

The Monopolistic Feudal and the Socialistic Bourgeoisie in Bram Stoker's *Dracula*

Dwi Setiawan

English Department, Faculty of Letters, Petra Christian University, Siwalankerto 121-131, Surabaya

60236, East Java, Indonesia

dewey@peter.petra.ac.id

Abstract: In this article, I would like to reveal the existence and the struggle of two social classes in Bram Stoker's *Dracula*. Using the theory of historical materialism, I attempt to show that Count Dracula is the symbol of the 19th century feudal while his opponents the (petty and big) bourgeoisies of the same century. The Count is the monopolistic feudal who tries to revive the ancient mode of concentration and monopoly. His monopolistic feudalism can be seen from his tendency toward territorial expansion and total submission of his subjects. The bourgeoisies in the novel are what Marx & Engels ridicule as the socialistic bourgeoisies who characterize the Victorian Capitalism. Still brand-new, ashamed of themselves, and troubled by guilty feeling, these bourgeoisies try to use their money and both scientific and superstitious knowledge to do good. And yet this in-betweenness is the key of their success in defeating the one dimensional Dracula.

Key words: class, class struggle, monopolistic feudal, socialistic bourgeoisie.

Abraham Stoker (November 8, 1847 – April 20, 1912) is an Irish writer of novels and short stories. During his lifetime, Bram Stoker was better known for being the personal assistant of the actor Sir Henry Irving than a great author of macabre stories. Stoker wrote for supplementing his income. His most famous work is the vampire tale *Dracula*, published in 1897. When it was first published, *Dracula* did not gain an immediate attention. According to literary historians Nina Auerbach and David Skal (1997, p. ix) in the Norton Critical Edition, most Victorian readers enjoyed it just as a good adventure story. *Dracula* only reached its broad iconic legendary classic status later in the 20th century. According to the Internet Movie Database (2011), the number of films that include a reference to *Dracula* may reach as high as 649. The character of Count Dracula has grown popular over the years, and

many films have used the character as a villain, while others have named him in their titles e.g., *Dracula's Daughter*, *Brides of Dracula*, *Zoltan*, *Hound of Dracula*, etc. An estimated 237 films (as of 2011) feature Dracula in a major role, a number second only to Sherlock Holmes (242).

Formally speaking, *Dracula* is an epistolary novel, written as a collection of diary entries, telegrams, and letters from the characters, as well as fictional clippings from newspapers and phonograph cylinders. By using the epistolary structure, Stoker maximizes suspense. There is no guarantee to the readers that any first-person narrator will survive by the end of the story. In terms of content, *Dracula* has been attributed to many literary genres including vampire literature, horror fiction, gothic novel and invasion literature (Rogers, 2000). The Dracula legend as Bram Stoker created it shows a compound of various influences. Before writing *Dracula*, he spent eight years researching European folklore and stories of vampires. Many of Stoker's biographers and literary critics have found marked similarities to the earlier Irish writer Sheridan le Fanu's classic of the vampire genre, *Carmilla* (Auerbach & Skal, 1997). Throughout the 1880s and 1890s, authors such as Arthur Conan Doyle, Rudyard Kipling, and Robert Louis Stevenson wrote many tales in which fantastic creatures threatened the British Empire. Invasion literature was at its peak, and Stoker's formula of an invasion of England by continental European influences was very familiar to readers (p. ix).

There are several reasons *Dracula* is more successful than the other works of its kind. Rogers (2000, p. viii), in his "Introduction and Notes" to *Dracula's* Wordsworth Classics edition, believes that the answer lies partly in the novel's thematic dichotomy. Narratives constructed upon a clash between two polarities such as those of good and evil are as old as narrative itself. Stoker follows this tradition by

setting Dracula against men whose qualities, action, and appearance seem to contrast him in almost every way. For this reason the novel provides many different allegorical readings. There are allegorical readings drawn from a number of conceptual polarities between Romanticism and Victorianism, including reason and feeling, rationality and irrationality, the visible and the invisible. There are those that might arise from 19th century debates concerning the struggle between the altruistic and the selfish individual. And there are also Marxist readings associated with class antagonism.

In this article, I am going to read *Dracula* as a class-struggle text. To be specific, I would like to reveal in it the existence and struggle of two competing classes for world domination. Along the way, I would like also to show how they, using their respective infrastructure and superstructure, try to overcome each other. In doing so, I am going to employ the theory of historical materialism with particular attention to class and class struggle.

Historical Materialism, Class Struggle, and Class

Historical Materialism is the application of Marxist philosophy to historical development. Marx (2010, p. 11) in his preface to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* sums up the fundamental proposition of historical materialism in one sentence: "it is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but, on the contrary, their social existence that determines their consciousness". In other words, the social relations between people are determined by the way they produce their material life. Marx further elaborates his proposition of historical materialism into several principles in the Introduction of the same book:

1. The basis of human society is how humans work on nature to produce the means of survival.

2. There is a division of labor into social classes based on property ownership where some people live from the labor of others.
3. The system of class division is dependent on the mode of production.
4. The mode of production is based on the level of the productive forces.
5. Society moves from stage to stage when the dominant class is replaced by a new emerging class, by overthrowing the political system that enforces the old relations of production no longer corresponding to the new productive forces (Marx, 2010).

The main modes of production Marx identified generally include primitive communism or tribal society (a prehistoric stage), ancient society, feudalism and capitalism (Worsley, 2002). In each of these social stages, people interact with nature and produce their living in different ways. Any surplus from that production is also distributed in different ways. Ancient society was based on a ruling class of slave owners and a class of slaves; feudalism based on landowners and serfs; and capitalism based on the capitalist class and the working class. The capitalist class privately owns the means of production, distribution and exchange (e.g. factories, mines, shops and banks) while the working class live by exchanging their labor with the capital class for wages.

Marx & Engels (1998) generally distinguished three major (fundamental) classes. Each of which was characterized in its role in the productive system by the factor of production it controlled. They are the land downers (feudalist), by their ownership of land; the capitalist (bourgeoisie), by their ownership of capital; and the proletariat (working class), by their ownership of labor power. Besides, there are also some classes which are fluctuating between the three major classes. In Marxism discourse they are usually being known as 'non fundamental classes'. One of them is

petty bourgeoisie class, e.g. farmer, owner of small shop, craftsman, and other owner of small means of production.

The classes can also be recognized from their typical superstructure. Superstructure contains more than certain forms of law and politics, a certain kind of state, whose essential function is to legitimize the power of the social class which owns the means of economic production (Eagleton, 2011). Marx (2010, p. 11) says it also consists of certain “definite forms of social consciousness” (political, religious, ethical, aesthetic and so on), which is what Marxism designates as ‘ideology’.

The Competing Classes and the Exploits of the Infrastructure & Superstructure

There are two competing classes in the novel such as the late 19th century feudalism and bourgeoisie. Count Dracula represents the late 19th century feudalism who tries to revive the feudalism as the dominant system of the world. His opponents consist of the big and petty bourgeoisies of the century. Lord Godalming and Quincey P. Morris represent the big bourgeois class. The petty bourgeois class is embodied by the professionals such as Dr. Van Helsing, Dr Seward, Jonathan and Mina Hawker. Adhering to the Marxist tradition, I am going to focus my discussion on their respective position in relation to production and ideology.

The Monopolistic Feudal

Count Dracula is an aristocrat of the late 19th century. He is a feudal which after years of losing tries to fight back to revive the old mode of concentration and monopoly. For Bram Stoker, monopoly should be feudal and tyrannical. For this reason he can only imagine monopoly in the figure of Count Dracula, the aristocrat, the figure of the past, the symbol of distant lands and dark ages. Furthermore, Stoker

sees that monopoly and free trade are two irreconcilable concepts. He therefore believes that, in order to become established, the feudal monopoly and the capital free competition must destroy each other. He cannot accept that monopoly can also be the future of free trade; that free trade itself can generate monopoly in new forms. This can be seen from his ambiguous attitude toward Quincey P. Morris as will be made clear in the next section.

There is a reason only the negative and destructive aspects of feudalism appear in the novel. In Britain where Stoker lived at the end of the 19th century, monopolistic feudalism was reduced (for various economic and political reasons) far more effectively than in other European countries, especially the Eastern ones. Monopoly was perceived as something no longer relevant to British history: as a foreign threat. This is why Dracula is not British, while most of his enemies are British. There are indeed two non-British opponents such as Van Helsing and Quincey P. Morris but they are born in the other well-known cradles of free trade, Holland and USA.

Bram Stoker does his best to characterize the Count with the negative, distant, old timey, feudal accessories. First of all, following the prescription of popular stereotype, the count lives in “a vast ruined castle, from whose tall black windows came no ray of light, and whose broken battlements showed a jagged line against the moonlit sky” (p. 15). The fact that the Count lives in a castle indicates that he is in possession of a vast land, which is the major means of production in the feudal system. Castle was not merely the private residence of feudal masters but also the headquarters of feudal production system (Coulson, 2003). It served a range of purposes, the most important of which were administrative and military (Friar, 2003).

Castle was where feudal masters coordinated and monitored the farming of his land (Coulson, 2003). Castle was usually surrounded by a vast farming land and much

smaller houses of peasants working on the land. It is from Castle Dracula the Count directs and controls his subjects. In his lifetime, the Count directs his peasants to farm on his land and harvest its fruits for his wealth. In the 19th century, Count Dracula directs his gypsies and undead subjects to plant the seeds of evil on his territory and to cultivate poor souls for his existence. Carfax in England serves exactly the same purpose as Castle Dracula does. The difference lies only on the subjects he commands. This time he commands Renfield the lunatic, Lucy, Mina, and the other victims of his hellish bites.

Furthermore, castle was an offensive tool used as a base of operations in a new occupied land. As feudal masters advanced through, it became necessary to fortify key positions to secure the land they had taken (Friar, 2003). Beside an offensive structure, castle was primarily intended to be a place of protection from enemies, be it other land-seeking feudalists or rebellious groups of peasants working for him. Count Dracula uses Castle Dracula for this very purpose. He uses it for protection against numerous foreign invaders aiming at taking his territory such as the Magyar, the Lombard, the Avar, the Bulgar, and the Turk. On the other hand, he also uses Castle Dracula for the springboard of offensive towards his enemy:

“Who was it but one of my own race who as Voivode crossed the Danube and beat the Turk on his own ground? This was a Dracula indeed! ... Was it not this Dracula, indeed, who inspired that other of his race who in a later age again and again brought his forces over the great river into Turkeyland, who, when he was beaten back, came again, and again” (Stoker, 1999, p. 32-33).

It is for the same strategic military importance that the Count purchases an estate at Purfleet. He wants to make it his new castle in his new conquered land to protect him from his new enemies as well as to expand his conquest. The estate is called “Carfax, a corruption of the old Quatre Face, as the house is four sided, agreeing with the

cardinal points of the compass” (Stoker, 1999, p. 25). Carfax meets the criteria of an ideal bastion for the Count, as being described vividly by Jonathan Harker:

It was surrounded by a high wall, of ancient structure, built of heavy stones, and has not been repaired for a large number of years. The closed gates are of heavy old oak and iron, all eaten with rust ... It contains in all some twenty acres, quite surrounded by the solid stone wall above mentioned. There are many trees on it, which make it in places gloomy, and there is a deep, dark-looking pond or small lake, evidently fed by some springs, as the water is clear and flows away in a fair-sized stream. The house is very large and of all periods back, I should say, to mediaeval times, for one part is of stone immensely thick, with only a few windows high up and heavily barred with iron (p. 25).

It is from this medieval place Count Dracula launches his repeated attacks on Lucy Westenra, Mina Harker, and his other victims. It is also in Carfax the Count hides from the bitter revenge of Dr. Van Helsing and his associates.

Along with the land, Count Dracula also owns feudal labor power. Bram Stoker does not give any clear account on the Count’s feudal subjects in his lifetime. Yet, Stoker provides quite clear information about his subjects during his undead time. They are not peasants whom feudal masters own for farming land. After all, the Count is not alive in the traditional sense of the word so he does not need farming land and farmer. His subjects are the Romanian gypsies and his victims both in Romania and England.

It is implied in the story that his servants do not financially depend on the Count. They have already had their own jobs, as testified by Jonathan, “In the morning come the Szgany, who have some labours of their own here, and also come

some Slovaks” (Stoker, 1999, p. 53). Although the Count may not give material rewards to his subjects, as any good feudal masters, he provides shelter and protection for them. Life was not easy back during the feudalism era, and commoners needed protection from bandits as well as cruel government officials (Bloch, 1989). Therefore, they naturally looked for protection from a strong feudal lord, and the Szgany and Slovaks of Count Dracula are of no exception. As retold by Harker in his diary, “the Szgany are quartered somewhere in the castle and are doing work of some kind” (Stoker, 1999, p. 48).

Count Dracula’s ideology is more straightforward than the one of his enemies. It is due to the fact that the Count stands in the absolute end of the ideology continuum. He is extremely right in the political sense of the word. Count Dracula is a true monopolist: solitary and despotic, and he will not allow any competition. He does not even allow competition from his own kind. It can be seen from the scene where he gets furious when the vampirellas in Castle Dracula try to seduce Jonathan Harker:

“How dare you touch him, any of you? How dare you cast eyes on him when I had forbidden it? Back, I tell you all! This man belongs to me! Beware how you meddle with him, or you'll have to deal with me” (Stoker, 1999, p. 42).

Furthermore, Count Dracula consistently threatens the idea of individual liberty. Like a good feudalist, his mission is to subjugate liberalist promises and destroy all forms of independence. He does not stop himself from sucking dry physical and moral strengths of his victims. His subjects are not bound to him for a fixed period of time as a capitalist contract usually stipulates with the intention of maintaining the freedom of workers and bosses. Count Dracula wishes to make his victims his forever. He, like feudal masters, destroys the hope that one's independence can one day be bought back.

This applies not only to his victims but also to his servants. The servants see their submission to the master as a natural subordination. They do not feel being forced by the Count and cheerfully serve somebody who they consider naturally superior. For example, on one occasion Jonathan Harker witnesses how the Gypsies seemed to be carefree while carrying out on the Count's order: "as I waited I heard in the distance a gipsy song sung by merry voices coming closer, and through their song the rolling of heavy wheels and the cracking of whips" (Stoker, 1999, p. 57).

Their adherence toward the master is somewhat religious. No discussion, let alone a conflict, comes between the master and the subjects. It remains so even when it is obvious that the Count was committing a crime. When Harker seeks help from his confinement, for instance, they just ignore his cry:

Then I ran to the window and cried to them. They looked up at me stupidly and pointed, but just then the "hetman" of the Szgany came out, and seeing them pointing to my window, said something, at which they laughed. Henceforth no effort of mine, no piteous cry or agonized entreaty, would make them even look at me. They resolutely turned away. (Stoker, 1999, p. 47)

This state of submission can only be achieved religiously as in the concept of the servant-lord relationship. What the servants do to the master is seen as a service instead of a job. Theologically, the goal is for the servant to achieve union with God (Moertono, 1968). The ideal servant-lord relationship is one in which the lord protects and the servant pledges his total devotion. This is what Marx and Engels (1998, p. 38) identify as "exploitation, veiled by religious and political illusions".

Last but not least, Count Dracula shows the sentimentalism of medieval knights. Not even his violence has pleasure as its goal. The Count does not *like* spilling blood: he *needs* blood. His ultimate aim is not to destroy the lives of others according to whim, but to *use* them for his survival and the return of the old order.

Dracula, in other words, is a knight, an ascetic, an upholder of the monk-warrior ethic. He is some sort of the medieval Knight Templar.

The Socialistic Bourgeoisie

If Count Dracula is the symbol of the 19th century feudal, then Stoker's heroes must be the bourgeoisies of the same era. Among the vampire slayers, there are two big business owners such as Lord Godalming and Quincey P. Morris. Judging from his title, Lord Godalming must have aristocratic blood in his veins or at least have a legitimate connection to the feudalist class. He inherits his title from his deceased father, which was a common practice among feudalists. However, Lord Godalming belongs to a new type of aristocrat. He is one of those aristocrats who were forced to transform themselves into bourgeoisie to maintain their leading position in the 19th century Britain.

Quincey P. Morris is a stereotype of an American, who is adventurous, slang-speaking, a hard nut to crack, and, naturally, a bourgeoisie. From his first appearance, just like the Count, Morris is shrouded in mystery. He is introduced as “such a nice fellow, an American from Texas, and he looks so young and so fresh that it seems almost impossible that he has been to so many places and has had such adventures” (Stoker, 1999, p. 63). Yet, it is never clear in the novel what places he has been to, what adventures he has had. At the end of *Dracula* the vampire's defeat is complete. Only the death of Morris clouds the happy ending.

The accident seems to disturb the narrative, yet it fits perfectly into Stoker's sociological belief. The American Morris must die because although he embodies the system Stoker defends, he represents its dark side: the monopolistic form of capitalism. As Lenin (1963) stated in his seminal work “Imperialism: the Highest

State of Capitalism”, the concentration of production and capital can develop to such a high stage that it creates monopolies. In Stoker’s era, America was perhaps the only country which came close to that state. In Morris, Stoker saw a new, potential enemy and a new, potential vampire.

Indeed, Morris displays this threat repeatedly. Lucy dies and then turns into a vampire immediately after receiving a blood transfusion from Morris. Morris also tells the story of his horse, sucked dry of blood by “one of those big bats that they call vampires” (Stoker, 1999, p. 162). Morris promises to guard the house from the vampire but fails miserably. So long things go well for Dracula, Morris acts like an accomplice. As soon as there is a bad luck, Morris is trying to replace Dracula in the conquest of the world. He does not succeed in the novel but in real history America would succeed to surpass Britain and other European countries in the world competition a few years afterwards.

The interesting thing is to understand why Stoker does not portray Morris as a vampire. The answer may lie in his conception of monopoly as described earlier. For Stoker, it is hard to admit that the very system he defends can produce a monopoly. The American Morris is a product of British Civilization, just as America is a descendant of Britain and American capitalism is a consequence of British capitalism. To make Morris a vampire means accusing capitalism directly or, rather, accusing Britain of giving birth to the monster. For the good of Britain, then, Morris’ true identity should not be revealed and his existence should be sacrificed.

And Britain must be kept out of this difficult task. Morris is eventually killed by a gypsy whom the British curiously allows to escape. And when Morris dies, and his threat disappears, Britain blesses its aggressive young brother, and raises him to the dignity of a hero: “And, to our bitter grief, with a smile and silence, he died, a

gallant gentleman” (Stoker, 1999, p. 140). Those are the last words of the novel, whose true ending suspiciously does not lie in the death of the Romanian feudal, but in the killing of the American bourgeoisie.

The Dracula hunters are not only business owners and financiers such as Lord Godalming and Quincey P. Morris. In fact, their role in the elimination of the Count is diminutive compared to that of their professional allies such as Dr. Van Helsing, Dr. Seward, Jonathan and Mina Harker. They are skilled workers in their respective fields. Dr. Van Helsing and Dr. Seward are physicians while Jonathan and Mina Harker are respectively a solicitor and an assistant schoolmistress. They do not rely entirely on the sale of their labor power for survival. It can be said that they are not dealing with the problems of survival in their daily life. In fact, some of them have subordinates under their care. As Lucy Westenra testifies about Dr. Seward: “Just fancy! He is only nine-and-twenty, and he has an immense lunatic asylum all under his own care” (Stoker, 1999, p. 60). Jonathan Hawker becomes a boss when his former boss Mr. Hawkins leaves him everything he has, “a fortune which to people of his modest bringing up is wealth beyond the dream of avarice and a law firm” (p. 169).

On the other hand, the professionals do not own means of production nor buy the labor of others to work it. They do not run or profit from any material production process. Their existence is merely supplemental to the capital system. The bourgeoisies everywhere need healthy and educated workers and legal certainty for their business. Those are what Dr. Van Helsing, Dr. Seward, Mina and Jonathan Hawker provide. Indeed they may have subordinates but they do not own them. No matter how prestigious a physician like Dr. Van Helsing or Dr. Seward could be in the

society, they are essentially the bourgeoisie's "paid wage labor", as Marx & Engels (1998, p. 38) puts it.

The professionals' unique position in relation to production makes them different ideologically from the business owners and financiers. Dr. Van Helsing and his associates embody the in-betweenness typical to the petty bourgeoisie ideology. First of all, they believe in the world of the past full of witchcraft and at the same time the emerging modern world of science and technology. Van Helsing personifies this fluctuating ideology. He uses modern technologies like blood transfusions. He also uses hypnotism to locate Dracula's position. During their pursuit of the vampire, the bourgeoisies use railroads and steamships, not to mention the telegraph and the telephone, to keep a step ahead of him (in contrast, Dracula escapes in a sailing ship). Mina even employs Criminology to anticipate Dracula's actions and quotes Cesare Lombroso and Max Nordau, who at that time were considered experts in the field.

However, Van Helsing is not so modern as to believe in the idea that an undead being causes Lucy's illness. He spreads garlic around the sashes and doors of her room and makes her wear a garlic flower necklace. After Lucy's death, he receives an indulgence from a Catholic cleric to use the Eucharist in his fight against Dracula. In trying to bridge the rational/superstitious conflict within the story, he cites new sciences, such as hypnotism, that are only recently considered magical. He also quotes the American psychologist William James, whose writings on the power of belief become the only way to deal with this conflict.

In *Dracula*, some superstitious beliefs are described as having an empirical basis and promise to yield to scientific research. Jonathan Harker displays the problems of living in a strictly rational world. As a solicitor, Harker is concerned with bare facts, verified by numbers and figures, of which there can be no doubt. For

example, he ignores the peasants who tell him to delay his visit to Castle Dracula until after Saint George's feast day. The first time he witnesses Dracula crawling down the castle, he is in total disbelief. Not believing what he sees, Harker attempts to explain what he sees as a trick of the moonlight.

No character at the end of the novel, however, advocates a rejection of science in favor of superstition. The garlic, crucifixes, holy wafers, and so on, are not important for their intrinsic superstitious meaning but for a practical knowledge. Their true function consists in setting impenetrable limits to the Count's activity. They prevent him from entering this or that place and seducing this or that woman. Setting limits to the monopolistic feudal means attacking his very reason of existence. He must by his nature be able to expand his land and to have his loyal subjects. Count Dracula, the feudal that is true to his own nature, cannot survive this condition.

Van Helsing receives the admiration of the other characters and succeeds to defeat Dracula by a combination of scientific and superstitious knowledge. Late in the novel, as Dr. Seward comes to embrace Van Helsing's superstition, he writes, "In an age when the existence of ptomaines is a mystery we should not wonder at anything!" (Stoker, 1999, p. 350). For Stoker, science opens the possibility of unfamiliar phenomena. As if he reminds the readers that 'established science' cannot offer a complete understanding of the world.

Despite their differences, the big bourgeoisies and petty bourgeoisies in this novel cooperate to destroy the Count Dracula. It is quite commonplace and common practice these two different strata of bourgeoisie work hand in hand in defeating the crumbling feudal class. The Great French Revolution is a classic example of this type of alliance. And indeed alliance has a significant role in *Dracula*. The idea of alliance is important because it is collective. It unites individual energies and enables

them to resist the threat. While Dracula threatens the freedom of the individual, every individual hero in the novel lacks the power to defeat him. Individualism is not the weapon with which Count Dracula can be beaten, just as the French Revolution would not succeed to champion individualism without the Parisian mobs.

In this alliance, the big bourgeoisie provide capital while the petty contribute knowledge. The capital of Lord Godalming is one that refuses to become capital and that denies the profane economic laws of capitalism. Towards the end of the novel, Mina Harker thinks of her friend's financial commitment: "it made me think of the wonderful power of money! What can it not do when it is properly applied; and what might it do when basely used!" (Stoker, 1999, p. 387). That is the point Stoker wishes to make: money should be used to do good. Money must have a moral, anti-economic end. Furthermore, the knowledge of the professionals must also refuse to become supplemental to capitalism and aims to have an altruistic end.

Such a perception on money and knowledge is a false ideology of Victorian capitalism, a capitalism which was ashamed of itself. Dracula's enemies are the exponents of this type of capitalism. They are the militant version of what Marx and Engels (1998, p. 70) calls "socialistic bourgeoisie" who "is desirous of redressing social grievances in order to secure the continued existence of bourgeois society". They find their fulfillment in and overcome their guilty feeling by doing good with their money and knowledge.

Conclusion

In conclusion, Bram Stoker's *Dracula* portrays the fierce struggle between the feudals and the bourgeoisie at the end of the 19th century for class domination. Count Dracula is the symbol of the feudal of the century while his opponents are the

representative of the big and petty bourgeois class. The Count is the monopolistic feudal who tries to revive the crumbling mode of production. His monopolistic feudalism can be seen from his tendency toward territorial expansion and total submission of his subjects. The bourgeoisie in the novel is what Marx & Engels ridicule as the socialistic bourgeoisies who characterize the Victorian Capitalism. With the exception of Quincey P. Morris, they are brand-new capitalists who are still ashamed of themselves and troubled by guilty feeling. As a result, they have a fluctuating belief on money and knowledge. And yet this 'flexibility' is the key of their success in defeating the one dimensional creature like Dracula.

References

- Auerbach, N., & Skal D. J. (1997). *Dracula (Norton Critical Edition)*. London: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Bloch, M. (1989). *Feudal society: Social classes and political organization*. UK: Routledge.
- Count Dracula. Retrieved May 21, 2011 from <http://www.imdb.com/>
- Coulson, C. (2003), *Castles in medieval society: Fortresses in England, France, and Ireland in the central middle ages*, Oxford: OUP.
- Eagleton, T. (1976). *Marxism and literary criticism*. UK: Methuen & Co. Ltd.
- Eagleton, T. (2011). *Why Marx was right*. USA: Yale University Press.
- Friar, S. (2003). *The Sutton companion to castles*. UK: Sutton Publishing.
- Lenin, V. I. (1963). *Selected works (Volume 1)*. Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- Marx, K. (2010). *A contribution to the critique of political economy*. General Books LLC.
- Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1998). *The communist manifesto: A modern edition (1848)*, London: Verso.
- Moertono, S. (2009). *State and statecraft in old Java: A study of the later Mataram period, 16th to 19th century*. Indonesia: Equinox Publishing.
- Stoker, B. (1999). *Dracula: A glassbook classic*. USA: Glassbook Inc.
- Worsley, P. (2002). *Marx and Marxism: Key Sociologists*. London: Routledge.