

Henrik Ibsen and George Bernard Shaw: New Philosophical Concepts of Modern Drama

Ahmed Hameed Ubeid
College of Education

Hamid Hamad Abd
College of Arts

Until the latter part of the nineteenth century, the theatre remains a vehicle of entertainment. Focusing upon the human conditions are only incidental and secondary factor in the dramatist's art and mind. Ibsen, however, has contributed a new significance to drama that changes the development of modern theatre. He is the acknowledged originator of modern prose realistic drama. He deserves this recognition because of his pioneering selections of challenging and sometimes shocking private and public issues. A brief consideration for some of his major dramatic topics shows his originality and daring: the manipulations of people seeking personal benefits, the sacrifices of pursuing truth, and the abandonment of personal happiness in favour of professional interests.

Ibsen has suffered great depression during his life. Before being an artist he has tasted the bitterness of life, thus, he knows well the meaning of poverty and the importance of money. Some critics have pointed out that Ibsen in his daily life is quite often comes up to his own heroic ideals and revolutionary theories, but listens to the troll voices of narrow-minded egotism and compromise, then the genius in him arouses, a judge without mercy. This ever-recurring fight means to him lifelong suffering; but it is this drama constantly going in his own soul that makes him a great dramatist and compels him again and again to undertake a penetrating self-analysis. For Ibsen, "the artist must possess some experience of the life he was trying to create. In some degree everything that Ibsen wrote during the turbulent years of his realistic revolt was for him also a felt experience."¹ Ibsen's contribution to the theatre of his day is to create plays, which effectively dramatize contemporary social issues with the intention of awakening his audience to them. Therefore, his plays appeal to the

spectators' minds because they have purpose. His plays have been considered scandalous at the time, when Victorian values of family life and propriety are still very much the norm, and any challenge to them would be immoral and outrageous. Thus, Ibsen's plays "examined the realities that lay behind many facades which the society of time did not want to see."² Every drama is expected to result in a proper conclusion and meaning, that goodness is to bring happiness, and immorality is merely pain. Ibsen insists on turning that concept upside down, challenging the beliefs of his audiences. James Walter Mcfarlane, a critic, has stressed that "Ibsen is after all, on all the evidence, not dead but on the contrary very much alive; yet the things he wrote about, the themes, the ideas, the content of the works, no longer seems to concern us very closely; therefore, surely his continued vitality can only ascribed to his technique. It is not what he said, seemingly, but the way he said it."³

In capitalistic societies, which Ibsen and Shaw have written about, money was the basis or the cause of all human activities. In their plays we find that people talk about money as a main concern. Money is a vital factor to working men and women and to the members of the professional classes. All types of society earn it, such as carpenters, servants, prostitutes, and labourers. Doctors, scientists, and artists sell their services in order to ensure living for their families. In these societies money has turned people into commodities to be bought, sold or rented-exploited. Europe at that time has witnessed changes everywhere, Ibsen also is changing and growing as a thinker and dramatist. He has been driven by the idea that a forward and creative drama could bring about deeper and more permanent changes than could be affected by soldiers and politicians. Toward this end he has developed the realistic problem play. Each problem is timely, topical, and realistic as are the characters, places, situations, and outcomes. In this vein Ibsen has written many major prose plays on which his reputation rests: from them, the main plays, *A Doll's House* (1879), *An Enemy of the People* (1882), *The Wild Duck* (1884).

In these major plays Ibsen has tackled the main issues; materialism and the related themes. Throughout these significant plays, Ibsen has presented believable people confronting virtually insoluble personal, marital, economic, and political problems.

As *A Doll's House* unfolds, we learn that earlier, Nora the heroine has extended herself beyond her means to save Torvald's from a near-fatal illness. We also learn that there had been an earlier relationship between Krogstad and Christine Linde. In this play Ibsen has handled the materialistic issue to put the nature of the modern marriage on the trail. Similarly, in *An Enemy of the People*, we learn about Dr. Stockmann's earlier investigations into the problems of the water contamination, his indebtedness to his brother for his job, and the dangerous and virtually criminal cutting of corners that occurred when the town's therapeutic spa was built. These details are logically and chronologically essential for our understanding of the problems and conflicts within both plays. Ibsen has given a real view to the life in that time and he also shows the hidden morals beyond the materialistic attitudes. He has left an enormous influence upon the spectators or the readers as a daring dramatist who transcends the boundaries of reality to convey his ideas.

It has been said that the most striking thing about this dramatist is his love for ideas. It means his moral restlessness, his preoccupation with problems of conscience, his need to bring all the events of daily existence into a singular focus. This trait, this love for ideas, cannot be isolated and considered in itself as a defect. It is, on the contrary, a great merit. With this merit our interest has been aroused not so much only in Ibsen dramas, but in Ibsen himself. That is why Ibsen appealed to Shaw because the Norwegian is concerned with a drama of purpose. For if any one is to be classified by Bernard Shaw among the very great, he must have a purpose and a philosophy of life. An artist without these Shaw may admire or envy, but he will never render him full allegiance. Arguing from this standpoint, "Shaw was able to drag into the arena no less a personage

than Shakespeare. Because in the poet's works there is discoverable neither purpose nor philosophy, therefore, said Shaw, Shakespeare is less great than Ibsen."⁴ Thus, he hoped to appreciate Ibsen by pulling Shakespeare down. Undoubtedly, Ibsen and Shaw have reflected their philosophies and views in their plays without hesitation. They have derived their subjects from the real situations or from reliable sources.

To Ibsen's and Shaw's plays, money is a chief link. The absence of money stimulates or urges one to sell; flowers, speech lessons, food, drink, clothing and military supplies. While the acquisition of money may enable one to survive, but money does not necessarily make one independent. So, dependence upon money creates question about independence from it as well as from individuals and social conceptions of which it is a part. Apparently Ibsen has treated this issue in *A Doll's House*.

On his side, Shaw has emphasized in some of his plays that status without money makes survival difficult and independence impossible. He has examined the relationship between money and these issues and finds them interconnected.⁵ He believes that the lack of money is the root of all evil. Shaw's interest in the drama increased when Ibsen burst upon the scene with his daring themes, which are undesirable, and against the Victorians' tastes. Ibsen's plays are sensational; they deal with social problems and arouse the wrath of puritans who object Ibsen's outspokenness. Shaw is excited by this new dramatic trend. He is hostile to the narrow Victorian thinking. Shaw has written *The Quintessence of Ibsenism* in 1890. In it he discusses Ibsen's ideas and some of his plays. Shaw credits Ibsen with inaugurating realistic drama and injecting fresh ideas into the theatre. Shaw has learned much from him, thus, he has carried Ibsen's ideas much further in changing the concept of drama. *Widowers' Houses*, is a powerful play written as consequence of Ibsen's influence on Shaw. In it Shaw has criticized society and tries to awaken its sleeping conscience. He loudly proclaims unpleasant facts and subtly urges reform to stop the materialistic

landlords from exploiting the poor. Janko Lavrin, a critic, has mentioned that “the towering pioneer and the chief innovator of the modern drama is, of course, Ibsen; its most prolific and most conspicuous and prominent representative is and remains Bernard Shaw.”⁶ With Ibsen, the stage became the pulpit, while the dramatist urging his audience to reassess the values of society, became the minister of a new social responsibility. Ibsen has discovered dramatic material in every day situation. When Nora in *A Doll's House* quietly confronts her husband to sit down and discuss their decisive moments, drama became no longer a mere diversion, but an experience closely affecting on lives of the play-attendance themselves.

Ibsen, in most of his plays has endeavored to show the importance of money, which could restore the health, and he has explained that survival is important but it cannot be obtained without money.⁷ Ibsen's focus on real-life issues has given his plays continued timeliness and strength. *A Doll's House*, for example, is almost prophetic in its portrayal of the helpless position of married woman in the nineteenth century. Most notably, a woman could not borrow funds without man signature, and Nora had to violate the law to obtain the money to restore her husband's health. The mailbox, to which her husband has the only key, symbolizes this limitation, and the ultimate disclosure of the box's contents, rather than freeing Nora and Torvald, highlights her dependency. This means that independence is connected with one's commitment of materialism. This matter has played a great role at that time, at the extent that woman has not been treated as a human being who has a free will and decision.

Ibsen's drama is a domestic drama. His aim is to dramatize the life of his own day. He has realized perfectly that the old-fashioned emotions of impressive plays have nothing in common with ordinary man and women; that the drama, if it to rise to its greatness, would have to adapt itself to the needs of the present, be a mirror of the age, and instead of escaping into romantic decorations, make itself the stern monitor of the time.⁷ While one might regard Ibsen's refusal to

spell out specific, practical solutions to the problems he has dramatized as a failure, one might also regard it as a daring challenge to his audiences to work out their own solutions.

In a similarly prophetic vein, *An Enemy of the People* deals with the effects of pollution and the conflicts between preservers of the environment and proponents of business as usual. This issue emerges early in the play as soon as Dr. Stockmann learns about the toxic wastes contaminating the water of the town spa. This place is the economic livelihood of the entire town. We know well that Ibsen is a political man and he reveals the defects of the social life far away from politics. To uncover the truth, Ibsen has transcended the brotherhood's connection for the sake of the public welfare. Once Mayor Stockmann convinces these men that Dr. Stockmann is using his discoveries to suit his own political goals. Thus, the play enlarges into the opposition between the individual and society at large. As these conflicts develop, Ibsen creates two of the great moments in the history of drama. In which Dr. Stockmann and his brother the mayor argue over the issue of truth and individuality versus interest and collective public opinion. Their conflict comes to a head, that Ibsen, through Dr. Stockmann, establishes an individual's need and absolute right to pursue truth, wherever it may lead.

G. B. Shaw, in most of his plays resents from poverty and at the same time he does not like the capitalists, the landlords. He shows in his passionate ending of a long denunciation of poverty, "but the best of it is, ladies and gentlemen, Shaw believes, that you are all going to die. A new generation would clean up the mess and the next generation would not believe that the mess had ever existed."⁸ Shaw also believes that rich people are so unhealthy that they are always running after cures and surgical operations of one sort or another. When they are not really ill they imagine they are. They are worried by their properties, by their servants, by their poor relations, by their investments, and by the need for keeping up their social position. Whereas Ibsen called for cultivated aristocracy

of the spirit, Shaw called for jobs with good salaries, since only they can enable people to become cultivated and spiritually ennobled.⁹

To Shaw, society's first order of business is the elimination of poverty. He perceives poverty to be a crime that must be destroyed. Shaw has stressed in his preface to *Major Barbara*:

To wit, that the greatest of our evils, and the worst of our crimes is poverty, and that our duty, to which every other consideration should be sacrificed, is not to be poor. "Poor but honest", "the respectable poor, and such phrases are as intolerable and as immoral as drunken but amiable, fraudulent but a good after-dinner speaker, splendidly criminal, or the like. Security, the chief pretence of civilization, cannot exist where the worst of dangers, the danger of poverty, hangs over everyone's head, and where the alleged protection of our persons from violence is only an accidental result of the existence of a police force whose real business is to force the poor man to see his children starve whilst idle people overfeed pet dogs with the money that might feed and clothe them."¹⁰

Shaw again has confirmed the importance of money. He believes that 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 of hard boring work and one man a thousand pounds for nothing. The crying need of 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 the Trinity, but simply for enough money. And the evil to be attacked is not sin, suffering, greed, priest craft, kingcraft, demagoguery, monopoly, ignorance, drink, war, pestilence, nor any other of the scapegoats which reformers sacrifice, but simply poverty."¹¹

Poverty, spoils whole cities, spreads horrible pestilence, strikes dead the very soul of all who come within sight, sound, or smell of it. The poor Shaw says, "they poison us morally and physically: they kill the happiness of society: they force us to do away with our own liberties and to organize unnatural cruelties for fear they should rise against us and drag us down into their abyss".¹²

Again Shaw has emphasized his detestation for poverty. He argues that poverty is a very uncomfortable misfortune for the individual who happens to be poor. But poor people, when they are not suffering from acute hunger and dangerous cold, are not unhappy than rich people. He has confirmed that “ you can easily find people who are ten times as rich at sixty as they were at twenty; but not one of them will tell you that they are ten times as happy. All the thoughtful ones will assume you that happiness and unhappiness are constitutional, and have nothing to do with money. Money can cure hunger: it cannot cure unhappiness. Food can satisfy the appetite, but not the soul.”¹³

According to Shaw, such poverty all over the world degrades the poor, and infects with its degradation the whole neighborhoods in which they live. He believes that whatever can devalue a neighborhood can also degrade a country and a continent and finally the whole civilized world. The rich cannot avoid or prevent its bad effects. Thus, Shaw as a socialist has stressed that “ we must therefore, take it as an indispensable condition of a sound distribution of a wealth that everyone must have a share sufficient to keep her or him from poverty. This is not altogether new. Ever since the days of Queen Victoria it has been the law of England that nobody must be abandoned to destitution. She said that nobody must die of starvation and exposure.”¹⁴ For Shaw, poverty, shabbiness, and shyness are his three disgraces, would link arms and stand before him in the “ still watches of pessimism, and stare at him and challenge him to throw them off.”¹⁹ This means that he does not believe in materialism as a cure for the society defects but he tries to emphasize the necessity of income equality. As a socialist, Shaw has employed his theatre to be a factory of his thoughts. It is a prompter of conscience, an elucidator of social conduct, an armory against despair and dullness, and a temple of the Assent of man. Shaw throughout the theatre has explained the importance of money and he has realized that it is the basis of all sound and successful personal and national morality, and “every teacher and twaddler who denies this or suppresses it,

Shaw insists, is an enemy of the life.”¹⁶ No one has made clearer than Shaw, the closeness of the bond between life and money. As is known, money is a means of life but should not be the end. Obviously, this issue is the main concern of the Shaw’s plays that are handled in this study.

Shaw’s views have played a prominent role in enriching the theatre with bold ideas and foreshadowing to other writers to say the truth without caring for the consequences. A lot of writers have shown Shaw’s importance in their writings such as C. E. M. Joad, who has affirmed that one of Shaw’s outstanding features, “ that he came to us as the great liberator. Born as we were, into the fag-end of the Victorian era, the process of growing up was, for my generation, like walking down a gallery of lay figures, the figures of the Victorian convention—conventions about families and family life, convention about the respect due to parents, conventions about gentlemanliness and ladylikeness, conventions about patriotism, ... Shaw passed through the ribs of these creatures, the rapiers of his satire and his wit, and, behold, there trickled out some sawdust and a little bran and they bothered us no more.”¹⁷

From both viewpoints (Ibsen’s and Shaw’s) one can deduce that, money is not only an economic necessity but also the means of power and grace. Those who cannot acquire enough of it will be wasting their lives and condemning their souls to utter doom. Whereas those who have it can buy anything even religious organization and political institutions but not at the expense of others. Shaw’s *Major Barbara* is the best example; when the Salvation Army lives in bankruptcy, the manager of it resorts to the wealthy capitalist, Undershaft to rescue. For Shaw, even to derive money from the capitalists is permitted, in condition it accords with the public welfare.

The discrepancy between Ibsen and Shaw in this issue, is Ibsen has dealt with humanity, while Shaw is concerned with the current problems of the day. Ibsen has sought and questioned in his very struggle. Shaw only answers because he knows beforehand all answers and solutions.

Ibsen is tormented by the vision of an ethical superman who could overcome and redeem the old Adam. There is the yeast of a prophet in Ibsen, but this yeast never fermented, he used to say less than he wants to, even less than he ought. This disproportion between actual content and a too cautious expression is unknown to Shaw.¹⁸ Jank Lavrin, a critic, has stated in his book *Studies in European Literature*, that for Ibsen everything was complex; to Shaw everything was simple. Even the greatest problems of life those of god, of Evil-he solved with simplification. Shaw being an active was directed towards external life problems, Ibsen on other hand, concentrated on eternal problem of life which could perhaps be solved only upon a supra-logical or religious plane. "The whole inner tragedy of Ibsen was due to the fact that, endowed with a profound moral instinct, he had no religious instinct".¹⁹

For a part from the differences, which existed, between a comedy and a serious drama, there were certain similarities in the inner constitution of Ibsen and Shaw. Both of them follow no normal ways of thinking and behaving which meant that they are stimulated by protest and by fight against the tide; both are reformers, both are intellectual and both write plays of ideas. In their writings, Ibsen and Shaw dramatize human beings breaking free from restrictions and inhibitions and trying to establish their individuality and freedom. In attempting to achieve these goals, Ibsen's and Shaw's characters find internal opposition in self-interest, self-indulgence, and self-denial. They find at the same time external opposition in the personal and political influences and manipulations of others. They are daring dramatists who dig deep inside their societies' life.

Ibsen concentrates on the individual because without this creature there would be no society and consequently, no history. When an individual protests against the hypocrisy and vulgarity which surround him, it is then that his spiritual and moral qualities, his insight, taste, and sensitivity are brought to the fore. Thus, Ibsen's ideas are considered ethical, but always apolitical. Dr. Stockmann in *An Enemy of the People*, is fighting the majority alone pursuing

the truth. This majority refuses to agree to the complete reconstruction of the municipal baths, which he feels to be so absolutely necessary for the welfare of the sick. The doctor has discovered the compact majority is; the shareholders of the municipal baths, the landlords, the newspapermen, and the townspeople who are under the influence of these three elements and follow them blindly. He would have discovered that the majority against whom he has thundered is not really enemies of progress; rather it is their ignorance and backwardness, which are products of their dependence upon a financially powerful minority. Throughout handling the issue of materialism, Ibsen reveals the real identity of his community.

Ibsen has often been called a pessimist. Indeed he is one. Considering his position, and the seriousness with which he regards the problems that has tormented him. He may become an optimist only if he succeeds in solving the riddle of the sphinx of our time. But this is not destined to do. Ibsen's main concern is humanity and he struggles great deal to unfold the truth in front of the people in order to distinguish between the wrong and right. Being individualist is due to the fact that his ethics could find no outlet in politics. Ibsen has arrived at the individualist point of view not because the strength of his personality, but because of its weakness, which again he has owed to his early social environment. He prefers to be far away from politics. He always asserts the need of individual to find out himself or hers. In fact the individualist Ibsen, like the individualist Shaw, is also a good collectivist, a believer in social, and even socialist organization. Eric Bentley, a critic, has stated that hearing of the young Shaw's lectures on Ibsenism, the Norwegian dramatist commented: "I was surprised that I, who had made it my chief task in life to depict human characters and human destinies, should, without conscious intention, have arrived in several matters at the same conclusions as the social-democratic moral philosophers had arrived at by scientific processes."²⁰ This shows that Ibsen is identical to Shaw, believes in socialism but in his own way.

Shaw being an active is directed towards external life problems; materialistic trends and exploitation are the main concern of them. Ibsen on other hand focuses first of all upon that eternal problem of life. Shaw as a socialist, propagandist for Fabian society, democratic, believes in change and betterment of society. The Fabian Society was formed in 1884, by the group of intellectuals and Shaw joined the society in September 1884, and its executive committee in 1885; resigning from that committee in 1911. Fabianism as defined by the Fabians is the “inevitability of gradualness.” They give a good example for the need of reform and socialism in democratic manner far from violence and revolution. Things must be so timed, “that you bring your horse to the water just as he is feeling in need of drink; not before, when he will refuse to drink and even, under pressure, kick you and bolt; and not after, when he may be dead of thirst.”²¹ This is precisely what we find in capitalist society, where on the hand there is tremendous concentration of wealth while poverty is the lot of the increasing majority. And along with the impoverishment of the masses comes a revolutionary discontent and an increasing understanding of the road to emancipation but in peaceful manner. Generally, there is a price for everything, the price being the fulfilment of conditions. At no time are we entirely free, Shaw the socialist attempts to demonstrate that a person is not free in his conducts. Thus, the capitalists and even ordinary people should subdue to the rules of their society. Shaw has argued that Rousseau was wrong when he said that man was born free. He believes that “even before he is born, man is struggling against, and in the end mutely accepting, conditions for survival in his mother’s womb, just as he accepts, far from mutely, further conditions as soon as he is born. When he is grown sufficiently to be able to think for himself, he still must accept condition; if he refuses, he becomes socially intolerable and is dealt with accordingly. The imposition of conditions by society and their fulfilment by its citizens are the warp and woof which hold society together and enable it to weave its pattern of civilization.”²²

Undoubtedly, when an artist or a writer of one country wishes to influence the inhabitants of other countries, the state of mind of that artist or writer must correspond to the state of mind of his foreign audiences. Being realist dramatists, Ibsen and Shaw are renowned all over the world since they are dealing with universal and contemporary social themes. From this it follows that Ibsen's influence spreads far beyond the boundaries of his native country. His works have characteristics, which correspond, to the state of mind of the reading public of the modern civilized world. These characteristics are Ibsen's individualism and his dislike of majority. Ibsen is a man who believes in minority, and obviously he has treated this idea in his famous play, *An Enemy of the People*, in which he has confirmed that the strongest man in the world that who lives almost alone. The present day popularity of his plays proves the wisdom and modernity of his thinking. Shaw has admired Ibsen's works, he sees the old forms are not suitable for modern ideas. Consequently, he has placed his philosophy and ideas in a structure suit the modern thought. The new subjects that he has treated are not confined to any particular technique but in fact, uses methods suitable to his ideas, regardless of whether or not they are accepted stage conventions.

The two basic links between Ibsen and Shaw are; firstly, both have handled the daring themes including materialism and morality. Secondly, William Archer, a translator of Ibsen's plays, has written as Martin Meisel has stressed "if I were asked to lay my hand on a single English play which was obviously imitated from, or directly influenced by Ibsen, Mr. Bernard Shaw was, of course, in some sense his disciple; but as for imitating him- well, I can only say I wish he had. But of indirect and what may be called pervasive influence, Ibsen had more, perhaps, than any other European writer since the time of Byron."²³ Shaw has become deeply involved at that time in the controversy over Ibsen, whose plays Archer, as translator, is instrumental in bringing to the London theatre. The work of the great Norwegian dramatist has

aroused Shaw's enthusiasm, and Ibsen's drama soon becomes a shaping influence on his thinking and writing. Though Ibsen is not a propagandist for socialism, Shaw has brought Ibsen's social thought to the attention of his fellow Fabians. He has agreed with the Norwegian's view of the New Woman and the failure of modern marriage that is cut by materialistic trends of either the husband or wife. Shaw has put great stress on Ibsen's concept of moral freedom for both men and women: " what Ibsen insists on is that there is no golden rule, that conduct must justify itself by its effect upon happiness and not by its conformity to any rule or ideal."²⁴

Generally speaking, Ibsen's plays gradually gain approval in England despite the opposition of the prudish people. Society's criticism of Ibsen is raised to a fever pitch at this point. But the society itself has lost its control over the mass of people, most of them do not live in the delicate mode of the Victorian Gentleman. They want to see Ibsen's plays because he shows what so many of them already know to be the reality. Nothing is considered more sacred than the bond of marriage, and to portray in such a way is completely unacceptable, particularly in *A Doll's House*. In *An Enemy of the People*, the Victorian belief is that the community is a noble institution and could be trusted, a fiction Ibsen has challenged. It is obvious to the reader that disaster is in store for the town as well as for the doctor, due to the community's unwillingness to face reality.

Curiosity is one of the chief traits of Shaw's personality; nothing human is alien to him. He does not cease hungering and thirsting after knowledge until he is near death. Shaw may be influenced by the Irish proverb; thirst after the drink and sorrow after the money. Being socialist, he believes in the equal distribution of wealth and in equality of income from birth to death. As a Fabian he believes that " a revolution that would come about by gradual change through the use of ballots, not bullets."²⁵ Thus, he has gained world fame as the influential Ibsen has. Both Ibsen and Shaw have considered the theatre as a place of illuminating people by their rational and reasonable ideas. They believe

that drama has its deeper effects upon people to create a sense of belief in change to better life and development. Violence and revolution would cause destruction and starvation instead of prosperity and happiness. With this in mind, they convince people to believe in change but in peaceful and sophisticated ways. Their plays appeal to the audiences' minds rather than to their hearts. The theatres they use become the places of thinking instead of entertainment.

NOTES

- 1- J. L. Styan, *Modern Drama in Theory and Practice, Realism and Naturalism*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), I, 18.
- 2- <http://www.planetpapers.com/Asset> Retrieved from the internet on 24-10-2006 p.2 of 4.
- 3- James Walter Mcfarlane, *Ibsen and the Temper of Norwegian Literature* (London: Oxford University press, 1960), p. 58.
- 4- Maurice Colbourne, *The Real Bernard Shaw*. (London: J. M. Dent and Sons Ltd., 1949), p.86.
- 5- Bernard F. Dukore, *Money and Politics in Ibsen, Shaw, and Brecht*. (Columbia: University of Missouri press, 1980) p.160
- ⁶ Janko Lavrin, *Studies in European Literature*. (London: Constable & co. Ltd., 1929), p.80.
- 7- Allardyce Nicoll, *British Drama, An Historical Survey From the Beginning to the Present Time*. (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company Publishers. 1925), p.342
- 8- C. E. M. (ed.) *Shaw And Society*. (London: Odhams Press Limited, 1951), p. 251.
- 9- Bernard Shaw, *The Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism, Capitalism, Sovietism, and Fascism*. (London: Penguin Books, Ltd., Harmondsworth, Middlesex, 1965), p. 78.

- 10- Bernard Shaw, *Complete Plays With Prefaces* (New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1963)I, 305
- 11- Ibid., p. 312
- 12- Shawky El-Soukary, *Major Barbara*.(Cairo: The Anglo-Egyptian Bookshop, 165, Mohamed Farid Street, n.d) p.xxiv
- 13- Bernard Shaw, *The Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism, Capitalism, Sovietism and Fascism*.pp.74--75
- 14- Ibid., p. 77
- ¹⁵⁻ Maurice Colbourne, *The Real Bernard Shaw* p. 67
- 16- Ibid., p. 284.
- ¹⁷⁻ [http:// chuma-cas-usf-edu/dietrich/britishdramaI-htm](http://chuma-cas-usf-edu/dietrich/britishdramaI-htm).
- 18- Janko Lavrin, *Studies in European Literature*.(London: Constable and Company Ltd., 1929), p.85
- 19- Ibid., p. 86
- 20- Eric Bentley, *The Playwright as a Thinker* (New York: Meridian Books, The World Publishing Company, 1964), p. 101.
- 21- Maurice Colbourne, *The Real Bernard Shaw*. p. 297.
- 22- Ibid., p. 284.
- 23- Martin Meisel, *Shaw and the Nineteenth Century Theatre*. (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1963), p. 85.
- 24-Eldon C. Hill, *George Bernard Shaw*. (Boston: Twayne Publishers, G. K. Hall & Co., 1978), p. 39.
- 25- Ibid., p.23.

Bibliography

- Bentry, Eric. *The Playwright as a Thinker* .New York: Meridian Books, The World Publishing Company,1964.
- Colbourne, Maurice. *The Real Bernard Shaw*. London: J.M .Dent and Sons Ltd.,1949.

Dukore, Bernard F. Money and Politics in Ibsen, Shaw and Brecht. Columbia: University of Missouri Press,1980.

El-Soukary, Shawky .Major Barbara. Cairo: The Anglo-Egyptian Bookshop,165Mohamed Farid St. ,n.d.

Hill, Eldon. George Bernard Shaw. Boston: Twayne Publishers, G.K. Hall &Co.1978.

<http://chuma-cas/british> drama-htm

<http://www.planet> papers.com

Lavrin, Janko. Studies in European Literature. London: Constable &Co. Ltd.1929.

M,C.E.(ed) Shaw and Society. London: Odhams Press Limited,1951.

Mcfarlane, James Walter, Ibsen and the Temper of Norwegian Literature. London: Oxford University Press,1960.

Meisel ,Martin. Shaw and the Nineteen Century Theatre .New Jersey: Princeton University Press,1963.

Nicoll, Allardyce, British Drama. New York: Thomas Y.Company,1925.

Shaw. Bernard, Complete Plays with Prefaces. New York: Dodd Mead Company,1963.

-----,The Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism, Capitalism and Fascism. London: Penguin Books Ltd.1965.

Styan , J. L. Modern Drama in Theory and Practice, Realism and Naturalism. Cambridge University press ,1988.