Jenkins and Juliet John. New York: St. Martin's, 2000: 81-95.

- Eagleton, Terry. *Marxism and Literary Criticism*. London: Oxford University Press, 1976.
- Encyclopedia Americana*. New York: Americana Corporation, 1965.
- Farson, Daniel. *The Man who wrote Dracula: A biography of Bram Stoker*. London: Oxford University Press, 1975.
- Forgacs, David. *Marxist Literary Theories*. New York: Penguin, 1993.
- Halberstam, Judith. "Technologies of Monstrosity: Bram Stoker's Dracula." *Victorian Studies* 36 (2002): 333-352.
- Hollinger, Veronica. "The Vampire and the Alien: Variations on the Outsider" *Science Fiction Studies* 16. 2 (Jul., 1989): 145-160.
- Houston, Gail Turley. *From Dickens to Dracula: Gothic, Economic, and Victorian Fiction*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Jameson, Fredric. *The Political Unconscious Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act*. New York: Longman, 1981.
- Lohani, Shreedhar Prasad, Rameshwor P. Adhikari, Abhi N. Subedi, ed. *Essays on the Creation of Knowledge*, Kathmandu: Ratna Pustak Bhandar, 1996.
- Lovecraft, Howard P. *Supernatural Horror in Literature*. New York: Dover Publications, 1973.
- Lukacs, George. *The Historical Novel*. New York: Dover Publications, 1971.
- Mayhew, Henry. *London Labor and the London Poor*. New York: Dover, 1968.
- McCarthy, Noelle. "Going beyond the Colonial." *The Irish Review* 27 (1986): 204-207.
- McKee, Patricia. "Racialization, Capitalism, and Aesthetics in Stoker's *Dracula*." *Novel: A Forum on Fiction* 36.1 (Autumn, 2002): 42-60.

Selden, Ramon. *Contemporary Literary Theory*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Stewart, Bruce. "Bram Stoker's *Dracula*: Possessed by the Spirit of the Nation?" *Irish University Review* 29.2 (1999): 238-255.

Stoker, Bram. *Dracula*. New York: Penguin, 1993.

The New Encyclopedia Britannica. Ed Philip W. Goetz. 15th ed. 29 Vols. Chicago: The University of Chicago, 1768.

The World Book Encyclopedia. USA: World Book, Inc., 1997.

Wicke, Jennifer. "Vampiric Typewriting: *Dracula* and its Media." *ELH* 59 (1992):469-93.