

2017

Enemies or Allies? Fear, Terror and Xenophobia in Dracula

Christopher Eaton

Western University, Canada

Follow this and additional works at: <https://research.library.kutztown.edu/dracula-studies>



Part of the [English Language and Literature Commons](#), [Feminist, Gender, and Sexuality Studies Commons](#), and the [Film and Media Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Eaton, Christopher (2017) "Enemies or Allies? Fear, Terror and Xenophobia in Dracula," *Journal of Dracula Studies*: Vol. 19, Article 1.

Available at: <https://research.library.kutztown.edu/dracula-studies/vol19/iss1/1>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Research Commons at Kutztown University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Dracula Studies by an authorized editor of Research Commons at Kutztown University. For more information, please contact czerny@kutztown.edu.

Enemies or Allies? Fear, Terror and Xenophobia in Dracula

Cover Page Footnote

Christopher Eaton is a Ph.D. candidate at Western University in Canada. His research focuses on both Victorian culture and on composition studies. He is particularly interested in how literature and rhetoric informed, inspired, and obscured cultural change during the nineteenth-century. When not working on his studies, he is a Senior Researcher at North Waterloo Academic Press, which specializes in Victorian newspaper and periodical research.

**Enemies or Allies?
Fear, Terror and Xenophobia in *Dracula***

Christopher Eaton

[Christopher Eaton is a Ph.D. candidate at Western University in Canada. His research focuses on both Victorian culture and on composition studies. He is particularly interested in how literature and rhetoric informed, inspired, and obscured cultural change during the nineteenth-century. When not working on his studies, he is a Senior Researcher at North Waterloo Academic Press, which specializes in Victorian newspaper and periodical research.]

Bram Stoker's *Dracula* (1897) demonstrates the complex relationships between immigrants and nineteenth-century British culture. It scrutinizes how the British characters' relationships with their foreign companions develop as Dracula's attacks multiply, as the fear of subsequent attacks mounts, and as terror becomes ubiquitous. Just as a vampire can morph into new forms, terror can manifest in seemingly endless ways and characters fear subsequent attacks. Marshall Berman describes this phenomenon as a sense that "grave danger is everywhere, and may strike at any moment" (23) after Dracula enters Britain. Fear looms constantly despite efforts to curb the primary threat, Dracula, and terror's psychological toll persists long after the Dracula's attacks. Apprehension invades characters' thoughts and emotions and, when it does, it lingers even once danger has passed. Therefore, one can never fully eradicate this fear because it is psychological, not tactile.

However, this paper rejects notions that ubiquitous danger and persisting fear necessitate rejecting foreign

Enemies or Allies?

people. Rather than subscribing to a simple solution to combat fear whereby foreign people are ostracized because of their cultural differences, the novel complicates the British characters' relationships with foreign characters and their cultures. It destabilizes notions of British xenophobia by demonstrating how foreigners, such as Abraham Van Helsing and Quincey Morris, may participate in British society during adversity. While cultural contact produces a threat—*Dracula*—it also generates friendships and allegiances between the British characters, Morris, and Van Helsing which are integral to eradicating this threat. Approaching the text from this perspective highlights the complex way that *Dracula* presents British relationships with other cultures, and this approach enhances our understanding of the relationship between conflict and immigration.

Later in the paper, these notions of fear are scrutinized using Marc Redfield's and Jacques Derrida's discussions about how terror develops and persists. Combining the novel with more recent perspectives highlights how fear provokes similar reactions despite differing contexts and how people face comparable struggles when coping with traumatic events. Understanding how terror works and how it impacts people can ultimately help generate solutions to the problem and help to manage fears about immigration during times of high-tension.

Xenophobia is a frequent consequence of terror when it derives from a foreign source, such as the terror that *Dracula*, the "other" from Transylvania, inflicts on the novel's Western characters. One may assume that when cultural and social ideals are threatened, rejecting foreign influences is a plausible measure to preserve one's culture.

However, the novel does not present relationships between the British and foreign characters so simply. Joseph Valente argues against the consensus among critics of *Dracula's* Anglo-Irish relationships, which prioritize notions that the novel's "allegorical dynamics express the concerns, register the anxieties, and even mythologize the struggle of an increasingly beleaguered hegemonic group...[which aims to] secure the borders of their collective identity against the nightmare of political violence and abandonment, the terrors of racial absorption, and that 'spectre of bad blood and degeneration'" (9). This approach to cultural contact is inadequate when evaluating Britain's relationships with foreigners throughout the novel. This position considers how the foreign people's immersion jeopardizes a distinctly "British" social fabric because cultural contact blurs the boundaries between British and foreign cultures. Just as Jonathan Harker is unable to prevent Dracula from invading England and attacking the British, this approach assumes that the British feared becoming helpless to curbing foreign influence.

Instead, Valente argues that the novel is undecided and even skeptical about racial distinctions and social hierarchies which prioritize the British over all other cultures. For Valente, *Dracula* "succeeds in troubling such binaries and the attitudes that they support" (9). While Valente discusses Anglo-Irish relationships, the same ideas translate into evaluations of how the novel's British characters interact with other cultures because the novel does not necessarily portray British characters who are trying to preserve a sense of British cultural supremacy. While Dracula is a threat, the novel's other foreign characters do not demonstrate the same desire to conquer or hinder British culture.

In fact, the primary British characters in *Dracula* accept—if not welcome—foreign influences. The novel

Enemies or Allies?

destabilizes notions of racial divide and the British characters rely on the same foreign intelligence, represented through Van Helsing, which they fear in Count Dracula to eradicate the monster. Both Van Helsing and Dracula know more than most “Western” characters like Harker, Lord Godalming, and Dr. Seward. Dracula possesses a prolific family history, has had a range of experiences, and has a profound knowledge of Britain. He has the *London Directory* for manufacturers and merchants, *Whitaker’s Almanack* containing lists of all prominent people and places in London, the *Law List* (Stoker 44), and, most importantly, *Bradshaw’s Guide* to railway schedules, routes, and times (47). Dracula knows all facets of British society, and he knows how to navigate this world both socially and physically.

Comparatively, Van Helsing is widely educated and very experienced. He is a doctor and a lawyer, and he has extensive teaching experience. He has dealt with medical practises and diseases that no other character has. Seward describes him as a “seemingly arbitrary man, but this is because he knows what he is talking about more than any one else” (Stoker 129). Both characters, Dracula and Van Helsing, think differently than their British counterparts, and both can resolve most problems that they face. However, their motivations contrast. Dracula wants to conquer the British while Van Helsing defends them. Short of knowing these motivations, it is difficult to discern whether they are a threat or whether they will use their talents for good. Rejecting Van Helsing on the premise of foreignness when they are being attacked by Dracula would only enhance the threat by leaving it uncontested. Negating foreign influences when being attacked by someone from abroad does not resolve the problem. It simply narrows the prospective solutions to the issue.

Dracula's irony is that the British characters require foreign help to resolve a problem which derives from abroad. As the "terrors of racial absorption" (Valente 634) are presented when the Count first enters London and attacks Lucy, these notions are complicated by Seward's call for Van Helsing's help. Two primary characters involved in defeating Dracula, Quincey Morris and Van Helsing, come from abroad, and neither of these characters' origins inhibits them. Some may argue that Morris being rejected as Lucy's suitor in favour of the British Lord Arthur Holmwood highlights a hierarchy which limits Morris. While this is true, Morris' participation in wider British society is unaffected and he remains a trusted friend. Eventually, he becomes integral to defeating Dracula. So while being American limits Morris in some ventures, he can still participate in British society. To assume that Morris is excluded simply based on British hierarchy oversimplifies the text.

Under this premise, any notion that the British are weary of foreigners like Dracula are destabilized by how welcomed Morris and Van Helsing are. One may suggest that these characters still represent the "West" while Dracula represents the threat from the "East", but this premise does not withstand scrutiny. Characters cannot be evaluated on the basis of their apparent foreignness; being foreign does not, in itself, determine the level of risk a person poses. The biggest threat in the novel, Dracula, speaks exquisite English and has extensive knowledge of the West. Quincey Morris fits into British society, is "really well educated and [having] exquisite manners" and the only hint that he is American is when he is "talk[ing] American slang...whenever [Lucy] was present, and there was no one to be shocked" (Stoker 79). Both Morris and Dracula assimilate with British norms and fit into British society for the most

Enemies or Allies?

part. They control their accents to accommodate their new milieu, and this control allows them to oscillate between their refined English and their natural accents given the circumstance. Morris' and Dracula's mastery of the English language allows them to blend into popular British society undetected while still maintaining their identities as an American and as a Transylvanian, respectively. Morris can participate in British culture without forfeiting much of his American heritage, and Dracula can do the same without forfeiting his identity.

Van Helsing is the novel's only character whose actions and speech consistently reflect his foreignness. He travels repeatedly between Amsterdam and London, collecting new knowledge and collaborating Western medical practice with knowledge of Eastern cultures. The reader's introduction to Van Helsing, his first letter to Dr. Seward, clearly establishes his foreignness:

Were fortune other, then it were bad for those who have trusted, for I come to my friend when he call me to aid those he holds dear. Tell your friend that when that time you suck from my wound so swiftly the poison of the gangrene from that knife that our other fired, too nervous, let slip, you did more for him when he wants my aids and you call for them than all his great fortune could do. (Stoker 130)

Van Helsing's speech is the most broken and distinctly foreign of all the characters. The broken English is prominent even in Van Helsing's writing. His verbs are imperfectly conjugated ('he call me,' 'that time you suck from,' 'when he wants my aids'), and his sentence structures are convoluted and written in a passive voice ('the poison of the gangrene from that knife'). His speech and his writing are less polished than the other characters. His accent dominates the pages

more than other characters, yet he is the solution to their problems. Van Helsing's intelligence and knowledge of the world is the English characters' best hope to eradicate Dracula. He is not a threat, and this affords him some flexibility in Britain, but it does not negate his foreignness. If the British were so concerned about foreign people, Van Helsing would be suspect because he is overtly foreign, yet this thought is never considered by the characters. They may question his methods, but they never ostracize him or refuse his council.

For many who study immigration in *Dracula*, London is considered a burgeoning haven for foreigners who are lured to the city where they can pursue new ventures. Sita Shutt explains that, for immigrants, even being labeled as foreign does not deter their pursuits, although it causes apprehension: "Foreigners' are as attracted to the capital city [London] where they are seen alternatively as threatening if not downright criminal, or as safely assimilated and tamed 'Londonized'" (56). Dracula's wishes to avoid being labeled a stranger (Stoker 45) hint that stigma exists, but there is evidence that his foreignness is not a major hindrance. The fact that he is a foreign investor does not hinder his ability to purchase property around Britain. For foreigners like Dracula, Britain is a place where expanding territory, accumulating wealth, and enhancing one's prosperity is possible. It is where an immigrant may improve his or her life without sacrificing core cultural ideals, and for the most part, the British characters accept and facilitate this process, as Harker does at the novel's beginning.

From another perspective, the British are sometimes characterized as being wary of these influences. This perspective considers immigrants as problematic for the British because they can freely participate in British society. This participation "threatens the English social fabric through territorial acquisition which takes the

Enemies or Allies?

form of [Dracula's] desire both to be assimilated and to assimilate" (Shutt 59). Under this premise, the fact that Dracula studies English culture, language, and customs is considered negative for the British. That he is easily able to purchase land—to possess a part of Britain—and benefit from the British economy threatens British solidarity and supremacy. This perspective would consider his uncanny arrival at the Whitby pier a reason for rejecting immigrants because they can infiltrate the country undetected and already have roots established before even entering the country. This openness of British borders may threaten British culture if foreigners' intentions are malicious, like Dracula's are, and the only way to preserve what is "British" is to reject these influences.

However, the novel does not support these perspectives. While Dracula's ability to blend into British society undetected is concerning, cultural assimilation is usually admired and encouraged, especially in the early conversations between Dracula and Harker. Dracula studies British culture, geography, and commerce so that he may immerse himself into London society. Despite apparent fears of assimilation, many of these practices would actually be lauded by English people like Harker because Dracula is trying to accommodate and understand British life. Harker even applauds the Count's English, explaining "'you know and speak English thoroughly!'" (Stoker 45). Harker encourages the Count's efforts to adapt and he is impressed by Dracula's ability to converse proficiently. Harker can speak with the Count almost as though he is speaking to a fellow countryman and this seems comforting to him. He is impressed by the Count's ability to converse, but he is equally intrigued by the Count's knowledge of England (Dracula "knows English" thoroughly), admitting that the Count "knew

very much more than I [Harker] did” (47). Harker’s delight when he sees the Count’s library, which contains “a vast number of English books, whole shelves full of them, and bound volumes of magazines and newspapers” (44) enhances Harker’s comfort at Dracula’s castle. Without the Count’s malicious intentions, these preparations and Dracula’s move to London would not be problematic.

Most of the Count’s attributes actually endear British people like Harker. He appears courteous initially. He is graceful, inviting, and welcoming. He is an ambitious businessperson and he wants to improve himself. He has a profound knowledge of English culture. He collaborates with English businesspeople to contribute to Britain’s economy. He sets goals and pursues them as far as he must. He is uncompromising in his pursuit of becoming a master in Britain, and he will not suffer those who impede his progress. As Stephen Arata summarizes:

“By Harker’s own criteria, Dracula is the most ‘Western’ character in the novel. No one is more rational, more intelligent, more organized, or even more punctual than the Count. No one plans more carefully or researches more thoroughly. No one is more learned within his own spheres of expertise or more receptive to new knowledge” (637).

Despite being foreign, Dracula reflects the ideal Englishman. His actions demonstrate his participation in a thriving British economy to which he contributes and from which he benefits. Little about the Count beyond his negative intentions would alarm British people, even those who are most-anxious about his presence because he is foreign.

Dracula’s apparent motivations are equally laudable. Although a reader recognizes Dracula’s negative

Enemies or Allies?

intentions, his discussions with Harker do not betray the Count's plan. He claims that he will be "content if I am like the rest, so that no man stops if he sees me, or pause in his speaking if he hear my words, to say, 'Ha, ha! A stranger!' I have been so long master that I would be master still—or at least that none other should be master of me" (Stoker 45). Dracula appears humble and unassuming. A knowing reader understands that Dracula aims to "master," but he can also be interpreted as a humble man who shares concerns which most people would if they moved to a foreign land. The Count wants to fit into society such that he will not be scrutinized. Participating in society is central to prosperity and, as a result, existing on the periphery of that society is undesirable.

Under this premise, cultural assimilation is an integral part of fitting in, and a desire to assimilate is understandable. Shutt explains that cultural assimilation is not a threat, but rather what derives from it threatens British society. Shutt discusses how "what is 'monstrous' in *Dracula* is less the vampiric, assimilative identity of the Count, but his desire to pass unnoticed in London...That count Dracula might elicit a 'Sir' from a policeman is a really rather disagreeable prospect" (58). This perspective understands that assimilation is not problematic despite the negative consequences that the British characters endure. However, approaching immigration from this perspective also assumes that passing unnoticed is problematic because the British are unable to distinguish between who is a threat and who is not. It assumes that perceiving who is foreign can curb threats to British solidarity, prosperity, and cultural supremacy. Losing control of the foreigner is the true anxiety under this perspective of immigration.

The novel's solution, however, is not increased control. Rather, collaboration is central to defeating

Dracula. In order to defend Britain, contributions from all available avenues must be accepted even if it means sacrificing some of Britain's cultural power and autonomy. This logic prevails when the group determines how each character will pursue Dracula. Harker is caught between wanting to be with his wife and pursuing Dracula via the boat—the former option allows him to protect his wife and the latter means facilitates his revenge on the monster. Van Helsing's logic settles the conundrum when he asserts that he cannot fight like the younger men can, but he can “be of other service; I can fight in other way. And I can die, if need be, as well as younger men” (Stoker 348). Van Helsing's strengths are his intellect and his experience. He is best-equipped to protect Mina. Jonathan cannot provide this protection, and he is best-served pursuing Dracula. Both contributions are integral to the group's objective, and both roles must be fulfilled. A person's origin cannot determine who undertakes a role. Instead, the contributions that the person can make supersede petty notions of British superiority. Van Helsing suggests that they are all the same in death and that one man may sacrifice just as much as another regardless of race or culture. Every person can contribute to the hunt, but the hunt may be successful only if they combine their best attributes.

While this collaboration dispels notions of xenophobia, the inability to use race, language, culture, or ethnicity to identify security threats highlights the complex ways that the novel presents fear and terror. Beyond knowing that one character is a threat and the other is the solution to that threat, there is no way to determine person is acceptable and which one is not. The boundaries between what or who is foreign and what or who is British disintegrate, leaving a homogeneous mixture of cultures, personalities, and values that are

Enemies or Allies?

nearly inextricable. Differences in speech, religion, political allegiances, and interests cannot deem someone a threat. What is most disconcerting for the British is not necessarily foreigners participating in British life or even the homogeneous culture itself because cultural diversity does not necessarily negate British culture. Instead, the British characters fear being unable to identify, to find, and to eradicate threats before negative consequences occur, and, after they occur, being unable to determine if, when, or where they will transpire again.

Under these circumstances, threats become ubiquitous and seemingly omnipotent. Scholars and philosophers who study modern terror discuss in this phenomenon frequently. Marc Redfield's work about the War on Terror examines how terror derives from an event, can be attributed to a particular moment, and extends infinitely beyond that moment. Redfield states that "terror belongs to the event precisely to the extent that the event *per se* has never quite arrived and thus can never be mastered or done away with" (79). He extends this discussion by examining Jacques Derrida's assertion that the original traumatizing experiences are concerning "because they underscored the possibility of another and worse catastrophe" (Redfield 79). In *Dracula*, this means that the major traumatic experiences which the characters endure—such as Jonathan Harker's imprisonment, Lucy Westenra's death and rebirth, and Mina Harker being bitten by Dracula—mark the beginning of a fear that cannot fully subside. They are initial events that suggest the possibility of experiencing future trauma, or, in the case of the latter two situations, they are the attacks that confirm the characters' fears while presenting the possibility for future attacks. In these situations, the fear and uncertainty of future events induces further fear and terror.

The focus often shifts from past traumas to future risks. Derrida, in conversation with Giovanna Borradori, asserts that “the wound remains open by our terror before the future and not only the past” (96). Evil may strike again in various forms, most of which cannot be readily-perceived by those who fear the threat. While the past is never forgotten, this inability to ignore the past and its implications on the future creates increased foreboding.

This idea that danger is everywhere prevails when Van Helsing and the group search for the boxes which Dracula brought on the *Demeter*. The task seems futile and Dracula may lurk in any box. Harker alludes to the constant tension when they are searching a house and they “kept looking over their shoulders at every sound and every new shadow” (Stoker 254) as “every breath exhaled by that monster seemed to have clung to the place and intensified its loathsomeness” (255). Paranoia simultaneously creates and is created by the constant tension. The tension derives from their fear, and the tension’s persistence both sustains and enhances their fear as danger seems imminent. They have no proof that the Count is there and there is no way of knowing what danger awaits them until they confront it. Ironically, the only way to alleviate this fear to search for its source, approach it, and eradicate it.

The group’s experience at Carfax highlights how fear and terror pervade society in tense moments. Fear is all-consuming and it cannot be eradicated without facing that which terrorizes. Without direct confrontation, the threat could literally be anywhere. If there are seemingly endless possibilities of where the threat may reside, the fear is never truly alleviated. For example, fear prevails even after the group leaves the house and they know that there is no danger there. Knowing that the Count is not at this residence causes the “shadow of dread” to “slip

Enemies or Allies?

from [them] like a robe,” but it does not cause the group “to slacken a whit in [their] resolution” (Stoker 256). Danger is ever-present, playing on their minds because they cannot identify Dracula’s location. Knowledge that danger is not present alleviates the terror’s immediacy, but it does not negate the reality that something bad may happen at any moment.

Identifying the source of terror cannot eradicate the fear that it instills because the threat seems to fester. A part of this threat always seems just beyond one’s grasp or comprehension. When discussing terror as an “infinite wound,” Jacques Derrida says that it is infinite because “we do not know what it is and so do not know how to describe, identify, or even name it” (Borradori 94). Despite differing contexts (Derrida discusses the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks), the same concept applies to the characters in *Dracula* because the threat’s definition and how Dracula is perceived is constantly changing. Dracula, in many ways, is amorphous even though (perhaps even because) he is a vampire. The Count is classified as a vampire, but this very classification produces a plethora of forms and possibilities. As Van Helsing describes the Count, “he can, when once he find his way, come out from anything or into anything, no matter how close it be bound or even fused up with fire—solder you call it. He can see in the dark—no small power this, in a world which is one half shut from the light” (Stoker 244). The vampire’s dexterity and flexibility allows Dracula to continuously evolve and slip beyond classification. Van Helsing describes the Count’s weakness as its lack of freedom because of the natural limits that he must comply with, such as his inability to move in sunlight (244-245). A lack of freedom impedes the monster, but it does not mitigate the terror that Dracula instills. He can slip through some of humankind’s most advanced

engineering, and he can move around freely in the dark, unlike people. If he wants, Dracula can remain unseen and this enhances the severity and precariousness of the situation as terror looms constantly and danger is possible anywhere.

Race and cultural differences are two primary attributes which often get blamed when people are scared. Foreignness is an easy target, but xenophobia is ultimately an inadequate and illogical way to combat terror. Foreignness does not help people to identify threats any more than calling Dracula a “monster” helps to track him. The characters hunting Dracula have an advantage knowing that he is a vampire and they can identify his weaknesses and potential locations, but the fact that he is foreign does not facilitate their search. Identifying one who is foreign as a source of terror because of that person’s foreignness does not help the investigation. In fact, making this assumption would complicate the hunt for Dracula. As an assimilated figure who knows England thoroughly and who speaks the language proficiently, Dracula cannot be categorized easily. Rather than xenophobia, therefore, a methodological plan based on logic, facts, and collaboration is a superior way to combat terror.

Van Helsing constantly reminds his companions that thinking through the problem is more prudent than rushing to conclusions. He is the voice of reason when temptation, fear, and anger supersede logic. Rather than being rejected as one who is foreign, he becomes their leader. When he wishes to cut off Lucy’s head, he does not explain the entire situation, but assures Seward that “there are things that you know not, but that you shall know” (Stoker 177). When they pursue Dracula, Van Helsing tells Harker that “the quickest way home is the longest way” and that they “shall all act, and act with desperate quick, when the time has come” (292). When

Enemies or Allies?

they must confront Dracula, Van Helsing wants to ““have ready some plan of attack, so that we may throw away no chance”” (303). Van Helsing constantly ensures that the proper method is undertaken and that the chance of success is maximized. He orchestrates the pursuit, and the British characters follow him. He does not divulge answers unnecessarily, especially if they will provoke hasty, angry, and impulsive reactions from his companions. He ensures that the answers present themselves before he explains them thoroughly. Rather than reacting blindly to fear and hatred, he allows events to develop so that the group do not miss an opportunity to eradicate Dracula. This patience and logic benefits the group numerous times, such as when they resist destroying the boxes at Carfax. As Van Helsing explains, the ““Count may have guessed [their] purpose”” (291) and hindered their attempts to apprehend him.

This logic is superior to the blind xenophobia that often becomes the center of attention in adverse circumstances. The fact that everyone trusts Van Helsing’s judgement highlights how xenophobia does not impede the hunt for Dracula, and therefore terror works paradoxically. On one hand, fear can arouse suspicion of that which is foreign such as the vampire. On the other hand, it creates allegiances—such as those with Abraham Van Helsing and Quincey Morris—which counter this logic. In order to overcome terror, all avenues must be explored. When fear is ubiquitous, collaboration supersedes racial, social and cultural differences because it can help to identify, track, control, and eliminate the immediate threat.

The one caveat is that terror is never eliminated completely, a fact which is always present in *Dracula*. That fear ever-lingers: the fear of forthcoming events and not knowing if/when they will happen or which

form they will take is always present. The novel ends with hope that the threats are eradicated. Dracula is dead and the three sisters are eliminated. The immediate threats have dissipated, but they have not faded entirely. This novel establishes the idea of a threat which reiterates over time when Dracula discusses his history with Harker, which Harker remarks that “it seems to have in it the whole history of the country” (Stoker 52) when the Count discusses his people—the Szekelys—fighting the “whirlpool of European races” (52). Harker remarks that the Count always discussed his people and their history by saying “we,” and spoke almost in the plural, like a king speaking” (52). There is a plethora of cultures, races, and societies which have been impacted by Dracula’s people. Some have been conquered, some have been adopted, some have simply been driven back, but cultural contact is rife. Dracula is not a singular threat. He is the ruler who has controlled many different weapons over time. He is the latest iteration of a long line of cultures which are constantly in contact and which assume their place in a never-ending power struggle. The threats do not dissipate permanently but rather evolve and change to blend into and later assume their place in the blazon of cultures which form Britain, Europe, and on a wider level, humanity.

Constant evolution means that fear and terror cannot be fully conquered because eliminating one threat does not mean that fear dissipates. Van Helsing even says that the “vampire live on, and cannot die by mere passing of the time” (Stoker 244). The group may conquer Dracula and his sisters, but they cannot conquer his race, and they cannot eradicate the fear that Dracula has produced. The vampire’s influence is too strong and it has influenced the cultures that it has contacted. The vampire is

Enemies or Allies?

“Known everywhere that men have been. In Old Greece, in old Rome; he flourish in Germany all over, in France, in India, even in the Chersonese; and in China, so far from us in all ways, there is even he, and the peoples fear him at this day. He have follow the wake of the berserker Icelande, the devil-begotten Hun, the Slav, the Saxon, the Magyar.” (243)

The phenomenon is synonymous with human civilization. These threats impact wherever humans exists, and they may equally derive from any of these locations which have been impacted by terror, fear, and threats from abroad. The threats persist through history, the rise and fall of peoples, and terror does not distinguish between regions, beliefs, or cultures. All are impacted and everyone must cope with the possibility that terror may arise unknowingly.

The novel's characters cope with their trauma, but they never move beyond it completely. Instead, the Harkers find hope in their son and in their friendships. Dracula's castle may stand “as before, reared high above a waste of desolation” (Stoker 368) as a testament to the vampire's terror, but Quincey Morris' memory is forever linked to the Harkers' son, who has “some of our brave friend's spirit” (368) and who shares a birthday with the anniversary of Quincey's death. They call their son Quincey, even though “his bundle of names links all our little band of men together” (368). Whereas Dracula's terror may persist, the Harkers' child reflects the solution to such danger. His names reflect collaboration, friendship, and hope for future generations.

The novel ultimately sets an example that the modern world may benefit from. In a world where ideas like the ‘War on Terror’ dominate political rhetoric, where migration is scrutinized, and where ideological battles are frequent, humanity still exists. Fear is

inevitable, but people may collaborate to find new strategies to combat social threats. A supportive environment which accommodates numerous cultural outlooks and helps to combat the collective fear that people endure can ultimately be a good strategy to mitigate security threats. Most people are fine and, although the task may seem futile and impossible, the anomalies may be identified, pursued, and eradicated. The process is less than ideal, but it is the best system available without creating unwarranted pain and alienation. Ostracizing all migrants will benefit no one, and foreign people may play an integral role in learning about and understanding society's threats.

Works Cited

- Arata, Stephen D. "The Occidental Tourist: 'Dracula' and the Anxiety of Reverse Colonization." *Victorian Studies*, vol. 33, no. 4, 1990, pp. 621-645.
- Berman, Marshall. *All That Is Solid Melts Into Air: The Experience of Modernity*. Verso Publications, 1983.
- Borradori, Giovana. *Philosophy in a Time of Terror: Dialogues with Jurgen Habermas and Jacques Derrida*. U Chicago P, 2003.
- Redfield, Marc. *The Rhetoric of Terror: Reflections on 9/11 and the War on Terror*. Fordham UP, 2009.
- Shutt, Sita A. "'Close Up From a Distance': London and Englishness in Ford, Bram Stoker and Conan Doyle." *Ford Madox Ford And The City*, edited by Sara Haslam, Rodopi Editions, 2005, pp. 55-66.
- Stoker, Bram. *Dracula* (1897), edited by John Paul Riquelme, Palgrave, 2002.

Enemies or Allies?

Valente, Joseph. *Dracula's Crypt: Bram Stoker, Irishness, and the Question of Blood*. U of Illinois P, 2002.