The
Constructive
Side Of
George
Bernard
Shaw's
Work

Walker

THE CONSTRUCTIVE SIDE
OF
GEORGE BERNARD SHAW'S WORK

THE CONSTRUCTIVE SIDE OF GEORGE BERNARD SHAW'S WORK

by

COLEMAN C. WALKER, B. A.
UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA

A THESIS PRESENTED TO
THE ACADEMIC FACULTY OF
THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS

[1924]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Subject Page

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PLAYS BY GEORGE BERNARD SHAW

Widowers' Houses
The Philanderer
Mrs. Warren's Profession
Arms and the Man
Candida
The Man of Destiny
You Never Can Tell
The Devil's Disciple
Caesar and Cleopatra
Captain Brasshound's Conversion
The Admirable Bashville
John Bull's Other Island
Man and Superman
How He Lied to Her Husband
Major Barbara
The Doctor's Dilemma
Getting Married
The Shewing-Up of Blanco Posnet
Press Cuttings
The Dark Lady of the Sonnets
Fanny's First Play
Androcles and the Lion
Pygmalion
Overruled
Great Catherine
O'Flaherty V. C.
The Inca of Perusalem
Augustus Does His Bit
Heartbreak House
Annajanska
Back to Methusaleh

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PLAYS BY GEORGE BERNARD SHAW

[illegible]

Widowers' Houses
The Philanderer
Mrs. Warren's Profession
Arms and the Man
Candida
The Man of Destiny
You Never Can Tell
The Devil's Disciple
Caesar and Cleopatra
Captain Brassbound's Conversion
The Admirable Bashville
John Bull's Other Island
How He Lied to Her Husband
Major Barbara
The Doctor's Dilemma
Getting Married
The Shewing-up of Blanco Posnet
Press Cuttings
The Dark Lady of the Sonnets
Fanny's First Play
Androcles and the Lion
Pygmalion
Overruled
Great Catherine
O'Flaherty V.C.
The Inca of Perusalem
Augustus Does His Bit
Heartbreak House
Annajanska
Back to Methuselah

BIBLIOGRAPHY

LIST OF BOOKS CONSULTED

"A Study of the Drama," by Brander Matthews.

"Studies in Stage Craft," by Clayton Hamilton.

"George Bernard Shaw, His Life and Works," by A. Henderson.

"European Dramatists," by Archibald Henderson.

"George Bernard Shaw," by Gilbert K. Chesterton.

"Bernard Shaw, The Man and The Mask," by Richard Burton.

"Bernard Shaw," by Herbert Skimpole.

"The Wisdom of Bernard Shaw," by Charlotte Shaw.

"Essays on Modern European Dramatists," by W. L. Phelps.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

LIST OF ARTICLES CONSULTED

Arena, vol. 32 ('04): 489.

Atlantic Monthly, vol. 99 ('07): 553.
vol. 103 ('09): 227.

Bookman, vol. 44 ('17): 628.

Century Magazine, vol. 87 ('14): 908.

Current Literature, vol. 29 ('00): 145.
vol. 45 ('08): 83.

Dial, vol. 47 ('09): 208.
vol. 59 ('15): 210.

Fortnightly Review, vol. 100 ('13): 132.
vol. 103 ('15): 443.

Hibbert Journal, vol. 8 ('10): 818.

Nineteenth Century, vol. 62 ('07): 852.

North American, vol. 185 ('07): 293.

Spectator, vol. 111 ('13): 814.

THE CONSTRUCTIVE SIDE OF GEORGE BERNARD SHAW'S WORK

It will be admitted that it involves some degree of real courage to write on the subject of the constructive element in the work of so startling a personality as George Bernard Shaw. Many have written and spoken of the destructiveness and iconoclasm of the man, and therefore to urge now the possibility of seeing anything constructive will no doubt be regarded as an impudent assumption to interpret the Shavian paradoxes. The attempt is certain to invite protest from a great number of people, and on quite valid grounds, I must admit. With Shaw, however, it is not destruction for destruction's sake, and I feel that we have talked all too long of his destructiveness, overlooking somehow the good that is in him. The golden age lies before and not behind us, and the effort to attain that age necessarily means a certain iconoclasm, a breaking of traditions and conventions which are the inheritance of the past, a destruction of certain things with which we are content because we know none better.

In this thesis I shall try to prove that the man's work has a constructive side, and to show just what it is; whenever possible I shall give his progressive program of reforms, as for example, in the matter of marriage. In seeking material I have limited my field to Shaw's plays and their prefaces. Of course the great difficulty is to keep from reading a meaning into his writings which was not intended at all, and therefore I have documented my paper with numerous quotations, especially on doubtful points. As for his opinions and ideas, I shall not attempt to criticize them and show their weak spots, nor shall I give any argument for endorsing them. I prefer to let my readers be the judges, and to let them form their own opinions of the value of his work.

The question may be asked, why has George Bernard Shaw been singled out of the mass of literary men, and been made the subject of a thesis. The answer is that nowhere else can we find a man who has brought such a penetrating intelligence to bear upon so many diverse phases of the thought and life of to-day, as has this man. He is one of the most vigorous and individualistic personalities of our time, an exceedingly clear-sighted observer and astute thinker, who is unselfishly fighting our grievous social evils and struggling for the cause of humanity. Shaw's works embody liberal and stimulating

discussions of current problems, of the creative ideas springing up in the sciences and philosophy, and of new forces and new movements at work in the world to-day, to all of which he has been and still is an influential and valuable contributor. It is as such that we are forced to admit the importance and significance of the man, and however we may disapprove of his ideas and reforms, we must perforce yield him the attention due to sincerity of impulse and integrity of conduct.

I would certainly be among the last to deny that Bernard Shaw is a baffling personality and is extremely difficult to fathom, which in itself may possibly be taken as proof of the man's depth. He has been the subject of much thought, and has certainly been most misunderstood and most variously misunderstood. The writing of a paper on the constructive ideas of Shaw necessarily carries with it the feeling of wading around in a cold, swift flowing river in search for gold, with the imminent chance of walking into quick sands and being swallowed up, to the total loss of all the effort at finding something valuable. How can we ever be sure of our ground concerning a man who wrote the following about himself?

> "I had no taste for what is commonly called popular art, no respect for popular morality, no belief in common

> religion, no admiration for popular heroics. As an Irishman I could pretend to patriotism neither for the country I had abandoned nor the country that had ruined it. As a humane person I detested violence and slaughter, whether in war, sport, or the butcher's yard. I was a Socialist, detesting our anarchical scramble for money, and believing in equality as the only possible basis of social organization, discipline, subordination, good manners, and selection of fit persons for high functions. Fashionable life I could not endure...I was neither a sceptic nor a cynic in these matters: I simply understood life differently from the average respectable person." (Preface to "Three Unpleasant Plays," pp. V-VI.)

He proceeded a little later to explain the reason for his unusual and startling attitude, telling us with comic seriousness of his visit to an ophthamalic surgeon:

> "He tested my eyesight one evening, and informed me that it was quite uninteresting to him because it was 'normal'. I naturally took this to mean that it was like everybody else's; but he rejected this construction as paradoxical, and hastened to explain to me

> that I was an exceptional and highly fortunate person optically, 'normal' sight conferring the power of seeing things accurately, and being enjoyed by only about ten per cent of the population, the remaining ninety per cent being abnormal. I immediately perceived the explanation of my want of success in fiction. My mind's eye, like my body's, was 'normal'; it saw things differently from other people's eyes, and saw them better." (Preface to "Three Unpleasant Plays", p. VII.)

Thus his vaunted normality of vision, which is the "abnormally normal eyesight of the realist," gives us a clue to his conception of the nature and value of his critical faculty. It now remains for us, who I suppose he considers a part of the "damned compact, liberal majority," to attempt the creation of imaginary normal spectacles, in order that we may get his point of view.

SHAW'S LIFE

Bernard Shaw's varied and energetic life has naturally been of inestimable value to him; it is his opinion that a necessary condition for a philosopher and advanced thinker, is an active and well-rounded life, for a man's

capacity for knowledge and learning is proportionate to his capacity for experience. His ideas and philosophy are not those of the indifferent solitary who holds aloof, but instead of the aggressive, energetic man who keeps in close contact with the world and its problems. He has no patience with those persons who advance new theories which are the result of a little study in a library and even less contact with, and observance of, modern society. No paper on the subject of Bernard Shaw would be complete without a brief sketch of the man's unique and distinctive life, which is so strongly reflected in his dramas and contributes so much to their interest, and in the following account I have tried to emphasize those circumstances and incidents which have influenced him. By this means we shall have a better understanding of him and a firm basis on which to build up an estimation of his teachings.

Of Irish extraction Bernard Shaw was born on July 26, 1856, in Dublin, and it is to his Celtic temperament that we must attribute his extraordinary power of analysis and satiric criticism; we might also note his true Irish pugnacity, always ready for a good fight. He spent rather an unusual and rebellious minority; he was disgusted by the social pretensions and prejudices of his family. Quite early he became dissatisfied with modern Christianity, and as a schoolboy he was "incorrigibly idle and worthless". In this period

much of his time and his "spare change" were spent in the cultivation of his taste for good music. That Shaw did not have a better training, particularly that he did not have a University training, is from many points of view to be regretted; it would probably have counteracted that tendency in him to despise traditions and institutions which we find in many who enter the world without having some conception of how it came to be what it is.

At the age of twenty, he went to London to begin his literary career by journalistic hack-work and the writing of novels, with little success, however. For quite a while he suffered from poverty, in fact he tells us that in the nine years previous to 1885 his net earnings through his pen were "the princely sum of exactly six pounds." Discouraged by his experience as a novelist, and yet unwilling to adapt his work to the public taste, Shaw next turned critic, in which capacity he first aroused attention by his clever social tracts, and critiques of music, painting, and the drama, especially through those appearing in "The Saturday Review." His work, particularly in the field of dramatic criticism, marked him as a penetrating thinker, quite original and very startling.

Now all during this period of his life Bernard Shaw was ardently studying Socialism and eagerly imbuing its ? modern ideas. He was daily coming into contact with the

brilliant younger Socialists and the leaders in advanced thought. He became thoroughly grounded in the Socialistic theories, but he was more than a student, being himself an original and shrew minister of Socialism. He became a member of the newly organized Fabian Society, where his influence and guiding spirit was strongly felt; the man seems always to have been among the leaders in any field he entered. To avoid prejudice, it might be well to state right here that just Shaw is rather a mild Socialist, a decided enemy of Anarchism, and an impassioned denouncer of insurrectionary methods and revolution. After long and persevering practice Shaw learned extremely well the art of public speaking and debating, and he now seized every opportunity to present his Socialistic views to the masses, making literally hundreds of fiery speeches at the street corner or anywhere else. He tells us that he "first caught the ear of the British public on a cart in Hyde Park, to the blaring of brass bands." It is interesting to note that he declared himself a natural-born mountebank, in order to gain a greater hearing for his ideas; thus his admitted sedulous advertisement of himself and his self-puffery are both consciously employed to further his opinions through the consequently larger audiences. Ardor and enthusiasm for his cause

made him use methods that less sincere men would have scorned. The formative influence of Socialism upon Shaw's career can scarcely be overestimated; except for it, he would simply not be Bernard Shaw.

Right here let me suggest what I think is the right cue for understanding Shaw. Underlying everything else he is a Socialist,—one of those fools or wise men, according to your point of view, who look for a new heaven and a new earth. He expects no good from the industrial scramble which is now called industrial order; he looks for a different order based on rational, cooperative, collective action.

After having employed novelistic, journalistic, and propagandist mediums for the communication to the public of his unique and peculiar views, he now turned to the stage as the best way to get a hearing and the most advantageous means for the exposition of those same opinions and theories. His first drama, "Widowers' Houses," exposing the guilt of the community, was produced in 1892, to be followed in the succeeding years by a great number of other successful plays; incidentally, he is still writing dramas, at the age of sixty eight, though not to the exclusion of other lines of endeavor. In his plays Shaw has never given the audience what it liked, but instead he has given it what he liked and

thought it needed. The fidelity of the man to his noble purpose is most admirable. In order to impress his aim more forcibly still, he has warned people that his "attacks are directed against themselves, not against the stage figures."

Thus throughout his career Shaw has been unselfishly striving to ameliorate the conditions in the world and to assist in the progress of humanity. He has said that his life belongs to the whole community, and that as long as he lives it is his privilege to do for it whatsoever he can. He wants to be thoroughly used up when he dies; life is no "brief candle" for him, but a sort of splendid torch, which he has got hold of for a moment and which he wants to make burn as brightly as possible before handing it on to future generations.

> "This is the true joy in life, the being used for a purpose recognized by yourself as a mighty one; the being thoroughly worn out before you are thrown on the scrap heap; the being a force of Nature instead of a feverish selfish little clod of ailments and grievances complaining that the world will not devote itself to making you happy." (Preface to "Man and Superman,"

[illegible] is needed. The fidelity of the man to his noble purpose is most admirable. In order to improve his [illegible] skill, he has worked [illegible] that his "[illegible] are directed against [illegible], not against the [illegible]."

Thus throughout his career from the first [illegible] striving to [illegible] the conditions of the world and to assist in the progress of humanity. He has said that his life belongs to the whole community, and that as long as he lives it is his privilege to do for it whatever he can. He wants to be thoroughly used up when he dies, for life is no "brief candle" for him, but a sort of splendid torch, which he has got hold of for a moment and which he wants to make burn as brightly as possible before handing it on to future generations.

> "This is the true joy in life, the
> being used for a purpose recognized by
> yourself as a mighty one; the being
> thoroughly worn out before you are
> thrown on the scrap heap; the being a
> force of Nature instead of a feverish
> selfish little clod of ailments and
> grievances, complaining that the world
> will not devote itself to making you
> happy." (Preface to Man and Superman)

pp. XXI-XXXII)

Surely this is a noble and high-minded attitude, and one worthy of praise. I feel that I can do no better than to conclude my résumé of the man's life with a quotation from Archibald Henderson's great book:

"By heritage, by environment, by temperament, Bernard Shaw was destined to display throughout his life that intensity of political conviction, that depth of humanitarian concern, that passion for social service which will ever be associated with his name." (Henderson's "George Bernard Shaw," p. 27.)

SHAW'S PLAYS

Bernard Shaw has written almost forty dramas, and a majority of them are prefaced by an essay or discussion of the subject, which contain a large and valuable part of his opinions; they present his explicit critical views which in the plays themselves are more or less concealed in the story. They are usually quite long and thorough, with a clear exposition of the problem under consideration, its basis, its faults and defects, and usually concluding with his conception of the course that will lead to improvement.

Shaw's dramas themselves are scintillating, invigorating, and edifying, most of them written, to use his own words, in his "energetically egotistical fighting style." They possess literary skill and effect, coupled with a pungent and stimulative appeal to thought. The greater number of his plays are comedies, but they are quite different from the ordinary type; in them he aims to teach rather than to amuse, and if he fails he thinks that he has been cheated of his just due. He holds that it is necessary to say things in a light and irritating way if you want people to attend to you; to say truths frankly and plainly is not his way. He wants to influence people and he is not scrupulous as to the means. In addition, note that he says "for the sake of the unhappy prisoners of the home, let my plays be printed as well as acted." He is determined to get his thoughts before the public, and he has the indomitable will to overcome obstacles.

In his plays he has tried to present his ideas in such a forcible way as to stimulate and provoke the audience into thought, and to arouse the people into discussion and action for reform. His plays bristle with ideas, each one a challenge, and for most people the end of the play is the beginning of mental activity;

instead of giving us drink, he gives us a thirst. What person can read or witness a performance of "Widowers' Houses," "Arms and the Man," "John Bull's Other Island," "The Doctor's Dilemma," or others, without great mental activity and a desire for better conditions?

The fact that Shaw is a satirist must be borne in mind, and also the fact that his whole being is vibrant with passion for the welfare of society. A satirist is always an egoist,—he appears to exaggerate the ego and, looking down from above, to assume the role of a critical judge in pointing out the defects and abuses of society. Shaw holds up these faults for ridicule, but his real end is not amusement but reformation and progress.

In Shaw's plays there is little action and clash of characters, but instead there is the clash of ideas; the plot is sacrificed to the thought. Their defining characteristic is their argumentative and controversial character: they are dramatized debates on Shavian philosophy. Sooner or later each of his characters has a theory to discuss and defend, and Shaw lets them argue it out. "Getting Married" is an outstanding illustration of this type. He writes of his puppets that "I have allowed every person his or her

opinion, and I hope that I have been as sympathetic" with one as with another; however, his dramas exhibit with tremendous comic irony the defeat and exposure of the non-Shavians by the Shavians! The dialogue is a veritable battle of argument, sprinkled throughout with the most brilliant and nonchalant wit, ironic paradoxes, and exquisite effrontery.

I have now led the discussion of Shaw's plays up to a very important point, and one which has been hinted at in the last paragraphs: namely, the fact that Shaw is a subjective dramatist, putting his own thoughts and opinions into the mouths of his characters. He lacks detachment from his characters, but it is a failing of which he is not ashamed, ~~and~~ of which he is instead quite proud. I do not mean to imply that all his characters are Shaw in disguise, for such is not the case, although there is certainly something of the man in each of them; but I do say that in each play there are certain unmistakable Shavians, who speak the language and philosophy of their master in no uncertain terms. John Tanner in "Man and Superman" is probably the most famous and the best known of these puppets; others are Bluntschli in "Arms and the Man," Dick Dudgeon in "The Devil's Disciple," Vivie in "Mrs. Warren's

Profession," Keegan in "John Bull's Other Island," and innumerable more, far too many to mention.

In order to understand this matter more thoroughly, it might be well to compare Shakespeare and Shaw on this point. The former is an absolutely objective dramatist, who has kept any alloy of himself from his characters so successfully, that although he has presented almost every aspect of human life, we do not know what kind of man he was nor what his opinions were. Now Shaw is the exact antithesis of Shakespeare, in that he is wholly subjective. We can learn of the man and his ideas without reading his prefaces, for every play and every person represent the author. Far from wishing to conceal himself, Shaw uses every method to reveal himself. He has written that he would give "half a dozen of Shakespeare's plays for one of the prefaces he ought to have written!" I have purposely stressed this point of Shaw as a subjective dramatist, in order to account for my many quotations from his plays, giving his ideas; the same course could never be followed in a similar paper on Shakespeare. But even in quoting from Shaw's plays great care must be exercised lest the quotation be one from an un-Shavian character, and therefore misleading ~~and false~~. However, I have taken pains to see that the thoughts in

these quotations have been echoed elsewhere, and are substantiated by statements in his prefaces.

SHAW'S SERIOUSNESS

Is Bernard Shaw serious, we ask? There is a strong temptation to think of him as saying smart things for the pleasure of saying them. He embodies his profoundly serious views of life in brilliantly witty and epigrammatic expression, and as a result he often pays the penalty of being looked upon as a frivolous near-philosopher. The reason for this is the popular impression that wit and seriousness are two mutually contradictory entities.

But I want to state right here that I consider that Bernard Shaw is a man fiercely in earnest, and that he uses this lively sparkling mode of expression merely for its greater effect. He even informs us of his earnestness in a facetious manner, when he says, in speaking of his plays and prefaces, that he "did not cut these cerebral capers in mere inconsiderate exuberance" — (Preface to "Back to Methuselah", p. C). Gilbert Chesterton, who is certainly not to be numbered among Shaw's admiring followers, admits the man's seriousness when

he says, in his book on "G. B. S." that "there is at least one outstanding fact about the man we are studying; Bernard Shaw is never frivolous. He never gives his opinions a holiday; he is never irresponsible even for an instant.....He never said an indefensible thing; that is, he never said a thing he was not prepared brilliantly to defend." Oh! the irony of those last words!

But it would be a great mistake, because Shaw himself is serious, to take everything that he says seriously, that is, at its full face value. We must allow for his exaggeration and extravagances, for it is the Shavian method of overemphasis for the sake of making the point; he is trying to startle us into thought. Probably Shaw would be himself the first to label with the gentle epithet of fool those who accept every sentence literally. I believe a good example of this is his attitude toward inoculation, as set forth in the preface to "The Doctor's Dilemma"; his real hostility seems not to be against inoculation in itself, but rather against the extravagant passion for it at times. However, we must respect above all the man's serious and sincere attitude, for it is his just due.

A little thought will prove that Shaw's method of dealing with serious subjects in a light-hearted way is

a rather subtle and crafty one. By this means he makes us take serious things lightly, but he makes us take them; the austere philosopher makes us take serious things seriously, but we do not willingly take them at all. It is only by tolerating something at first as a joke that we may afterwards come to regard it as a possibility; some ancient sage has judiciously pointed out toleration as only one step removed from forgiveness, and we need no wise man to tell us that forgiveness is quite closely akin to acceptance. Preach at a drunkard and he will call you a prig, and drink all the more to spite you; but laugh at, but not with, him, and he will blush with shame. That is the reason why Shaw is patronized by thousands of people who denounce his ideas. They say that they appreciate his wit but not his views, but in appreciating the wit of Shaw they are laying up in their minds and hearts some of his opinions and theories.

SHAW'S INTELLECTUAL POINT OF VIEW

A most important fact to bear in mind in this study of Shaw is that his attitude toward life is a sternly intellectual one. This position places him in sharp contrast with the great majority of people, having as they do

a highly emotional point of view. It is due to his complete reliance upon thought and reason that so many persons are unable to understand the man, for they can never free themselves from their narrow view to see things in the light of pure logic. But through this unemotional mask of clear reason there shines the hot humanitarian passion for progress and better conditions of society. It is very interesting to read what Shaw has written about himself in this matter, as said by two dramatic critics in "Fanny's First Play":

> VAUGHAN...Now Ive repeatedly proved that Shaw is physiologically incapable of the note of passion.
>
> BANNAL. Yes, I know. Intellect without emotion. Thats right. I always say that myself. A giant brain, if you ask me; but no heart. ("Fanny's First Play," p. 242.)

/ The ordinary man loves the members of his family, his countryman, his coreligionist, to the detriment of all who differ from him. Shaw, on the other hand, cares not for persons, but for principles; not for human beings, but for humanity; not for man, but for

the destiny of man. Accordingly, he attaches little importance to such matters as patriotism, dogma, imperialism, etc. But he attaches far more importance than the ordinary man to social problems, eugenics, and kindred matters, which savour too much of dryness and speculation for the man in the street.

APOSTLE OF DISILLUSIONMENT AND UNMASKER OF HYPOCRISY

Disillusionment is one of the basic and fundamental elements in the make-up and the work of Bernard Shaw, and he plainly sees that progress is possible only through the persistent discovery of mistaken conceptions of life and society; this iconoclasm has its constructive side, for Shaw aims at progress through this necessary destruction. He insists that the pursuit of illusions is one of the greatest, and most deplorable forces in the world, and he resolutely and characteristically sets out to unmask those illusions. Note the following passage:

> "To me the tragedy and comedy of life lie in the consequences, sometimes terrible, sometimes ludicrous, of our persistent attempts to found our institutions on the ideals suggested

> to our imaginations by our half-satisfied passions, instead of on a genuinely scientific natural history." (Preface to "Four Pleasant Plays," p. XVIII)

He points out with fanatical frenzy that man is founding his institutions on greed and selfishness and ignorance, instead of wisdom and love and impartial justice. He repeats this thought later on, in these words:

> "We must finally adapt our institutions to human nature. In the long run our present plan of trying to force human nature into a mould of existing abuses, superstitions, and corrupt interests, produces the explosive forces that wreck civilization." (Preface to "Getting Married," p. 204.)

This ability to hit the Achilles-heel of an institution and to expose defects in all their stark reality, is one of the most Shavian things about George Bernard Shaw, and in a large measure it is because of his strictly intellectual point of view, as opposed to the merely emotional point of view of the majority of people.

Shaw is a hater of shallow conventions of all kinds, of idealism, of romance, and of sentimentality, but he means something rather different from the customary interpretation of these last terms. In the preface to his "Four Pleasant Plays" he wrote that he looked upon "romance as the great heresy to be rooted out from art and life," that it was the "root of modern pessimism and the bane of self-respect," whereas "idealism, which is only a flattering name for romance in politics and morals, is as obnoxious to me as romance in ethics or religion." Also we find by careful reading that he means by sentiment the instinctive emotional impetus which leads men to preserve their ideals when they are obsolete and to defend them when they are attacked.

Bernard Shaw believes that the idealists are retarding the progress of the world; if they would only respect reality we should get along much better and faster. Shaw's main contention is that ideals are merely masks which men have put on life to hide the horrid realities, as for example, building cottages on the ground and imagining them castles in the air. "Arms and the Man" is a general onslaught on idealism; in the "Man of Destiny" and "The Dark Lady of the Son-

nets" he strikes at another kind of idealism, and Napoleon, Shakespeare, and Queen Elizabeth fall from their pedestals. There is much to be said in favor of this typically Shavian view of idealism; its positive side is the plea to face life frankly and squarely, and in the matter of those famous characters mentioned, it teaches us not to look so much to the past with its illusions, but rather to the present and the future.

To Shaw's mind, romance is an attempt to escape from a condition in which real life appears empty, prosaic, and boresome. He points out that "the lot of the man who sees life truly and thinks of it romantically is Despair." He places his theory into the mouth of one of his characters as follows:

> MRS. CLANDON. Let me tell you, Mr. Valentine, that a life devoted to the Cause of Humanity has enthusiasms and passions to offer which far transcend the selfish personal infatuations and sentimentalities of romance. ("You Never Can Tell," p. 296.)

By close study we learn that to Shaw romance is merely the illusion by which people deceive themselves into believing that their ideals are actually realized, and

that as such it is to be condemned. His dislike of romance is sharply presented in "Arms and the Man" and in the last scene in "Candida"; in"Fanny's First Play" the old Count is awakened from his romantic dream and brought back to actuality. Instead of being idly romantic, Shaw would have us actively try to better the real.

Shaw has no patience with the shams, hypocrisy, and false respectability of modern society, in which "the whole system is one of false goodfellowship, and you may know a man for twenty years without finding out that he hates you like poison" (from "You Never Can Tell", p. 309.). He denounces the narrowing and degrading results of our numerous silly conventions and our supposedly respectable conduct; people do not reach their full and normal development, but are warped and stunted by an allegiance to these false notions, and consequently do not get the greatest enjoyment out of life. He sums all this up in the following passage:

> TANNER (seriously). We live in an atmosphere of shame. We are ashamed of everything that is real about us; ashamed of ourselves, of our relatives, of our incomes, of our accents, of our opinions,

that as a result of the experiment. The feeling of romance is sharply presented in "Tess and the Sea" and in the last scene in "Othello"; in "Tess's First Play" the old trout is caught when the romantic mood and brought back to actuality. [illegible] (1) [illegible] the [illegible].

Thus are no [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible], [illegible] [illegible] [illegible], in which [illegible] [illegible] to one of [illegible] [illegible], and you [illegible].

> [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible], of [illegible] [illegible], of [illegible] [illegible], of [illegible] [illegible].

> of our experience, just as we are ashamed of our naked skins. Good Lord, my dear Ramsden, we are ashamed to walk, ashamed to ride in an omnibus, ashamed to hire a hansom instead of keeping a carriage, ashamed of keeping one horse instead of two and a groom-gardener instead of a coachman and footman. The more things a man is ashamed of, the more respectable he is. ("Man and Superman," p. 13).

Thus acquired notions of propriety become stronger than natural instincts, so that it is easier to recruit for monasteries and convents than to induce a British officer to walk through Bond Street in a golfing cap on an afternoon in May. And so our respectability becomes a continual round of pretending, pretending, pretending. Shaw would like to knock out of us this dissimulation and pharisaical conduct, and to replace it with a widespread warmth of heart, a true sincerity, and a bond of sympathy among all people.

ART AND THE THEATRE

Bernard Shaw boldly declares that the man who believes in art for art's sake is "a fool, a hopeless fool, and in a state of damnation." This is indeed rather a definite statement, and one hardly liable to be misunderstood! He says that life is greater than art, and it is art for life's sake; Shaw as an artist lives not for the sake of art, but for the sake of humanity. He would employ art for social, political, religious, and moral ends, especially for that last purpose. He declares that "it is ridiculous to say, as inconsiderate amateurs of the arts do, that art has nothing to do with morality."

> "I am convinced that fine art is the subtlest, the most seductive, the most effective means of moral propagandism in the world, excepting only the example of personal conduct; and I waive even this exception in favour of the art of the stage, because it works by exhibiting examples of personal conduct made intelligible and moving to crowds of unobservant unreflecting people to whom real life means nothing." (Preface to "Three Un-

pleasant Plays")

However he realizes, even as the Ancient Mariner did, that he must tell his story entertainingly if he is to hold the wedding guest spellbound in spite of the siren sounds of the loud bassoon, but at the same time for art's sake alone, he claims that he "would not face the toil of writing a single sentence."

> TANNER....For mark you, Tavy, the artist's work is to shew us ourselves as we really are. Our minds are nothing but this knowledge of ourselves; and he who adds a jot to such knowledge creates new minds as surely as any woman creates new men. ("Man and Superman," p. 23)

In a word, to Shaw art has an end beyond itself, and its object should be to make men think, to make them uncomfortable, to convict them of the sinfulness of error, and in this manner to accelerate the rate of progress. Now this is undeniably a soundly constructive conception of the high purpose of art, and one which should assuredly lead to beneficial results.

It is with regard to the drama as a particular expression of art that Bernard Shaw is most concerned. Shaw has repeatedly expressed his disapproval of the

modern stage, and in his own definite and original way, he has sought to reform it. He has declared that the existing popular drama is quite out of the question for people who are accustomed to use their brains. From all sides today there is heard a cry of disapproval of the present status of the theatre; Bernard Shaw deplores the fact that the theatre creates the drama under current conditions, whereas the ideal state of affairs is just the reverse. He is one of the most suggestive and certainly one of the most brilliant of the modern critics of the stage, and it is a mark of distinction with him that in addition to his attacks, he has also made a notable effort in actually writing plays to elevate its plane. These plays themselves are rather a new type, for Shaw found the comedy and the dialogue-play, and created out of them the dialectic or philosophic comedy. He has even gone farther than that, for in conjunction with John Galsworthy, Granville Barker, and several other prominent dramatists, he attempted the formation of a "Free Theatre," with the object of stimulating the writing and aiding the production of more realistic plays of a higher intellectual character.

Thus Shaw has the basic conviction that the theatre of to-day, properly utilized, is an instrumentality for the moulding of character and thought not at all inferior to

the church or the school; in fact, he even puts it above the church in one respect, because "the oftener you laugh the better, and through laughter only can you destroy evil without malice, and affirm good-fellowship without mawkishness." To the theatre there is given the splendid opportunity to popularize great sociological, philosophical, and religious ideas, and therefore exercise an almost incalculable effect upon the social morals of a whole people. Life as it occurs is senseless to the vast majority of people, and therefore Shaw thinks that it is the business of the dramatist to pick out the significant facts from the chaos, and to arrange them so that their relation to one another becomes significant, thus changing us from bewildered spectators of a monstrous confusion to man intelligently conscious of the world and its destinies. It is significant of much that to Shaw the play is not the thing, but its thought, its purpose, its integration of the diverse elements and circumstances of life into an understandable philosophy.

This last point leads up to a very important consideration in Shaw's mind, namely, that it is the philosophy, the outlook on life, that changes, not the craft of the playwright. As he has put it, "what is the use of writing plays or painting frescoes if you have

nothing more to say or shew than was said and shewn by Shakespeare, Michael Angelo, and Raphael?" (Preface to "Three Plays for Puritans," p. XXXII)

Therefore there can be no new drama without a new philosophy. He defies anyone to prove that the great epoch makers in fine art have owned their position merely to their technical skill; the technique of the great masters has been acquired, refined on, and surpassed over and over again, but the supremacy of these men still remains undisputed. The following passage gives the keynote of his whole theory in this matter:

> "New ideas make their technique as water makes its channel; and the technician without ideas is as useless as the canal constructor without water, though he may do very skilfully what the Mississippi does very crudely." ("Three Plays for Puritans," p. XXXIII)

Finally, Bernard Shaw longs for a "great National Theatre which shall be to the drama what the National Gallery and British Museum are to painting and literature, and we can get it by endowing it in the same way." (Preface to "Four Pleasant Plays," p. XIII) The great difficulty now is very well summed up in the following quotation concerning theatre managers:

> "Before he performs plays he must pay rent. In London we have no theatres for the welfare of the people: they are all for the sole purpose of producing the utmost obtainable rent for the proprietor. If the twin flats and twin beds produce a guinea more than Shakespeare, out goes Shakespeare and in come the twin flats and the twin beds. If the brainless bevy of pretty girls and the funny man outbid Mozart, out goes Mozart." (Preface to "Heartbreak House," p. XLV)

It is very amusing to see how Shaw has brought this question of a National Theatre into his little sketch on Shakespeare and Queen Elizabeth:

> SHAKESPEARE....Wherefore I humbly beg your Majesty to give order that a theatre be endowed out of the public revenue for the playing of those pieces of mine which no merchant will touch, seeing that his gain is so much greater with the worse than with the better. Thereby you shall also encourage other men to undertake the writing of plays who do now despise it and leave it wholly to those whose counsels

> will work little good to your realm.
>
> ELIZABETH. It may prove so. But of this I am certain (for I know my countrymen) that until every other country in the Christian world, even to barbarian Muscovy and the hamlets of the boorish Germans, have its playhouse at the public charge, England will never adventure. And she will adventure then only because it is her desire to be ever in the fashion, and to do humbly and dutifully whatso she seeth everybody else doing. ("The Dark Lady of the Sonnets," p. 154-155)

But alas! Shaw writes in the preface to the play that "its appeal for a National Theatre as a monument to Shakespeare failed to touch the very stupid people who cannot see that a National Theatre is worth having for the sake of a National Soul."

As the first step in founding such a theatre, Shaw suggests the following plan: "The proper course is to form an influential committee, without any actors, critics, or dramatists on it, and with as many persons of title as possible, for the purpose of approaching one of our leading managers with a proposal that he shall, under a guarantee against

loss, undertake a certain number of afternoon performances of the class required by the committee, in addition to his ordinary business." (Preface to "Four Pleasant Plays," p. XIII) If the committee is influential enough, the offer will be accepted, in which case the first performance will be on the beginning of a classic repertory for the manager and his company which every subsequent performance will extend. Hand in hand with the formation of the repertory will go the training and building up of audiences. Shaw reminds the critics of the committee plan that it has been in operation in London for two hundred years in support of Italian opera.

It must be borne in mind that the above is merely the first step, for he proceeds to add that "such a theatre would be the needed nucleus for municipal or national endowment," which is the big thing naturally. But as the situation rests now, there are no theatres capable of attracting such an endowment, and Shaw urges his program as the best method by which to gain the desired end.

THE CENSORSHIP OF THE STAGE

No discussion of Bernard Shaw and the theatre

would be complete without an account of his attitude toward the censorship of the stage, over which he has fought so long, with his true Irish intensity, beginning with that widely known war over the proposed production of "Mrs. Warren's Profession." In 1898 he wrote that the Queen's Reader of Plays was a "gentleman who robs, insults, and suppresses me as irresistibly as if he were the Tsar of Russia and I the meanest of his subjects." (Preface to "Three Unpleasant Plays," p. XIV) Then later in the preface to "The Shewing-Up of Blanco Posnet" he has presented a long general case against censorship as a principle, and a particular case against the existing English censorship and against its replacement by a more enlightened one. He maintains that

> "the toleration of heresy and shocks to morality on the stage, and even their protection against the prejudices and superstitions which necessarily enter largely into morality and public opinion, are essential to the welfare of the nation." (Preface to "The Shewing-Up of Blanco Posnet," p. 381)

But please remember that Shaw uses the word "morality" in the sense of "custom", that is, our morals are only

our habits; the understanding of this point will throw much light on the above passage. So Shaw claims that the existing censorship intentionally suppresses heresy and challenges to morality, while at the same time it unintentially gives the special protection of its official license to the most extreme impropriety that the lowest section of London playgoers will tolerate in the theatres especially devoted to their entertainment; in a nutshell, the existing censorship licenses everything that is popular and forbids any attempt to change public opinion or morals.

As for the licensing of theatres, Shaw sees in it greatly dissimilar circumstances.

> "Regulation of theatres is an entirely different matter from censorship, inasmuch as a theatre, being not only a stage, but a place licensed for the sale of spirits, and a public resort capable of being put to disorderly use, and needing special provision for the safety of audiences in cases of fires, etc., cannot be abandoned wholly to private control, and may therefore reasonably be made subject to an annual

> licence like those now required
> before allowing premises to be used
> publicly for music and dancing."
> (Preface to "The Shewing-Up of
> Blanco Posnet," p. 382)

But he would not have a license refused a theatre on the ground that its proximity to a church, mission hall, school, or the like, would draw the public away from such places into its own doors.

In conclusion, therefore, Shaw prefers "the Freedom of The Press, allowing the dramatist and manager to perform anything they please and take the consequence as authors and editors do." (Preface to "Three Unpleasant Plays," p. XV) He believes that in this manner the whole question would work out its solution in time, for the law would lose none of its teeth, the tyranny of the censorship would be removed, and the responsibility for all plays would rest upon the playwrights and the managers of the theatres.

SOCIALISM

It is very difficult to get a clear understanding of Shaw's Socialism from his plays and prefaces, for the great bulk of his theories in this field are contained

in his numerous pamphlets. However, I shall attempt to give a brief account of his principles, to which I have already alluded in my sketch of his life.

Although the man is a passionate and ardent Socialist, it is from his customary intellectual point of view and is not at all from an emotional interest; he denied the existence of what is commonly called the war of classes; in principle and in practice he is strictly a constitutional Socialist, for he does not believe in revolutionary measures except as the very last resort against direst tyranny. Also, he is convinced that it is only through Socialism that we can escape the social chaos of the day:

> "The vitality which places nourishment and children first, heaven and hell a somewhat remote second, and the health of society as an organic whole nowhere, may muddle successfully through the comparatively tribal stages of gregariousness; but in nineteenth century nations and twentieth century empires the determination of every man to be rich at all costs, and of every woman to be married at all costs, must, without a highly scientific social organization, produce a ruinous

> development of poverty, celibacy, prostitution, infant mortality, adult degeneracy, and everything that wise men most dread. In short, there is no future for men, however brimming with crude vitality, who are neither intelligent nor politically educated enough to be Socialists."
> ("Man and Superman," pp. XV - XVI.)

In "Widowers' Houses" Shaw has disclosed one pressing phase of the present day exploitation of the poor by the rich; in his own words from the preface it is "a grotesquely realistic exposure of slum landlordism, municipal jobbery, and the pecuniary and matrimonial ties between it and the pleasant people of 'independent ' incomes who imagine that such sordid matters do not touch their own lives." He has presented the two vile consequences of such a base business: first, the degrading, hopeless lives that thousands of poor people are forced to lead, and second, the degenerating influence of tainted money upon the moral sense of those persons who profit from such transactions. Thus the situation is all the more deplorable in that both sides suffer. The economic point is driven home and the social guilt

of the community is forcibly impressed; now something must be done to correct such glaring conditions, and when we ask how, Shaw implies that the answer is through Socialism.

"Mrs. Warren's Profession" imparts a stern lesson, making clear the theory that money controls morality, and that capitalistic society is to blame for Mrs. Warren's prostitution. With her knowledge of the world she has exclaimed that the only way for women, such as she was, "to provide for themselves decently is to be good to some man who can afford to be good to her." Vivie, however, does not acquiesce like Trench of "Widowers' Houses" in the acceptance of tainted money, yet she understands well the preference of dishonor to starvation. Now Shaw aims his bitter attack at the society that tolerates such conditions and the laws that permit them; he presses the argument that society, and not individual passion and vice, is responsible, and with his passionate, unselfish Socialism he pleads for a more just and humane social order.

> "I believe that any society which desires to found itself on a high standard of integrity of character in its units should organize itself in such a

> fashion as to make it possible for all men and all women to maintain themselves in reasonable comfort by their industry without selling their affections and their convictions." (Preface to "Three Unpleasant Plays," p. XXVI)

In "Major Barbara" Shaw attempted to awake public thought and to arouse public sentiment upon the pressing problems of poverty and the unemployed; he preaches his Socialism here by putting into the mouths of his characters rather extreme Socialistic opinions in his belief that this is the most effective way to accomplish his end.

At present those who do the hard work are the worst paid, those whose work is easy are better remunerated, while those who do nothing receive most.

Shaw sees in money the basis of modern society, and he attributes the slavery of workers and of women to capitalized wealth.

> "Money is the most important thing in the world. It represents health, strength, honor, generosity and beauty as conspicuously and undeniably as the want of it represents illness, weakness, disgrace, meanness and ugliness. Not

the least of its virtues is that it destroys base people as certainly as it fortifies and dignifies noble people. It is only when it is cheapened to worthlessness for some, and made impossibly dear to others, that it becomes a curse. In short, it is a curse only in such foolish social conditions that life itself is a curse. For the two things are inseparable: money is the counter that enables life to be distributed socially: it is life as truly as sovereigns and bank notes are money. The first duty of every citizen is to insist on having money on reasonable terms; and this demand is not complied with by giving four men three shillings each for ten or twelve hours' drudgery and one man a thousand pounds for nothing. The crying need of the nation is not for better morals, cheaper bread, temperance, liberty, culture, redemption of fallen sisters and erring brothers, nor the grace, love and fellowship of Trinity, but simply for enough money. And the evil to be attacked is not sin, suf-

> fering, greed, priestcraft, kingcraft, demagogy, monopoly, ignorance, drink, war, pestilence, nor any of the scapegoats which reformers sacrifice, but simply poverty." ("Major Barbara," p. 171)

In England, he says, nine-tenths of the wealth goes into the pockets of one-tenth of the population. Also, our whole industrial system is based on successive competitive waves of overwork with their ensuing troughs of unemployment. The result is of course great masses of poor people, and "poor people are cancers in the commonwealth, costing far more than if they were handsomely pensioned off as incurables." (Preface to "Androcles and the Lion," p. LXXVI) Shaw takes the logical stand that the only rational reason for hating poverty is because it is wasteful.

> "Until the community is organized in such a way that the fear of bodily want is forgotten as completely as the fear of wolves already is in civilized capitals, we shall never have a decent social life. Indeed the whole attraction of our present

> arrangements lies in the fact that they do relieve a handful of us from this fear; but the relief is effected stupidly and wickedly by making the favored handful parasitic on the rest." (Preface to "Androcles and the Lion," p. LXXVI)

Thus security, the chief pretense of civilization, cannot exist where the worst of dangers, the danger of poverty, hangs over everybody's head. To Shaw there is no longer any practical question open as to Communism in production; the struggle today is over the distribution of the product, and he declares that it must be an equal distribution:

> "When that problem is at last faced, the question of the proportion in which the national income shall be distributed can have only one answer. All our shares must be equal." (Preface to "Androcles and the Lion," p. LXXVI)

In the preface to another play there is found a continuation of this plan:

> "The sensible course would be Cobden-Sandersons's: that is, to give every man enough to live well on, so as to guarantee the community against the possibility of

> a case of the malignant disease of poverty, and then (necessarily) to see that he earned it." (Preface to "Major Barbara," p. 167)

Shaw would put into practice that which his beloved Fabian Society desires so strongly,—the socialization of the industrial resources of the country. Thus Shaw is a Socialist of a very thorough kind; he feels that our present capitalistic system is both cruel and wasteful, and he proposes Socialism in the common ownership of the means of production as the only remedy. In this way the two abuses already noted, the slums and their landlordism, and prostitution, will certainly be greatly alleviated, if not eliminated altogether.

As to the form of government, Shaw is a State-Socialist and he ridicules the fear that the Socialist-State will ever become the Servile State; Socialism will eventuate in the gradual establishment of public rule and a public administration set into effective action by parliaments, assemblies, and common councils. Now Shaw thinks that Democracy in America has failed since it has led to the withdrawal of ordinary refined persons from politics; and the same result is coming in England as fast as its Democracy is made as democratic as it is in America.

> a part of the religious dreams of
> Jewry, and which necessarily is
> the thing [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] to
> "Jewish Question," p. 118

than could yet take practical shape [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] of Europe,— the exploitation of the industrial resources of the country. Then when is a [illegible] of a very [illegible] [illegible], we [illegible] that the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] a more great and peaceful, and so [illegible] [illegible] of the [illegible] [illegible] of the [illegible] of [illegible] of the [illegible]. In this way the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible], the facts and their [illegible], and [illegible], will certainly be greatly alleviated, if not eliminated altogether.

As to the form of government, [illegible] of a [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] and the [illegible] [illegible] will ever become the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] will [illegible] to the [illegible] [illegible] of [illegible] with [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible], [illegible], and [illegible] [illegible], the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] to the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] as [illegible] to [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible].

> "From what is called Democracy no corrective to this state of things could be hoped. It is said that every people has the Government it deserves. It is more to the point that every Government has the electorate it deserves; for the orators of the front bench can edify or debauch an ignorant electorate at will. Thus our democracy moves in a vicious circle of reciprocal worthiness and unworthiness." (Preface to "Heartbreak House," p. XIV)

It is a scientific fact, Shaw maintains, that the majority, however eager it may be for the reform of old abuses, is always wrong in its opinion of new developments. The pioneer is a tiny minority for the force he heads; and so, though it is easy to be in a minority and yet be wrong, it is absolutely impossible to be in the majority and yet be right as to the newest social prospects. Therefore we shall never march a step forward except at the heels of "the strongest man, who is able to stand alone" and turn his back on "the dammed compact Liberal majority."

> "The business of a democratic statesman is not, as some of us seem to think,

> to convince the voters that he knows no better than they as to the methods of attaining their common ends, but on the contrary to convince them that he knows much better than they do, and therefore differs from them on every possible question of method. The voter's duty is to take care that the Government consists of men whom he can trust to devize or support institutions making for the common welfare."
> (Preface to "Getting Married," p. 143)

Shaw's conclusion seems to be that the best type of government is a Socialized Democracy of Supermen (q. v. supra).

> "We must either breed political capacity, or be ruined by democracy." ("Man and Superman," p. XXIV)

But as I have pointed out, this Government must permit both individualistic and united leadership. Shaw has defined Socialism as "merely Individualism rationalized, organized, and in its right mind." The people of the country, then, should be politically intelligent enough to keep the living as well as the mechanical elements of Government in their hands, and the collec-

tive mind must get expression in the few individual minds of clear seeing and natural leadership. Shaw's ideal of a Socialized Democracy is well expressed in "John Bull's Other Island" through the words put into the mouth of Father Keegan:

> KEEGAN. In my dreams heaven is a country where the State is the Church and the Church the people: three in one and one in three. It is a commonwealth in which work is play and play is life: three in one and one in three. It is a temple in which the priest is the worshipper and worshipper the worshipped: three in one and one in three. It is a godhead in which all life is human and all humanity divine: three in one and one in three. It is, in short, the dream of a madman."
>
> ("John Bull's Other Island," p. 125)

This is indeed rather an ethereal and fantastic dream, but I shall proceed in the ensuing pages to point out that Shaw has some more tangible Socialistic ideas, such as doctors salaried by the city, mothers pensioned by the state, divorces made easier, and the like.

PATRIOTISM AND WAR

Bernard Shaw objects to patriotism because it narrows and divides men, produces sentiments of irrational affection and baseless hatred, and arouses quarrels and wars among nations. Patriotism is of course dependent upon nationalism, and he cannot understand the logical reasons for dividing up the world into a great number of nations. Notice how he expresses this thought in a rather indirect way through one of his stage figures:

> DOYLE. Hes a Nationalist and a Separatist. I'm a metallurgical chemist turned civil engineer. Now whatever else metallurgical chemistry may be, it's not national. It's international. And my business and yours as civil engineers is to join countries, not to separate them. The one real political conviction that our business has rubbed into us is that frontiers are hindrances and flags confounded nuisances. ("John Bull's Other Island," p. 22)

He points that a healthy nation is as unconscious of its nationality as a healthy man is of his bones, but that trouble arises when you break a nation's nationality,

which is, of course, the result of war and conquest. In such a case it will think of nothing else but getting it back again; it will listen to no reformer, to no philosopher, to no preacher, until the demand of the nationalist is granted; it will attend to no business, however vital, except the business of unification and liberation.

> "There is indeed no greater curse to a nation than a nationalist movement, which is only the agonizing symptom of a suppressed natural function. Conquered nations lose their place in the world's march because they can do nothing but strive to get rid of their nationalist movements by recovering their national liberty." ("John Bull's Other Island," p. XXXVII)

Therefore he gently admonishes England to improve her ways, with his native Ireland naturally as one glaring reason for the need of it:

> "Now for England's share of warning. Let her look to her Empire; for unless she makes it such a Federation for civil strength and defence that all free peoples will cling to it voluntarily, it will

> inevitably become a military tyranny to prevent them from abandoning it; and such a tyranny will drain the English taxpayer of his money more effectually than its worst cruelties can ever drain its victims of their liberty. A political scheme that cannot be carried out except by soldiers will not be a permanent one." ("John Bull's Other Island," p. X)

To Shaw the main and greatest objection to nationalism and its patriotism is war, that frantic scramble in which "there is only one virtue, pugnacity: only one vice, pacifism." He cannot overlook the facts that war depends on the rousing of all the murderous blackguardism still latent in mankind; that every victory means a defeat; that fatigue, hunger, terror, and disease are the raw materials which romancers work up into military glory; and that soldiers for the most part go to war as children go to school, because they are afraid not to.

> NAPOLEON. There is only one universal passion: fear. It is fear that makes men fight: it is indifference that makes them run away: fear is the mainspring of war.

("The Man of Destiny," p. 185)

In "Arms and the Man" Shaw has written a most effective attack on the idealization of the modern military man. At first Raina Petkoff is full of the highest conceptions of valor and heroism, but her most cherished illusions are dispelled by the Swiss Bluntschli, the famous "chocolate soldier" who knew that he had a talent for soldiering and joined the Servian army rather than the Bulgarian simply because he came across it first. Raina learns among other things that modern wars are not won by bravery, but by munitions, and that her fiancé Sergius's dashing charge was a mere piece of romantic insanity, which succeeded only through an accident to the Servians' ammunition. As a result she throws up her absurdly fanciful ideals, leaves her badly damaged idol, Sergius, to her maid, and prepares to marry the common-sense Bluntschli with his practical idealism. Also, the audience is disillusioned along with Raina, and is awakened into thought!

"The Man of Destiny" is a further satirization of war and the military man. Near the beginning of the play the author makes a very striking simile:

> GIUSEPPE. Every man to his trade, excellency. We innkeepers have plenty of cheap wine: we think nothing of spilling it. You great generals have plenty of cheap blood:

> you think nothing of spilling it. Is it
> not so, excellency?
>
> NAPOLEON. Blood costs nothing: wine
> costs money. ("The Man of Destiny," p. 169)

A little later Napoleon ruthlessly exposes the hypocrisy of the Englishman's principles in assisting the weak, putting down the overpowering, taming the savages, spreading the Gospel, and the like, ending with the testy motto that "the nation which lets its duty get on the opposite side to its interest is lost." Most demoralizing upon the military authority and discipline is the young lieutenant's attitude toward his general; for example, recall his order to the innkeeper to "go and find the general, and tell him that I want to speak to him." It is the old Molière way of ridiculing and laughing an institution to a premature end.

The preface to his recent play, "Heartbreak House," contains more of his opinions on war, with special attention paid to the late World War as an example. It is hard for some of us to realize the man's depth of feeling and sincerity in this matter, and the mental anguish that he experienced from 1914 to 1918. He sees only too clearly that war puts a strain on human nature that breaks down the better half of it, and makes the worse half a diabolical virtue. He deplores the demoralization

and delirium of war:

> "When nearly every house had a slaughtered son to mourn, we should all have gone quite out of our senses if we had taken our own and our friend's bereavements at their peace value. It became necessary to give them a false value; to proclaim the young life worthily and gloriously sacrificed to redeem the liberty of mankind, instead of to expiate the heedlessness and folly of their fathers, and expiate it in vain." (Preface to "Heartbreak House," p. XXVII)

But in addition to the recognized destructiveness of war, all creative work is either destroyed or severely crippled, not only in the industrial world, but also in the field of literature and the fine arts:

> "Hardly one of the epoch-making works of the human mind might not have been aborted or destroyed by taking their authors away from their natural work for four critical years." (Preface to "Heartbreak House," p. XXIX)

He shot a telling arrow when he asked us to imagine exulting in the death of Beethoven because Bill Sykes dealt him his death blow! Finally, the irony of the whole World War to Shaw is that nothing has really been

gained, for the conquerors are now forgetting everything they had professed to fight for:

> "It remains doubtful whether Germany and Russia, the defeated, will not be the gainers; for the victors are already busy fastening on themselves the chains they have struck from the limbs of the vanquished."
> (Preface to "Heartbreak House," p. XLI)

Shaw's attitude toward war was not a popular one during the struggle with Germany, but it showed his Irish strain with his courage to fight for what he thought was right and not to flinch.

> "When men are heroically dying for their country, it is not the time to show their lovers and wives and fathers and mothers how they are being sacrificed to the blunders of boobies, the cupidity of capitalists, the ambition of conquerors, the electioneering of demagogues, the Pharisaism of patriots, the lusts and lies and rancors and bloodthirsts that love war because it opens their prison doors, and sets them in the thrones of power and popularity. For unless these things are mercilessly exposed they will hide under the mantle of the ideals on the stage just as they do in real life."
> (Preface to "Heartbreak House," p. LIV)

ground; for the conquerors and the [illegible] breathing
they had continued to fight that:

> "It remains doubtful whether [illegible]
> the English, the [illegible], will [illegible]
> [illegible] for the [illegible] are already [illegible]
> belonging to the [illegible] the [illegible] they have
> struck from the [illegible] of the [illegible]."
> (Preface to "[illegible]," p. [illegible])

There's a [illegible] that the [illegible] and during the [illegible] with [illegible], but it [illegible] the [illegible] remain with the [illegible] for [illegible] the [illegible] right and not to France.

> "Then the war automatically [illegible]
> country. It is not the time to [illegible]
> [illegible] and [illegible]
> they are being [illegible] to the [illegible] of
> [illegible], the [illegible] of [illegible], and the
> [illegible] of [illegible], the [illegible] of
> [illegible]; the [illegible]
> [illegible] and [illegible]
> that [illegible] to [illegible]
> and [illegible] of [illegible]
> [illegible]. The [illegible]
> [illegible] they [illegible] the [illegible]
> [illegible] of the [illegible] they [illegible]
> [illegible] of [illegible]," p. [illegible])

But now that we have all cooled down a bit, we can study Shaw's opinions on the matter with a fairer judgment, and thank him for unmasking war and disclosing its true nature in all its stark, horrible reality. If we will only think over his work and remember that the only valid argument against war is that it is useless and expensive, it will certainly be a great stride in the right direction. And as for patriotism, Shaw is in favor of that patriotism which is ready to work for the whole world, for as a Socialist, he would like us to have the whole world for our fatherland.

MARRIAGE

Before entering into any discussion of Bernard Shaw's opinions and ideas about marriage, it is most necessary to get this basic point, namely, that the man does not wish to destroy or to abolish marriage, as so many people seem to think, but he wishes to modify and improve it in order that it may better fulfill its purpose under modern conditions. He has written that marriage is

> "an institution which needs nothing more than a little obvious and easy rationalizing to make it not only harmless but comfortable, honorable, and useful." (Preface to "Getting Married," p. 202)

In another place we find the following passage:

> "Marriage remains practically inevitable; and the sooner we acknowledge this, the sooner we shall set to work to make it decent and reasonable." (Preface to "Getting Married," p. 121)

Shaw does consider various phases of our marriage laws as rather inhuman and unreasonable, and he seeks to ameliorate them, but he takes a very fair stand on the question, as proved by this quotation:

> "We may take it then that when a joint domestic establishment, involving questions of children or property, is contemplated, marriage is in effect compulsory upon all normal people; and until the law is altered there is nothing for us but to make the best of it as it stands." (Preface to "Getting Married," p. 200)

He is constantly teaching people that they must reform society before they can reform themselves, and that individual sallies of rebellion are useless and suicidal.

> "Man in society must do as everybody else does in his class: only fools and romantic novices imagine that freedom is a mere matter of the readiness of the individual to snap his fingers at convention." (Preface to

"Misalliance," p. LXXXI)
Not only in his prefaces but also in the "Doctor's Dilemma," has Shaw stressed this point, for Louis Dubedat, who is himself somewhat of a Shavian, recognizes on his deathbed that a man who sets himself up against the morality of his day will have the morality of the day up against him.

One of Shaw's early plays, "The Philanderer," is responsible for a great deal of the criticism of Shaw for his supposed attitude toward marriage, but contrary to the widespread opinion, this play is little concerned with modern marriage laws; it is grossly unjust to interpret it in that light and to identify the author's views with those of that romantic, cynical, "advanced" Charteris. In this play we should hesitate for quite a while before attributing to Shaw any opinions more than Grace Tranfield's statement that "no woman is the property of man; a woman belongs to herself and nobody else." Instead he satirizes the unwillingness of the self-termed "advanced" people to stick to their guns when the tide turns against them; note what Charteris said when he unwittingly pronounced his own doom:

> CHARTERIS. Advanced views, Julia, involve advanced duties, and you cannot be an advanced woman when you want to bring a man to your feet, and a conventional woman when you want to keep him there against his will.

("The Philanderer," p. 89)

Therefore instead of criticising the author for this play, we should thank him for unmasking a certain degenerate type of hypocrite.

Shaw believes that the great difficulty lies in the common notion that the existing forms of marriage are not political contrivances, but sacred ethical obligations to which everything, even the very existence of the human race, must be sacrificed, and therefore one on which no government should act. It is certainly true that the marriage question influences, or at least is believed to influence, so many votes, that no government will touch it if it can possibly help it.

> DON JUAN....The confusion of marriage with morality has done more to destroy the conscience of the human race than any other single error. ("Man and Superman," p. 121)

Therefore the problem of effecting reforms in the institution is made unusually difficult.

However, Bernard Shaw claims that marriage as it now stands, is beginning to depopulate the country with alarming rapidity, and that this fact is the crux of the whole situation.

> "But what is now making some action in the matter imperative is neither the sufferings of those who are tied for life to criminals, drunkards, physically unsound and dangerous

> mates, and worthless and unamiable people generally, nor the immorality of the couples condemned to celibacy by separation orders which do not annul their marriages, but the fall in the birth rate." (Preface to "Getting Married," p. 142)

In the preface to a later play, "Androcles and the Lion," we find the same thought, with his ideas of reform stated in a fair unprejudiced way and with the argument based upon our common knowledge of the history of the changes in the institution of marriage:

> "Unless we gratify our desire the race is lost: unless we restrain it we destroy ourselves. We are thus led to devise marriage institutions which will at the same time secure opportunities for the gratification of sex and raise up innumerable obstacles to it; which will sanctify it and brand it as infamous; which will identify it with virtue and with sin simultaneously. Obviously it is useless to look for any consistency in such institutions; and it is only by continual reform and readjustment, and by a considerable elasticity in their enforcement, that a tolerable result can be arrived at." ("Androcles and the Lion," p. LXXXIX)

The trouble is that we create an artificial morality, and

consequently an artificial conscience, by manufacturing disastrous consequences for events, which, left to themselves, would do very little harm.

Now that the ground has been cleared and the greatest obstacles moved, we come to the important question of what is to be done. Polyandry and polygamy are both rejected, because the former would enable the best women to monopolize all the men, just as the latter would enable the best men to monopolize all the women. He let his characters in "Getting Married" try to draw up a marriage contract, but they find that they cannot arrange matters to suit everybody; the general conclusion however seems to be that neither Church nor State has provided a suitable basis of agreement for the married life.

In the first place, Shaw believes that economic slavery is here the root of much evil, just as we shall later find he thinks that to be the case in other fields.

> "Family life will never be decent, much less ennobling, until the central horror of the dependence of women on men is done away with. At present it reduces the difference between marriage and prostitution to the difference between Trade Unionism and unorganized casual labor: a huge difference, no doubt, as to order and comfort, but not a difference in kind." ("Getting Married," p. 164)

Mrs. Warren was deprived of the chance to contract an honorable and happy marriage on account of her financial status; "when every young woman has an honorable and comfortable livelihood open to her on reasonable terms, the streets will make no more recruits." ("Getting Married," p. 189) In the preface to "Androcles and the Lion" he has written that "there is no mortal reason why a married couple should be economically dependent on one another" (p. XC). Therefore, as one plan he proposes the following plan:

> "Place the work of a wife and mother on the same footing as other work: that is, on the footing of labor worthy of its hire; and provide for unemployment in it exactly as for unemployment in shipbuilding or any other recognized bread-winning trade." (Preface to "Getting Married," p. 204)

Of course, this passage is written from the typical Shavian intellectual point of view, and in a manner calculated by him to attract attention, but that should not prevent us from recognizing the thought and the principle back of the words. He would change those laws and those restrictions of large companies which handicap motherhood through the cessation of work during that period; instead he points out that the proper course is to aid them during this time, and even go so far as to put a premium on the number of children born.

I have now led this discussion up to a most important

point, namely, the question of divorce in the Shavian marriage. To Shaw a contract for better for worse is a contract that should not be tolerated, for there is always some point at which the theory of such a marriage breaks down in practice. Again, to impose marriage on two unmarried people who do not desire to marry one another would be admittedly an act of enslavement; but it is no worse than to impose a continuation of marriage on people who have ceased to desire to be married. Therefore he proposes such an extension of divorce as will reduce the risks and obligations of marriage to a degree at which they will be no worse than those of the alternatives of marriage. He claims that this is the solution to which all arguments tend when a marriage has lost the inward and spiritual grace of which the marriage ceremony is the outward and visible sign.

The dramatist has very cleverly put his argument for divorce into the mouth of one of his characters in "Man and Superman:"

> DON JUAN. Send me to the galleys and chain me to the felon whose number happens to be next to mine; and I must accept the inevitable and make the best of the companionship. Many such companionships, they tell me, are touchingly affectionate; and most are at least tolerably friendly. But that does not make a chain a desirable ornament nor the galleys an abode of bliss. Those who talk most

point, namely, the question of divorce in the present conditions. To find a method for better marriages is a problem that should not be neglected, for there is always more cases in which the theory of such a marriage breaks down in practice again. To impose marriage on two unmarried people who do not desire to marry one another would be manifestly an act of enslavement; but it is no worse than to impose a continuation of marriage on people who have ceased to desire to be married. Therefore to proceed with an extension of divorce as will reduce the pains and obligations of marriage to a degree at which they will be no worse than those of the alternatives of marriage. He claims that this is the solution to which all arguments tend when a marriage has lost the inward and spiritual grace of which the marriage ceremony is the outward and visible sign.

The Greek who has very directly put his thoughts and ideas into the mouth of one of his characters is "Not the Gallows!"

Not Ideas. Send me to the gallows and quickly to the faith which rather becomes. It is what is right, and I must repay. The inferiority who make the rest of the sin commit deeds. Make more acquaintances. Thus they who are thoroughly affectionate, and cold and vice of kind towards themselves. The other harmless lover or chaste a woman's thoughts whom they are good, love so whole of kinds. Fierce the best meal

> about the blessings of marriage and the constancy of its vows are the very people who declare that if the chain were broken and the prisoners left free to choose, the whole social fabric would fly asunder. You cannot have the argument both ways. If the prisoner is happy, why lock him in? If he is not, why pretend that he is? ("Man and Superman," p. 122)

In the preface to "Getting Married" Shaw has given his reasons for believing that divorce is favorable to marriage, boldly claiming that it is not the destruction of marriage but the first condition of its maintenance: for a thousand indissoluble marriages mean a thousand marriages and no more, whereas a thousand divorces may mean two thousand marriages, since the couples may marry again. Divorce only reassorts the couples, which is a very desirable thing when they are ill-assorted. Also, it makes people more willing to marry, especially prudent people and proud people with a high sense of self-respect. Again, the fact that a divorce is possible often prevents its being petitioned for, not only because it puts married couples more on their good behavior towards one another, but just as no room feels like a prison if the door is left open, so would the removal of the sense of bondage at once make marriage much happier than it is now. Also, if the door were always left open, there would be no need to rush through it, as there is now,

when it opens for one moment in a lifetime, possibly never to open again.

Shaw even declares that the interest of the children forms one of the most powerful arguments for divorce, since an unhappy household is a bad nursery. Again, if parents are not doing their duty by their children, these young persons should be divorced from their parents.

Therefore having, as he thinks, established a conclusive argument for lighter divorce laws, Shaw proceeds to recommend that they be such that the contract may be dissolved without disgrace and scandal. One of the main points is that there shall be no publication of the grounds on which a divorce is sought or granted, and that a divorce may even be granted on the simple grounds that one of the parties wants one. Shaw maintains that the only effect of the farce of compelling people to plead and prove misconduct is "that cases are manufactured and clean linen purposely smirched and washed in public, to the great distress and disgrace of innocent children and relatives." (Preface to "Getting Married," p. 205) At the conclusion of his preface to "Getting Married," Shaw has summed up his recommendations as follows:

> "1. Make divorce as easy, as cheap, and as private as marriage.
>
> 2. Grant divorce at the request of either party, whether the other consents or not; and admit no other ground than the request, which should be made without stating

> any reasons.
>
> 3. Confine the power of dissolving marriage for misconduct to the State acting on the petition of the king's proctor or other suitable functionary, who may, however, be moved by either party to intervene in ordinary request cases, not to prevent the divorce taking place, but to enforce alimony if it be refused and the case is one which needs it.
>
> 4. Make it impossible for marriage to be used as a punishment as it is at present. Send the husband and wife to penal servitude if you disapprove of their conduct and want to punish them; but do not send them back to perpetual wedlock." ("Getting Married," p. 203)

Thus we find that Shaw believes that the practical solution is to make the individual economically independent of marriage and the family, and to make marriage as easily dissoluble as any other partnership. Shaw claims that these are the conclusions to which experience is driving both our sociologists and our legislators. He does not expect this to cure instantly all the evils of marriage, nor to root up at one stroke its detestable tradition of property in human bodies; but it will leave Nature free to effect a cure.

Finally, Shaw maintains that every woman has the right to motherhood, but that under present conditions this fact is denied in practice or else has been made unduly difficult. Observe how sharply and strongly he has presented the case:

> "There are many women of admirable character, strong, capable, independent, who dislike the domestic habits of men; have no natural turn for mothering and coddling them; and find the concession of conjugal rights to any person under any conditions intolerable by their self-respect. Yet the general sense of the community recognizes in these very women the fittest people to have charge of children, and trusts them, as schoolmistresses and matrons of institutions, more than women of any other type when it is possible to procure them for such work. Why should the taking of a husband be imposed on these women as the price of their right to maternity?" (Preface to "Getting Married," p. 156)

Thus he believes, from his experience of discussing this question, that the one point on which all women are in furious secret rebellion against the existing law is the saddling of the right to a child with the obligation to become the life-long mate, and sometimes servant, of a man. Lesbia, in "Getting Married," is an example of this type of woman to

whom Shaw is quite ready to offer separate conditions, for she wants children honorably without the trouble of looking after a house and a husband. There are many women who put a high premium on themselves and look for a husband who is up to a certain standard, and who are quite prepared to become old maids if they cannot realize their ideals. Finally, there is a majority of women in the world, which necessarily means that some must be left out. What must be done therefore? Shaw answers:

> "There is no way at all out of the present system of condemning the superfluous women to barrenness, except by legitimizing the children of women who are not married to the fathers."
> (Preface to "Getting Married," p. 152)

However, as I have already pointed out at the beginning of this discussion of the Shavian attitude toward marriage, individual rebellions are to be discouraged and discountenanced as Society stands now, but that at the same time, we must all endeavor to reform that Society. Yet why does he make John Tanner, in "Man and Superman," defend with passionate earnestness the supposed immoral act of Violet Robinson? My explanation of Shaw's position is that in all such cases the greater crime is the punishment inflicted by Society; and again, that he is so deeply in earnest about what he calls the Life Force, and so free himself from moral taint, that what to us is a disastrous

moral lapse is to him an indiscretion committed at the prompting of the most powerful impulse of Nature. Shaw seems to me to make the great mistake of Shakespeare's Brutus, whom by the way he did not understand,—the mistake of judging other men by himself, of assuming that the same lofty motives that actuate a thinker and a philosopher like himself, are also the motives of the man in the street.

CHILDREN AND EDUCATION

Bernard Shaw might be quite justly called the Champion of Children's Rights; for many years he has plead for a wider recognition of their prerogatives. He claims that the vilest abortionist is he who attempts to mould a child's character, thus depriving it if the chance for individual development and a distinct personality; on the whole, whatever our theory or no theory may be, our practice is to treat the child as the property of its parents and to allow them to do what they like with it as far as it will let them. Perhaps it might be well to pause just here to observe the irony of the following words from "Fanny's First Play," in which the Frenchman Duvallet is addressing Mrs. Knox:

> DUVALLET.....Your daughter, madam, is superb. Your country is a model to the rest of Europe. If you were a Frenchman, stifled with prudery, hypocrisy and the tyranny of the family and the home, you would understand how an

> enlightened Frenchman admires and envies your freedom, your broadmindedness, and the fact that home life can hardly be said to exist in England. You have made an end of the despotism of the parent.....In France we are not men: we are only sons—grown-up children. Here one is a human being--an end in himself.
> ("Fanny's First Play," p. 233)

Now we assume that the child does not know its own business, and that we do. In this we are almost sure to be wrong, for the child feels the drive of the Life Force (called by most people the Will of God), and we cannot feel it for him.

> "If adults will frankly give up their claim to know better than children what the purposes of the Life Force are, and treat the child as an experiment like themselves, and possibly a more successful one, and at the same time relinquish their monstrous parental claims to personal private property in children, the rest must be left to common sense." (Preface to "Misalliance," p. LVII)

Thus most children can be, and many are, hopelessly warped and wasted by parents who are ignorant and silly enough to suppose that they know what a human being ought to be, and who stop at nothing in their determination to force their children into their own moulds. Every child has a right to its own bent and parents should recognize this basic principle; it involves a

heavy responsibility.

Shaw disapproves heartily of the

> "conventional good father who deliberately imposes himself on his son as a god; who takes advantage of childish credulity and parent worship to persuade his son that what he approves of is right and what he disapproves of is wrong." (Preface to "Misalliance," p. XV)

He insists that if a man must hold himself up to his children as an object lesson, which by the way is not at all necessary, he should hold himself up as a warning and not as an example. How else may there be any improvement?

On the question of discipline the man also has something to say. It is rather amusing to note how he exposes the usual way in "Pygmalion," though the pair here are not parent and child:

> HIGGINS. Somebody is going to touch you, with a broomstick, if you don't stop snivelling. Sit down.
>
> LIZA (obeying slowly) Ah-ah-ah-ow-oo-o! One would think you was my father.
>
> ("Pygmalion," p. 133)

Now there is, of course, some point at which every person with human nerves must say to a child "Stop that noise." But if the rebuked youngster asks why, the simplest answer, "Because it irritates me," may fail, either because it may strike the

child as rather amusing to irritate you or else the child with its comparatively few nerves may be unable to conceive of your meaning vividly enough. Although there are other reasons to give to the child, the best way in Shaw's opinion, of gaining the desired end, is

> "to explain that the effect of the irritation will be that you will do something unpleasant if the noise continues. The something unpleasant may be only a look of suffering to arouse the child's affectionate sympathy (if it has any), or it may run to forcible expulsion from the room with plenty of unnecessary violence; but the principle is the same: there are no false pretences involved: the child learns in a straightforward way that it does not pay to be inconsiderate." (Preface to "Misalliance," p. XV)

Above all do not say to a noisy or mischievous youngster such things as "If you do that, angels will never love you," "If you don't do as I say, you will go to hell," and the like; bodily violence, provided it is the hasty expression of normal provoked resentment and not vicious cruelty, cannot harm a child as this sort of pious fraud harms it.

Again, to insist that "little children should be seen and not heard" tends to produce a stupid, unscrupulous class with the fixed idea that all enjoyment consists in undetected sinning. The enforcement of docility will generate not a

self-reliant, free, fully matured human being, but a grown-up schoolboy or schoolgirl.

> "The crux of the whole difficulty about parents, schoolmasters, priests, absolute monarchs, and despots of every sort, is the tendency to abuse natural docility. A nation should always be healthily rebellious."
> (Preface to "Misalliance," p. LXXIII)

On the other hand, such unamiable precepts as "Always return a blow" or "Never lose a chance for a good fight," will never do. The proper course is a "golden mean," as Aristotle would say; Shaw insists that in handling children good common sense, and not logic, is needed.

As for religion, Shaw acknowledges the need for some religious instruction, but claims that a child has the right to an impartially communicated historical knowledge of all the creeds and churches. No controversial subject should be taught dogmatically; men should be informed throughout life of all sides of any question, because men who know their opponents and understand their case, will quite often respect and like them, and will always learn something from them. Perceval, in "Misalliance," seems to come pretty well up to the mark, for he has a wide religious and ethical outlook as a result of having been brought up in a household of clashing views. Finally, as for the enforced reading of the Bible, no comment is needed with such a passage as the following before us:

self-reliant, free, fully matured human being, not a [illegible] schooling or [illegible].

> "The crux of the whole difficulty about
> [illegible], circumstances, pictures, [illegible]
> [illegible] and [illegible] of every sort, is the
> tendency to [illegible] between [illegible]. A person
> should always be [illegible] [illegible]."
> (Preface to "[illegible]," p. [illegible])

On the other hand, such unreliable precepts as "Always return a blow" or "Never lose a chance for a good trade," [illegible] etc. The [illegible] [illegible] in a "[illegible]," [illegible] say that [illegible] in [illegible], and not logic, is needed.

As for religion, [illegible] the [illegible] for more [illegible] instruction, but [illegible] that a child has the right to an impartially comprehended historical knowledge of all the creeds and churches. In controversial subject should be taught [illegible], and should be [illegible] throughout life of all sides of any question, [illegible] their own [illegible] will [illegible] respect and like them, and will [illegible] that [illegible]. [illegible] is "Misalliance," [illegible] will be to the [illegible], for he has a [illegible] and [illegible] as a result of [illegible], brought up in a [illegible] of [illegible] views. Finally, [illegible] the [illegible] of the [illegible], [illegible] is [illegible] with such a temper as the following letter [illegible]

> TARLETON. Whats the use of telling children to read the Bible when you know they wont. I was kept away from the Bible for forty years by being told to read it when I was young. Then I picked it up one evening in a hotel in Sunderland when I had left all my papers in the train; and I found it wasnt half bad. ("Misalliance," p. 22)

Shaw views with deep regret the widespread suppression of the subject of sex questions, and demands that the taboo be removed. A healthy frank discussion of the problem would be much the wiser course, and would benefit everyone concerned.

> "When people were ashamed of sanitary problems, and refused to face them, leaving them to solve themselves clandestinely in dirt and secrecy, the solution arrived at was the Black Death. A similar policy as to sex problems has solved itself by an even worse plague than the Black Death; and the remedy for that is not salvarsan, but sound moral hygiene, the first foundation of which is the discontinuance of our habit of telling not only the comparatively harmless lies that we know we ought not to tell, but the ruinous lies that we foolishly think we ought to tell." (Preface to "Overruled," p. 77)

Shaw claims that the most important simple fundamental economic truth to impress on a child in complicated civilizations like ours is the truth that whoever consumes goods or services without producing by personal effort the equivalent of what he or she consumes, inflicts on the community precisely the same injury that a thief produces, and would, in any honest State, be treated as a thief, however full his or her pockets might be of money made by other people.

> "Therefore, if for only half an hour a day, a child should do something serviceable to the community." (Preface to "Misalliance," p. XLVI)

Shaw believes that home-life alone is bad for children, and so he advances the theory that the best way of bringing up children is by a compromise between the home and the boarding school. One reason for his stand on this question is the fact that parents and their offspring can seldom reach a proper mutual understanding of each other; there always seems to exist some sort of a barrier or common feeling of reservation between them. Notice what one Shavian character says about parents and children:

> TARLETON. Oh, the gulf that lies between them! the impassable, eternal gulf! ("Misalliance," p. 96)

Of course, this is an example of Shaw's overemphasis for the sake of impressing the fact, but even so it is difficult for

the child to realize its parent's humanity, and for the parent to realize that of the child. We have another example in "Fanny's First Play" of this drawback, here between a mother and her son:

> MRS. GILBEY. I never did. The things people do! I cant understand them. Bobby never told me he was keeping company with you. His own mother!
>
> DORA (overcome) - Excuse me: I cant help smiling.
>
> ("Fanny's First Play," p. 190)

Also, the responsibility of raising children should not be left entirely to the many people of feeble character or intelligence, and so there is a need for a compromise between the home and the boarding school. At the same time people of high character and intelligence should not be plagued with the care of children; it would interfere with their work and handicap them. He thinks that there is no reason why children and adults should not see just as much of one another as is good for them, no more and no less.

Finally, one last reason is that such a course would relieve unfortunate persons from the effects of incompatibility of temperament between blood relations. Shaw'seems to have exaggerated this phase of the question rather unduly, and I suggest that it may be an outcome of the man's very high opinion of Samuel Butler and his ideas; anyone acquainted with the child to realize the parent's standpoint, and for the parent to realize that of the child. We have another example in "Tommy's First Play" of this situation, here between a mother and her son:

> Mary (crying). I forbid it. The Chinese
> people do! I want [illegible] [illegible]
> never [illegible] [illegible] to [illegible] with
> you. Oh you mother!
> Tom (conscious) - [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
> mother.
> ("Tommy's First Play," p. 100)

Again, the responsibility of parents [illegible] should not be left entirely to the [illegible] people of [illegible] in- telligence, and so there is a need for a [illegible] between these [illegible] and the [illegible] [illegible]. On the other hand people of "high [illegible] and intelligence should not be [illegible] with the care of children; it would interfere with their work and [illegible] [illegible]. It is true that there is no reason why [illegible] and [illegible] should not [illegible] as much of the [illegible] as is good for them, as [illegible] and [illegible].

Finally, [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] between [illegible] the [illegible] of [illegible] [illegible] of the [illegible] between [illegible] [illegible]. [illegible] [illegible] to [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible], I [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] of [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] this novelist's "The Way of All Flesh" and its exposure of the innermost feelings of the Pontifex family, will readily understand how my intimation might be true. However, there are enough instances in real life of this fact of family contrariety to give Shaw's position some ground of plausibility.

From one point of view this method of raising children would be advantageous to the people as a whole, in that the whole community would share in the expense. Thus the poor widow with her many children would be materially aided by the rich, childless bachelors and by the wealthy families with only a few children.

In the matter of those schools, Shaw is somewhat sceptical, for his own education was defective and left him with a bad opinion of schools in general; he has written that his schooling did him a great deal of harm and no good whatever,--"it was simply dragging a child's soul through the dirt."

> "I am sorry to seem irreconcilable; but it is the Life Force that has to make the experiment and not the schoolmaster; and the Life Force for the child's purpose is in the child and not in the schoolmaster." (Preface to "Misalliance," p. LX)

From his own experience he regards the difficulties of education as twofold: What to teach and how to teach it. As to the first point, he is opposed to all one-sided instruction:

> "It is said that if you wash a cat it will never again wash itself. This may or

this novelette. The Way of All Flesh, and its exposure of the inherent defects of the Pontifex family, will readily understand how an [illegible] might be true. However, there are enough instances in real life of this lack of family understanding to give Shaw's position some ground of plausibility.

From the point of view, it is rather of [illegible] that would be [illegible] to the people as a whole, in that the whole community would share in the expense. Thus the poor widow with her many children could be materially aided by the rich, childless bachelors and by the wealthy families with one or a few children.

In the matter of these details Shaw is extremely theoretical, for his own education was defective and left him with a bad opinion of schools in general; he nevertheless says his schooling did him a great deal of harm and no good whatever, as if not simply [illegible] a [illegible] and [illegible] through [illegible].

> "I am sorry of [illegible]: that is
> to say the idea that one is to rule the other
> [illegible] and not the subordinate [illegible] the life.
> [illegible] for the child's purpose is in the world
> and only in the [illegible]." Preface to
> "Misalliance," p. 102

From his own experience he regards the significance of education in general: There is [illegible] and [illegible] to [illegible] it. As to the first point, as in [illegible] of [illegible]:

> "It is only that if you don't [illegible] it
> will never [illegible] your [illegible]. This may be

> may not be true: it is certain that if you teach a man anything he will never learn it."
> (Preface to "Back to Methusaleh," p. XIII)

Pupils should be told every point of view and every theory, not merely that which the teacher approves, and they should be permitted to form their own opinions for themselves.With regard to the second point, Shaw is in agreement with educational reformers at large, that what is wrong with education is that learning is pursuing the child with a birch instead of the child pursuing learning with a brain; therefore the only remedy is the arousing of interest and self-activity in the pupil. Finally, he insists that everything depends on good teachers, for without them nothing can be done.

In conclusion, then, Shaw demands an acceptance of the conception of children's rights. They must be allowed a larger opportunity for normal self-development, both at home and in the school, and the Life Force will work out their salvation. "Hardy bodies and timid souls" must be corrected, that is, parents must allow their children to run moral risks more after the manner in which they now permit them to run physical risks.

MEDICINE

Just as we did at the beginning of the discussion of Bernard Shaw's attitude toward marriage, so must we do here before entering into the discussion of his opinions on the

> may you be sure it is certain that if you
> " needs a new morning as only those dared it."
> (Trading to "Back to Washington," p. 173)

Pupils should be told every point of view and every thought, not merely that which the teacher approves, and they should be permitted to think their own opinions. [illegible] begun to the second point. This is in agreement with advertised judgments of logic, that what is known with [illegible] tion is that learning is probably the pupil with a given instead of the child [illegible] learning with a being; therefore the only remedy is the creation of interest and self-activity in the pupil. Finally, it follows that education depends on good teachers, for without them nothing can be done.

In conclusion, then, this depends on recognition of the conception of children's nature. They must be allowed a larger opportunity for normal self-development, both at home and in the school, and the life force will work out their salvation. "Sunny hearts and full souls" must be cultivated. That is, parents must allow their children to understand [illegible] more often the manner in which they are growing than to the physical ideas.

SUMMARY

Just as we set at the beginning of the discussion, we [illegible] parents [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] the science of medicine and its practice: we must realize that the man respects and appreciates the institution. We have only to read closely his preface to "The "Doctor's Dilemma" to reach that conclusion. What he does do, however, is to draw attention to the dangers of the profession as it now stands, to criticise certain individual phases of it, and suggests state control, as we might expect a Socialist to do. The following passage, spoken by a doctor, sums up most admirably, I think, the man's whole attitude on the question:

> SIR PATRICK. And a very good profession, too, my lad. When you know as much as I know of the ignorance and superstition of the patients, youll wonder that we're half as good as we are.
>
> ("The Doctor's Dilemma," p. 32)

However, he does not hesitate to ridicule certain aspects of the situation. For example, he comically draws attention to the fact that doctors themselves die of the very diseases that they profess to cure:

> WALPOLE. Yes, by George: its like a bald-headed man trying to sell a hair restorer.
>
> ("The Doctor's Dilemma," p. 27)

Of course his aim in this case is to make people recoil from the dogma of the medical infallibility of the doctor.

In another play, "The Inca of Perusalem," he puts these words into the mouth of an ex-doctor who is now a hotel waiter:

> THE WAITER. But the war came; and my

> patients were ordered to give up their luxuries. They gave up their doctors.
>
> ("The Inca of Perusalem," p. 223)

The dramatist expects the audience to start thinking of the numerous unnecessary occasions on which a doctor is consulted.

Again, everything is on the side of the doctor, for when men die of disease, it is said to result from natural causes, but when they recover, and Shaw says they mostly do, the doctor gets the credit for curing them:

> WALPOLE (springing to his feet) Great heavens, man, you dont mean to say you sent her for a throat operation!
>
> B. B. (archly) Aha! Ha ha! Aha! (trilling like a lark as he shakes his finger at Walpole) You removed her nuciform sac. Well, well! force of habit! force of habit! Never mind, ne-e-e-ver mind. She got back her voice after it, and thinks you the greatest surgeon alive; and so you are, so you are, so you are.
>
> ("The Doctor's Dilemma," p. 21)

Shaw objects to the general opinion that medicine is an exact science; instead, it is quite uncertain, and the very best medical opinion and treatment varies widely from doctor to doctor.

> SIR PATRICK. Well, Ive known over thirty men that found out how to cure consumption.

patients have ordered to give up their luxuries. They gave up their doctors.

("The Dose of Medicine," p. 288)

The dramatist exposes the [illegible] of [illegible] thinking of the numerous unnecessary operations to which a doctor is subjected.

Again, everything is on the side of the doctor. The [illegible] the [illegible] of disease. It is said to profit them [illegible], but when they recover, and then says they [illegible] the doctor pays the people for curing them.

RIDGEON (continuing to [illegible]) [illegible] [illegible], [illegible] [illegible] to [illegible] you [illegible] [illegible] a [illegible] [illegible]

B. B. [illegible] what? He [illegible] what.

([illegible] like a [illegible] to [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible]) The [illegible] for [illegible] [illegible]. Well, well [illegible] of [illegible]. [illegible] of [illegible] [illegible] [illegible], [illegible]. [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] after it, [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] out of [illegible] [illegible], [illegible] [illegible] [illegible].

("The Doctor's Dilemma," p. 80)

[illegible] [illegible] to [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] that medicine is a [illegible] [illegible]. [illegible] it is [illegible] [illegible], and [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]. [illegible] doctor is [illegible].

[illegible] Well, [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]-

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] out [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

("The Doctor's Dilemma," p. 12)

Therefore the man protests against the hasty claims to scientific accuracy and finality in such an experimental field. Doctors necessarily stand by one another at all costs!

Shaw's attitude toward vaccination and vivisection is unquestionably the most debatable point in his opinions on medicine, and yet he does advance quite plausible arguments against them. The main drawback of vaccination, he points out, is the great liability that doctors will encourage a fashion for certain kinds, as has happened in the past; thus vaccination is not founded so much on science as on half-crowns. He makes this a part of his argument for socialized medical treatment.

In the matter of vivisection, the man's passionate hatred of taking the brute life, and his vegetarian habits, play a stellar role and do most assuredly influence his attitude. He claims that the practice of vivisection blunts all the finer feelings sooner or later, with general indifference to life as a result. Note the following quotation on the subject:

> JENNIFER. There are doctors who are naturally cruel; and there are others who get used to cruelty and are callous about it. They blind themselves to the souls of animals; and that blinds them to the souls of men and women.
>
> ("The Doctor's Dilemma," p. 110)

In addition, there is always present the danger of vivisection-

ists, and doctors in general, becoming immune to all human concern in their violently consuming desire to increase scientific knowledge. Dr. Paramore in "The Philanderer" is more concerned about his supposedly new disease than about his patient; he calls its overthrowing "the worst blow pathological science has received for the last three hundred years," but with desperate determination he swears to rediscover and prove his disease if he has "to experiment on every mortal animal that's got a liver at all." This same thought is echoed later in another play:

> "Science (by which they meant their practices) was so important that no consideration for the interests of any individual creature, whether frog or philosopher, much less the vulgar commonplaces of sentimental ethics, could weigh for a moment against the remotest off-chance of an addition to the body of scientific knowledge." (Preface to "Heartbreak House," p. XVII)

But I must hurry on to the real point at issue: what is to be done? Now the glaring fault, as matters now stand, is that we make a man's selfish interests coincide with an easy line of profitable conduct:

> "To offer me a doctor as my judge, and then weight his decision with a bribe of a large sum of money and a virtual guarantee that if he makes a mistake it can never be

> proved against him, is to go wildly beyond the ascertained strain which human nature will bear." (Preface to "The Doctor's Dilemma," p. VII)

This state of affairs is deplorably inadvisable, for what men can always be impartial when they have a strong pecuniary interest on one side? Therefore something must be done to remedy matters.

Shaw maintains that the medical problem can be solved through Socialism:

> "Until the medical profession becomes a body of men trained and paid by the country to keep the country in health it will remain what it is at present: a conspiracy to exploit popular credulity and human suffering." (Preface to "The Doctor's Dilemma," p. LXXIX)

He points out that fortunately we do not have to begin absolutely from the beginning, as we already have in the Medical Officer of Health a sort of doctor who is free from the worst hardships, and consequently from the worst vices, of the private practitioner; he is paid by the city to keep the people well, and as every increase in his salary depends upon the health of the general constituency under his charge, he has every inducement to strive toward the ideal of a clean bill of health. Shaw asserts that everything points to this method as the best solution of the difficulty.

Therefore, Shaw proposes the following main reforms:

> "Take the utmost care to get well born and well brought up. This means that your mother must have a good doctor. Be careful to go to a school where there is what they call a school clinic, where your nutrition and teeth and eyesight and other matters of importance to you will be attended to. Be particularly careful to have all this done at the expense of the nation, as otherwise it will not be done at all, the chances being about forty to one against your being able to pay for it directly yourself, even if you know how to set about it. Otherwise you will be what most people are at present: an unsound citizen of an unsound nation, without sense enough to be ashamed or unhappy about it.
>
> "Make up your mind how many doctors the community needs to keep it well. Do not register more or less than this number; and let registration constitute the doctor a civil servant with a dignified wage paid out of public funds."

(Preface to "The Doctor's Dilemma," pp. XCI-XCII)

In conclusion, I wish to state that I have definitely established the truth of my statement that Shaw heartily approves of the science of medicine; for if he does not, why

should he have written that last passage which I quoted? In addition, we should all thank him for disclosing certain shortcomings and abuses of the profession. Finally, and especially, we should express our gratitude for the rational, constructive program of reform that he has furnished.

THE SUPERMAN

Shaw nowhere tells us much about his conception of the Superman, but we know that he is to be evolved through eugenics, by consciously breeding a higher race:

> "The changes from the crab apple to the pippin, from the wolf and fox to the house dog, from the charger of Henry V. to the brewer's draught horse and the race horse, are real; for here Man has played the god, subduing Nature to his intention, and ennobling or debasing Life for a set purpose. And what can be done with a wolf can be done with a man. If such monsters as the tramp and the gentleman can appear as mere by-products of Man's individual greed and folly, what might we not hope for as a main product of his universal aspiration?"
>
> ("Man and Superman," pp. 181, 182.)

The Superman is to be of an intellectual type with a mighty brain. He will despise the morality of ordinary men

and will introduce a higher code in its place. His life is to be devoted to discovering and carrying out the purpose of God, or as Shaw puts it, the purpose of the Life Force.

> "Now that we have reached the stage of international organization, Man's political capacity and magnanimity are clearly beaten by the vastness and complexity of the problems forced on him. And it is at this anxious moment that he finds, when he looks upward for a mightier mind to help him, that the heavens are empty. He will presently see that his discarded formula that Man is the Temple of the Holy Ghost, happens to be precisely true, and that it is only through his own brain and hand that this Holy Ghost, formerly the most nebulous person in the Trinity, and now become its sole survivor as it has always been its real Unity, can help him in any way. And so, if the Superman is to come, he must be born of Woman by Man's intentional and well-considered contrivance. Conviction of this will smash everything that opposes it. Even Property and Marriage, which laugh at the laborer's petty complaint that he is defrauded of "surplus value," and at the domestic miseries of the slaves of the wedding ring, will themselves be laughed aside as the lightest of trifles if they cross

> this conception when it becomes a fully realized vital purpose of the race."
>
> ("Man and Superman," pp. 184, 185)

John Tanner in "Man and Superman" spends all his life in railing against mere romance and Philistine self-satisfaction, and declares that the institutions of men must be changed and ameliorated so as to fit them for the true purpose of the Universe, the making of the Superman.

The Superman is necessary from many points of view, but especially politically. Democracy means being governed by ignorance, and autocracy means being governed by selfishness.

> "There is no public enthusiast alive of twenty years' practical democratic experience who believes in the political adequacy of the electorate or of the bodies it elects. The overthrow of the aristocrat has created the necessity for the Superman." ("Man and Superman," p. 223)

Only with a Democracy of Supermen can we have a perfect state, therefore.

We have no definite idea of the kind of person the Superman is going to be, but we must each of us try to produce him in conformity with our own innate ideals, and "the proof of the Superman will be in the living."

SHAW'S PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION

Bernard Shaw's philosophy of life and his religion are so closely akin and interdependent, that it is advisable to treat them together rather than under separate heads. Of course this overlapping of the two is rather common, but in this man they are peculiarly related, the explanation being, I believe, in the fact that his religion is a this world religion.

Perhaps it might be well to start with a clear conception of Shaw's ideal philosophic man, who is described in the following passage:

> DON JUAN. I sing, not arms and the hero, but the philosophic man: he who seeks in contemplation to discover the inner will of the world, in invention to discover the means of fulfilling that will, and in action to do that will by the so-discovered means. Of all other sorts of men I declare myself tired.
> ("Man and Superman," p. 115)

The author has the greatest respect and admiration for such a man, and throughout his works there are to be found references to him.

To proceed now to the main point, I believe that the whole Shavian working hypothesis of life is summed up in the following speech from "Man and Superman" expressed through Don Juan:

> DON JUAN. I tell you that as long as I can conceive something better than myself I cannot be easy unless I am striving to bring it into

SHAW'S PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION

Because Shaw's philosophy of life and his religion are so closely akin and interdependent, that it is advisable to treat them together rather than under separate heads. Of course this overlapping of the two is rather common, but in this man they are peculiarly related, the explanation being, I believe, in the fact that his religion is a this world religion.

Perhaps it might be well to start with a clear conception of Shaw's ideal philosophic man, who is described in the following passage:

> DON JUAN. I sing, not arms and the hero,
> but the philosophic man: he who seeks in contemplation to discover the inner will of the
> world, in invention to discover the means of
> fulfilling that will, and in action to do
> that will by the so-discovered means. Of all
> other sorts of men I declare myself tired.
> ("Man and Superman," p. 118)

The author has the greatest respect and admiration for such a man, and throughout his works there are to be found references to him.

To proceed now to the main point, I believe that the whole Shavian working hypothesis of life is summed up in the following speech from "Man and Superman" expressed through Don Juan:

> DON JUAN. I tell you that as long as I can
> conceive something better than myself I cannot
> be easy unless I am striving to bring it into

> existence or clearing the way for it. That is the law of my life. That is the working within me of Life's incessant aspiration to higher organization, wider, deeper, intenser self-consciousness, and clearer self-understanding.
> ("Man and Superman," p. 129)

Existence is no mere personal, selfish thing, but it is a cooperation with the forces of the universe. Looked from one angle, the Shavian philosophy is a protest against the narrow scheming of those who desire above all else to rise in the world at the expense of the rest of the people. Shaw's own life is probably one of the best examples of his high toned, public-spirited theory put into practice. Thus life is not so much the fulfillment of moral laws and social laws and the like, as it is the satisfaction of a passion in us of which we can give no account. It is the pursuit of life for its own sake, every intensification of activity being an increase in life, and life is realized only as activity that satisfies the will.

Shaw is a firm believer in will, engineered by reason of course, mainly because he sees in it the only real instrument for the achievement of Socialism. He has at last come to believe in two things: the Superman and the Socialist State at one end of the ladder of evolution, and the present world at the other end. The hard task remained for Shaw to warn men off the dangerous traps and pitfalls that might lie in their path. It is something to know, as Shaw claims, that the earth will one day be heaven; but it is incumbent upon us to see that the road to heaven is made a direct and

> existence or clearing the way for it. That is the law of my life. That is the working within me of Life's incessant aspiration to higher organization, wider, deeper, intenser self-consciousness, and clearer self-understanding.
> ("Man and Superman," p. 129)

Existence is no mere personal, selfish thing, but it is a struggle with the forces of the universe. Viewed from one angle, the Shavian philosophy is a protest against the narrow scheming of those who desire above all else to rise in the world at the expense of the rest of the people. Shaw's own life is probably one of the best examples of his high ideal, public-spirited theory put into practice. Thus life is not to seek the fulfillment of moral laws and social laws and the like, as if in the satisfaction of a passion in us of which we can give no account. It is the pursuit of life for its own sake, every intensification of activity being an increase in life, and life is realized only as activity that satisfies the will.

Shaw is a firm believer in will, emphasizing by means of culture, mainly because he sees in it the only real instrument for the achievement of Socialism. He has at last come to realize in two things: the Superman and the Socialism at one end of our ladder of evolution, and the present world at the other end. The race has remained for Shaw to wear out all the dangerous ways and pitfalls that might lie in their path. It is something to know, as Shaw claims, that the earth will yet become heaven; but it is a comfort upon us to know that the road to heaven is made a direct and undiverging one. Notice the following passage:

> DON JUAN. Just as Life, after ages of struggle, evolved that wonderful bodily organ the eye, so that the living organism could see where it was going and what was coming to help or threaten it, and thus avoid a thousand dangers that formerly slew it, so it is evolving to-day a mind's eye that shall see, not the physical world, but the purpose of Life, and thereby enable the individual to work for that purpose instead of thwarting and baffling it by setting up shortsighted personal aims as at present. ("Man and Superman," p. 115)

Life needs a larger outlook than the selfish ends to which most of us devote ourselves; the real man is he who is an energetic part of a great progressive movement, thus giving expression to what Shaw terms the Life Force.

Now by this phrase Life Force the man means what is customarily called the Will of God; the Life Force is his modern representation of God, not so much as a Being, but rather as a Becoming Tendency in the universe, a striving upward. Thus we find Shaw saying through one of his characters:

> DON JUAN. The philosopher is in the grip of the Life Force. This Life Force says to him, "I have done a thousand wonderful things unconsciously by merely willing to live and follow-

undervaluing man. Notice the following passage:

> DON JUAN. Just as Life, after ages of struggle, evolved that wonderful bodily organ the eye, so that the living organism could see where it was going and what was coming to help or threaten it, and thus avoid a thousand dangers that formerly slew it, so it is evolving to-day a mind's eye that shall see, not the physical world, but the purpose of Life, and thereby enable the individual to work for that purpose instead of thwarting and baffling it by setting up shortsighted personal aims as at present. ("Man and Superman," p. 110)

Life needs a larger outlook than the narrow ends to which most of us devote ourselves; the real man is he who is an energetic part of a great progressive movement, thus giving expression to what Shaw terms the Life Force.

Now by this phrase Life Force the man means what is commonly called the Will of God: the Life Force is his modern representation of God, not so much as a Being, but rather as a ascending Tendency in the universe, a striving upward. Thus we find Shaw saying through one of his characters:

> DON JUAN. The philosopher is in the grip of the Life Force. This Life Force says to him, "I have done a thousand wonderful things unconsciously by merely willing to live and follow-

> ing the line of least resistance: now I want to know myself and my destination, and choose my path; so I have made a special brain - a philosopher's brain - to grasp this knowledge for me as the husbandman's hand grasps the plough for me. And this," says the Life Force to the philosopher, "must thou strive to do for me until thou diest, when I will make another brain and another philosopher to carry on the work. ("Man and Superman," p. 134)

We learn that to Shaw evolution is not a materialistic but rather a mystical theory. He has a contempt for the blind coarseness and shallowness of the Darwinian doctrine; he has a "natural abhorrance of its sickening inhumanity." (Preface to "Back to Methusaleh," p. LIX). In the preface to "Misalliance" he calls Natural Selection

> "the most horrible of all religions: that which teaches us to regard ourselves as the helpless prey of a series of senseless accidents." ("Misalliance," p.CXI)

He prefers to think of evolution as the struggle of a creative Will or Purpose, which he calls the Life Force, towards higher forms of life. He could not let Darwin's Natural Selection drive the soul out of the universe. I quote a passage in sup-

port of this statement:

> TARLETON· All this damned materialism: what good is it to anybody? Ive got a soul: dont tell me I havnt. Cut me up and you cant find it. Cut up a steam engine and you cant find the steam. But, by George, it makes the engine go. Say what you will, Summerhays, the divine spark is a fact. ("Misalliance," p. 57)

Now this is certainly a very spiritual view, and I earnestly suggest that it be borne in mind; it is just another case of finding an unexpected reverent attitude in this misunderstood man.

Shaw looks upon God as a Spirit interpenetrating the universe, and not as a sort of grey-bearded old man sitting up in the clouds and watching men.

> "The Kingdom of God is within you. You are the son of God, and God is the Son of man. God is a Spirit to be worshipped in spirit and in truth, and not an elderly gentleman to be bribed and begged from. We are members of one another, so that you cannot injure or help your neighbour without injuring or helping yourself. God is your Father; you are here to do God's work; and you and your Father are one." (Preface to "Androcles and the Lion," p. XVIII)

In "Man and Superman" there is also found again this theory of the interrelation of God and man. God, that is, the Life Force, is a Spirit which wishes to increase its Consciousness by the increase of wisdom in mortals, and we can best support this process by striving in the highest degree to evolve into Supermen.

In "The Shewing-Up of Blanco Posnet" God is represented as imbuing the soul of Blanco with strivings for better things:

> BLANCO. No. No more paths. No more broaf and narrow. No more good and bad, Theres no good and bad; but by Jiminy, gents, theres a rotten game, and theres a great game. I played the rotten game; but the great game was played on me; and now I'm for the great game every time. Amen. ("The Shewing-Up of Blanco Posnet," p. 442)

This passage is an admission that Shaw recognizes the fact of the great overruling mystic Power which controls the instincts of humanity. The man is practically acknowledging a personal God.

Shaw therefore has the eternal spirit of religion, although he cannot assent to the many dogmas that are attached to Christianity.

> "It is the adulteration of religion by the romance of miracles and paradises and torture chambers that makes it reel at the impact of every advance of science, instead of

> being clarified by it." (Preface to "Back to Methusaleh," p. LXXXIII)

He claims that there is only one religion, "though there are a hundred versions of it." The big and important thing is this religious spirit which is present in the breasts of us all, and which works toward our salvation.

> THE CAPTAIN. Sacrifice then to the true God. What does his name matter? We call him Jupiter. The Greeks call him Zeus. Call him what you will as you drop the incense on the altar flame: He will understand.
> ("Androcles and the Lion," p. 15)

Accordingly, Shaw has a great respect for the personality of Christ, although he cannot accept him as more than a man. He is no supernatural personnage, but "only a prophet as Mahomet was a prophet." He insists that the doctrines of Jesus are the significant things, and in the preface to "Androcles and the Lion" he defends these teachings. He claims that the moral code of Christianity, if put into practice by any nation (to date it has not been done), would effect happier results than any that might be attained from any other theory of society or state.

Shaw's heaven is not a place in the sky, but a perfected earth. Also, hell is our earth in its present state:

> KEEGAN. Now, sir, there is only one place of horror and torment known to my religion; and that place is hell. Therefore it is plain to me that this earth of ours must be hell, and

being clarified by it." (Preface to "Back to Methuselah," p. LXXXIII)

He claims that there is only one religion, "though there are a hundred versions of it." The big and important thing is this religious spirit which is present in the make-up of us all, and which works toward our salvation.

> THE CAPTAIN. Sacrifice then to the true God. What does his name matter? We call him Jupiter. The Greeks call him Zeus. Call him what you will as you drop the incense on the altar flame: He will understand.
> ("Androcles and the Lion," p. 135)

Accordingly, Shaw has a great respect for the personality of Christ, although he cannot accept him as more than a man. He is no supernatural personage, but only a prophet as Mohammed was a prophet? He insists that the doctrines of Jesus are the significant things, and in the preface to "Androcles and the Lion" he defends these teachings. He claims that the moral code of Christianity, if put into practice (as yet it has not been done), would effect happier results than any that might be attained from any other theory of society or state.

Shaw's heaven is not a place in the sky, but a perfected earth. Also, hell is our earth in its present state:

> CUSINS. Yes, sir, there is only one place of horror and torment known to my religion; and that place is hell. Therefore it is plain to me that this earth of ours must be hell, and

> that we are all here to expiate crimes
> committed by us in a former existence.
> ("John Bull's Other Island," p. 97)

He asserts that the ideal of immortality was invented because men were afraid of death, and yet people still stick to it, although they know that it cannot be true. Shaw would rather have the world set up the ideal of immortality in the race or something more in accord with actual facts.

In conclusion, I claim that the reflective person will not fail to see a constructive value in both Shaw's philosophy and in his religion, - a distinct contribution to social, moral, and religious ends. There is a too prevalent habit of forming a hasty opinion of Shaw's real attitude toward and of his religious beliefs from what appears simply on the surface in his writings; his most startling statements are are dwelt upon to the exclusion of all else. The fact that the man is insistent that we shall see things as they really are, stands largely responsible for the attitude of mind that regards him as a menace.

Shaw's philosophy is unquestionably a noble, unselfish, constructive attitude toward life. By putting it into practice a person will work out his own salvation while at the same time aiding in the progress of the world, thus performing both an individual and a collective service. This is a most inspiring and useful conception of man's duty, and indeed one worthy of Bernard Shaw.

As for his religious views, the man is assailing the purely

conventional inreligion and the conduct which grows out of it. He boldly expresses the beliefs that so many persons hold secretly in their hearts. It is not playing fair to try to smother a candid revelation of facts as they really are, simply because they are not clothed in orthodox garb. He takes issue with the practice and theory of Christianity, and not with the teachings of Jesus; he insists that men shall no longer delude themselves and others by preaching and professing what they inwardly regard as impracticable. The present world is the most telling witness for the need of new thought and stimulation in religion, and surely the destruction of religious shams is a help to true spiritual growth.

conventional limitation and the conduct which grows out of it. He boldly expresses the beliefs that so many persons hold secretly in their hearts. It is not playing fair to try to smother a candid revelation of facts as they really are, simply because they are not dressed in orthodox garb. He takes issue with the practice and theory of Christianity, and not with the teachings of Jesus: he insists that men should no longer delude themselves and others by professing and practising what they inwardly regard as unbelievable. The present world is in need of a living witness for the good of new thought and interpretation of religion, and surely the description of religious doubt is a help to such spiritual growth.

CONCLUSION

Nothing can be more certain to an attentive observer than that the great majority of people, even those who reason about their opinions, have arrived at their conclusions by a process quite distinct from reasoning; they judge all questions by a mental standard derived from their education and from the general views held by modern society. Now the great obstacle is that they are perfectly unconscious of this ascendency of old associations and of their acquiescence to the opinions that they have been taught.

This state of affairs makes the reformers' road a most difficult and uninviting one, and retards progress; for people proportion their attention and sympathy to the degree in which the reforms or arguments presented to them support their foregone conclusions. There is such a pang when cherished dreams are scattered, and old institutions are abandoned, that it is not surprising that men should wish to close their eyes to the unwelcome light. They hastily convince themselves that the arguments in behalf of their hereditary opinions and institutions are irresistibly conclusive and that the arguments against them exceedingly absurd. The process of reasoning

CONCLUSION

Nothing can be more certain to an attentive observer than that the great majority of people, even those who reason about their opinions, have arrived at their conclusions by a process quite distinct from reasoning; they judge all questions by a mental standard derived from their education and from the general views held by modern society. Yet the great obstacle is that they are perfectly unconscious of this ascendancy of old associations and of their acquiescence in the opinions that they have been taught.

This state of affairs makes the reformer's task a most difficult and uninviting one, and retards progress: for people proportion their attention and sympathy to the degree in which the reforms or arguments presented to them support their foregone conclusions. There is such a pang when cherished dreams are shattered, and old institutions are abandoned, that it is not surprising that men should wish to close their eyes to the unwelcome light. They readily convince themselves that the arguments in behalf of their hereditary opinions and institutions are irresistibly conclusive and that the arguments against them exceedingly absurd. The process of reasoning is much more difficult than is commonly supposed, and so in probing into existing problems and then in estimating proposed reforms, we must resolve to spare no prejudice and accord no favour, basing our conclusions on reason and conscience, and rejecting every illegitimate influence. Only after great mental conflict can we obtain the inestimable boon of an assured and untrammelled mind, and although few people succeed in the attempt, the result justifies the effort.

To this intellectual freedom there must be added a spirit of scepticism, a thing which has played an immense part in the world's progress; for scepticism in turn breeds inquiry, and then the road is open to higher and better things. Scepticism leads to truth, and only lovers of truth will take the trouble to test the reality of what usually passes by that name. Until doubt begins, progress is impossible; men satisfied with existing conditions and convinced of the accuracy of their opinions, will never take the pains to examine the basis on which they are built, and they will look with wonder and even horror on views contrary to those which they have inherited from their fathers. Doubt must intervene before investigation can begin.

Now Bernard Shaw, with his free unbiassed mind and is much more difficult than is commonly supposed, and so is probing into existing problems and then in estimating proposed reforms, we must resolve to spare no prejudice and accord no favour, basing our conclusions on reason and conscience, and rejecting every illegitimate influence. Only after great mental conflict can we obtain the inestimable boon of an emancipated and untrammelled mind, and although few people succeed in the attempt, the result justifies the effort.

To this intellectual freedom there must be added a spirit of scepticism, a thing which has played an immense part in the world's progress; for scepticism is pure Greek inquiry, and then the road is open to higher and better things. Scepticism leads to truth, and only lovers of truth will take the trouble to test the reality of what usually passes by that name. Until doubt begins, progress is impossible; men satisfied with existing conditions and convinced of the accuracy of their opinions, will never take the pains to examine the basis on which they are built, and they will look with wonder and even horror on views contrary to those which they have inherited from their fathers. Doubt must intervene before investigation begins.

The Harvard idea, with its free unfettered mind and logical reasoning, has most assuredly aroused a certain degree of doubt on many subjects, and no one has ever quite the same attitude toward a thing after having caught a glimpse of the Shavian view. Anybody reading Shaw's plays and prefaces is put on pins and needles, with the resultant thinking and restless squirming and cross-questioning; the stimulating effect of this brilliant and thoughtful author is really most remarkable. If he has arrested our jaded attention, if he has irritated us and made us pause to revolve various problems in our minds, has he not unquestionably done a great service? We may call him and his opinions disagreeable, yet he has aroused us from our stupid torpor and made us sceptical on many matters; he has awakened us out of our self-complacency like a clap of thunder, instead of lulling us to sleep with sweet sentimentalities.

William Lyon Phelps made a most significant comparison when he likened Shaw to a gadfly, which insect is usually "a torment, but if one were sinking into a stupor in a snowdrift, then an active gadfly would be a blessing." There are so many dull and prejudiced people in the world that a man like Shaw should by all means be heartily welcomed. If his purpose is to shock self-contentment and self-gratulation into wakeful thought and reform, there is abundant evidence that he has by

no means failed.

But apart from the fact that Shaw has provoked a great deal of private meditation and public discussion in making people aware of certain problems which might otherwise have long remained unnoticed, he has also contributed a great deal toward the solution of those difficulties. However, I feel that I have established the truth of this statement so clearly in the body of this paper as to make unnecessary here a long recapitulation. The spirit of fair play should prompt a recognition of what he has contributed to the world and to the cause of humanity. He has skillfully drawn the outline of a picture for the thinking and the observing to fill in. As yet he suffers under the disadvantage of being a little ahead of his day, but it is quite reasonable to believe that the future will owe Bernard Shaw a debt of gratitude which the present has not dared acknowledge.