Chapter IV:

Professional Evil,

*Pygmalion*

and

*The Doctor's Dilemma*
Section One: *Pygmalion* (1912-13)

*Pygmalion* looks like a misnomer. Shaw takes its title from the Greek myth, of a sculptor named Pygmalion who fell in love with a statue of his own making, which represented the beautiful goddess Galatea. Shaw makes use of this classical myth in his drama. The statue has been so skillfully and cleverly prepared that it is considered Pygmalion's beloved masterpiece. The myth shows that the statue is brought to life with the help of Aphrodite. Shaw's *Pygmalion* seems to be identical with this classical myth, for it tells of something similar to it. The myth shows how an artist creates the image of a beautiful girl in the shape of a statue and how he falls in love with it despite the fact that he hates women. The statue symbolizes the perfection and the idealism whereas man's love for the piece of marble reveals the flaw of man’s disability to grasp reality. Throughout the employment of this classical reference Shaw manages to give details about, and at the same time criticizes life in general, and the social barriers in particular. Besides, Shaw sheds some significant light on human weakness and moral values and principles. The contrast between man's attitudes towards values and women has been obviously unfolded throughout the entire play. Social relationships and human nature, with all its manifestations have not been overlooked by the dramatist.

*Pygmalion* derives its name from the famous story in Ovid’s Metamorphoses, in which Pygmalion revolted against the shameful lives of the women of his time and decided to live alone and unmarried. Then he created a beautiful statue, the more he looked at her, the more he falls in love with her, until she becomes alive by the help of Aphrodite. Although the play dramatizes the Greek
myth, Shaw ignored the original theme which is love and beauty, and turned a girl of slums into a woman of stylish society by giving her only some lessons in phonetics. The beginning of the play shows that “phonetics is a hint to class distinction; generally it deals with the English language.”

Shaw sees that this play is “a didactic drama focusing on the power of phonetics and the stupidity of modern social attitudes.” According to the bet between the protagonists of the play, Higgins, a professor of phonetics and spoiled eccentric, and his friend, Colonel Pickering, Higgins promises that he has the ability to change Eliza, a cockney flower girl into a lady within three months, and to achieve that he must educate her. Colonel Pickering has just returned from India where he has been studying speech patterns of the natives. He is different from Higgins, as he is a gentleman and treats all the people with respect. He really does not believe that Higgins and science can create a duchess from a flower girl. Eliza before her accepting this transformation said:

We were above that in convents Garden....... I sold flowers. I didn’t sell myself. Now you made a lady of me; I am not fit to sell anything else. I am a good girl, I am. 

To win the bet, Higgins does all his best to train Eliza how to behave like a duchess and how to speak well in conventional regular pronunciation.

The story of Pygmalion centers around three main characters: Eliza Doolittle, Professor Henry Higgins, and Colonel Pickering. Eliza is very sensitive and emotional girl, her qualities are unlike Higgins who is arrogant and his mind is preoccupied with only phonetics. In his life, there is no place for women, as he is very
much obsessed with the language. Colonel Pickering is from India, a gentleman and also expert in language. On contrary to Higgins, he treats Eliza with respect.

The play is about transformation. Higgins believes by his extraordinary skill he can transform a flower girl, Eliza, into a duchess. Eliza is the heroine of the play, to change her becomes a challenge to his professional pride. Within six months, this flower girl with the help of Higgins, who trains her has been miraculously transformed into a person of high significance—a lady. Because the flower girl looks so hopeless, she attracts his attention and thus he decides to choose her for his inspired experience of creating something significant out of the insignificant, a poor and dirty girl. He considers his achievement and experience a great professional and scientific success. This is the reason for him to live in an imaginative and ideal world. As a matter of fact, he has accepted to perform this experience in order to preserve his spiritual integrity, forgetting and ignoring the actual life with all its horrors and evil practices.

Hypocrisy, stupidity, and snobbery are dominant forces in social life, which are dreadful as Higgins discovers; and for him civilization is only a mask behind it: “we're all savages, more or less. To express what we really think would break up the whole show.” He is well-educated, but his views are against conservative society. For him, any reconciliation with social conventions is considered a treachery against his honesty. He regards these conventions as a prison that enchains man's will and threatens his intellect. In Pygmalion, it is something amazing that a flower girl is changed into a duchess and this creation means the creation of a
new character that displays all signs of new manners, new outlook to life, new speech, and new awareness of the world. To create a new character means destruction of the old one. In other words, to create a duchess Higgins has to kill the flower girl.

The story of this play is about the triumph of Professor Higgins in teaching Eliza Doolittle, a Cockney flower girl and slum dweller, to speak and behave like a lady. It is meant basically to satirize the class system. For Shaw even class discrimination is an evil in itself. This also involves issues of women’s self-reliance and absolute independence. Shaw wants to point out that it is not just the difference between the rich and the poor, but it is the superficial difference of education and social training, also the desire of the poor to be like the rich in manners. To convert Eliza into a lady means to make her independent,

since a lady is as much a slave of upper-class convention as the flower girl is a slave of poverty; both of them being mechanical wind up dolls full of automatic responses to social stimuli.  

According to the myth, Pygmalion created a female statue that came to life and responded to him, this is the essence of the self-fulfilling prophecy; in reality as Robert Rosenthal described in his report the case in which a researcher told the teachers that only the students of high potential could acknowledge the hard program, whereas those of low potential could not. The result is that only those of high potential can gain benefits. Another report explores:

the limits of self-fulfilling prophecy, emphasizing that if one cannot imagine a statue coming alive, he can affect level of act by the level of expectations.  

Shaw wants to connect both the myth of Pygmalion and the fairy tale of Cinderella. In the myth, Pygmalion is a sculptor who after creating the statue of a perfect woman, falls in love with her, that is Galatea, then he begs Aphrodite to give her life and then marries her. The Cinderella story also involves the changing of a young girl into a new one, that is much better than the reward of marrying a prince. Eliza is then a modern Cinderella as she suffers because of her stepmother, her drunkard father, Mrs. Pearce the housekeeper and discourteous Prof. Higgins. Eliza in her serious dilemma decides to leave the house of Prof. Higgins. She meets Freedy outside the house who saves her and gives her emotional support. Although Freedy is not impressive, they happily marry. The modern Cinderella, Eliza with the financial help of Pickering opens a flower shop.

Shaw's play has made the point that a modern Galatea would not come alive until she decides to be by herself and not be the society doll. He concentrates on the quality of change, as a Fabian devoted to the alteration of England through education; he asks how can socialist movement bring about change as he is not satisfied by what he sees. He seeks a profound change, like the change of nature or character that Eliza finally undergoes, not just a social transformation. The social change is very significant and essential but it might be a change on the surface level just as in the case of Eliza's father. The change must infiltrate into deeper layers and include the way of thinking. When Eliza attends the ambassador party as a duchess the aristocracy is fooled by her artificial new look. Both Higgins and Eliza have the ability to deceive those who live in a world of appearances, where the
relations between people are superficial and nobody has the chance to remove the mask and discover the reality behind it. This also unfolds one important fact about the rich; that is, they can easily be deceived by false appearances.

Higgins regards Eliza as a non-living entity, commenting, “The girl does not belong to anybody, is no use to anybody but me,” as if she were a piece of property rather than a human being a slave whom he has bought for five pounds which are paid to her father. He tells her, “no use slaving for me and then saying you want to be cared for: who cares for a slave?” These words hurt her and make Eliza yearn for her previous days when she was a flower girl, although now she is a duchess, she feels that she is a slave as she has already lost her freedom. She bitterly blames Higgins for changing her into a false duchess: “why didn't you leave me where you picked me? I am a slave now, for all my fine clothes.” Despite her new condition, she decides to flee from his house, refusing to come back again because she does not want to be treated as a slave any more. Higgins is like Satan who gives Eve a chocolate, the symbol of temptation taken from the fruit dish which refers to ‘the tree of knowledge.’ His ill-treatment causes Eliza to lose her soul which is more important for him than her face or voice. All these make her accuse him of being a devil.

Norbert F. O' Donnell makes some general observations and criticizes the social aspects presented in *Pygmalion*, commenting that the play is a struggle between human vitality and the artificial system of middle class normality. The insecurities of life in the modern society build the structure of this system of bargains. By overcoming her doubts and fears, Eliza gets vitality and courage to
face life, but at the same time she has imprisoned herself in the middle class system as she seeks marriage, which is a social convention. Here Shaw does not end the play with marriage of Eliza and Higgins, which is contrary to what the audience may have anticipated. Although the natural solution to Eliza’s problem, is marriage with Higgins which does not happen and the problem remains unsolved. Shaw has not provided solution to Eliza’s problem. After the experiment on Eliza is complete, Higgins starts to neglect her. Both Higgins and Pickering suggest that Eliza has to marry Freedy. Now she herself must find solution for her problem. In an attempt to illustrate what a comedy provides and how it functions Northrop Frye believes that it is “designed not to condemn evil but to ridicule a lack of self knowledge.”

Eric Bentley observes that “to condemn evil would be direct, un ironic, and therefore uncomic.” In this play, we cannot find evil in the form of human wickedness, but the lack of self knowledge which is the main source of the problem, and confusion is the form of evil. Though Higgins is intellectual, he is snobbish and brute; he uses his language as a weapon of class war and suppression of woman. Shaw is a great social rebel and reformer; he has converted the English theatre from being a place of enjoyment into an important influence on moral actions, monetary situation, and literary admiration. According to him, art has a purpose, he does not believe in art for art's sake. His plays are very important as they are considered a medium of his ideas. His aim is to reveal the defects of the society from an insider's point of view.

The problem play is a new form of drama, called thesis play, discussion play and comedy of ideas. It originated in the
nineteenth century in France. Henrik Ibsen, practiced it effectively. Henry Arthur and A. W. Pinero introduced the problem play into England at the end of nineteenth century, whereas Shaw and Galworthy flourished it in the twentieth century. The problem play is a drama concerned with a specific problem which generally has sociological nature, such as prostitution, suffering of the workers, and unemployment. In this type of drama, many problems are presented but without solutions. The writer’s duty is just to provoke the readers. *Pygmalion* is a problem play; the most important problem that Shaw sheds light upon, is education. Eliza’s education is torment for her and also for Prof. Higgins, but both of them triumph over it. Within six months, Eliza at the ambassador party can pass off as a princess not only as a duchess. By education she becomes a lady, and she has been lifted out of her social environment. But this transformation creates problems for her as she cannot return to her past environment and sell flowers, and at the same time, she does not belong to the middle class to which her education has raised.

*Pygmalion* deals with the problem of education as a central theme focusing on women’s education, their status in labour and in society. Although Shaw cannot be seen as an absolute fighter for the rights of women, he tried to encourage the people to change their old social and economic values. Education seemed to be a vital aspect for him to induce such changes. Thus the story of this play forces the readers mind to think about what education really means. He was more interested in the ills of London society, particularly the unequal distribution of wealth, the inherent unfairness of the class system, and the domination of society by man. Eliza's life is miserable as she has to work very hard
to earn her living. The conflict of *Pygmalion* is basically the undertaking of teaching Eliza to rise in society. This conflict is most obvious humor in the play; the audience can relate to the use of slang and improper English in their own speech causing Eliza's mistakes to be funny. Shaw uses the conflict between Eliza and Higgins to express his own thoughts to the people.

Now she faces the problem of loss of her identity and isolation; search for belonging in the new social environment. Her seeking of new social identity and her loss of former identity makes her feel desperate and sad. She needs a sense of belonging in order to achieve happiness which is very necessary. Prof. Higgins has made her a ‘new woman’. She now desires for a better life. By her education, she also acquires aspiration and ambitions about her future life, seeking emotional fulfillment as the experiment is over. After the experimental was over, Prof. Higgins, however, failed to realize the change which she had undergone. Eliza for him was only a talking machine. He did not take in trust in her as a living woman. He only made an experiment with her and he thought that he was successful. Higgins and Pickering start to ignore her, she poignantly asks: “What I am fit for? What have you left me fit for? Where am I to go? What am I to do? What to become of me?”

She expresses her depression and frustration by throwing slippers on Higgins face. She gives back the jewels and leaves the house. She decides to work out her own solution and to make place for herself in the society.

According to A. C. Ward, the problem of education is very important in the world; to educate means to give new life. A teacher who drives away ignorance and educates his student then
leaves him alone, to find a new way of life, is left in the lurch. It is not easy for the student to deal with the new mode of life. The education leads to individual and social turbulence as Eliza complains:

You never thought of the trouble it would make for me? To which Prof. Higgins replies Would the world ever have been made if its maker had been afraid of making trouble? Making life means making trouble?  

Along with this, Shaw has also presented the various dialects of English language as spoken by English people of different localities. In the play Prof. Higgins says, “A woman who utters such depressing and disgusting sounds has no right to live.” Shaw accuses the English spelling and demands new alphabet with phonetic system that offers symbols for each spoken word. He feels that the unity of language will end the class distinction and make the society classless. Through this play, Shaw highlights the problem of education and the problem and difficulty of pronunciation because there is no one to one correspondence between the spoken and the written form in the English language. He does not provide any solution to the questions raised in the play and leaves the people to ponder over it.

In the history of English drama, Shaw occupies a second position after Shakespeare. He is one of the most unusual and multifaceted personality who builds his own theatre of ideas. No doubt, all his plays give the impression of artistic influence, working in spontaneous unity. Archibald Henderson states that, “Shaw is a social thinker and ethical teacher, a philosopher
concerned for unities and universal objects of life which are so rare and prophetic.”

This play is an attack on the British class system, especially that aspect which is relevant to the condition of woman. Throughout the presentation of Eliza among both social classes, the poor, when she is a flower girl, and the rich, when she is a duchess, Shaw reveals the reality of society with all its defects and weaknesses, and at the same time he implicitly presents a clear picture of society that illustrates its conflicting ideals. After having been transformed into a duchess, Eliza must be treated as a human being and not as a slave, or a slipper fetcher trod upon as dirt, or abused in bad language by a man with uncontrolled temper. The most important difference between a flower girl and a duchess is “not how she behaves but how she is treated.” The reality of her life is poverty, she has no family, only an irresponsible father who has never cared for her; his aim is only how to gain money and that is why he sells his daughter to Higgins in only five pounds.

Mrs. Higgins gives Eliza money to find out how she knew her son’s name, shows the mother’s fear that her son might be associating with the wrong sort. This act evokes a society whose members have rigid relations with one another. Her son, Higgins treats people like objects and not, like human beings; this shows the emptiness of higher English society. He even talks about Eliza as a guinea pig, which injured her feelings. The act of throwing her slippers on Higgins’ face complaining that she means no more to him than his slippers she bursts out, saying; “You don’t care. I know you don’t care. You wouldn’t care if I was dead. I’m nothing to you...not so much as these slippers.” From this experiment the most important
thing she knows is not how to dress well, or learning the vowels, and the consonants, but the self-respect which is something authentic which do not hinder the growth of an independent spirit. John Ervine comments on her as follows:

It was not a course of phonetics which made Eliza display good manners in a world which was not a social and intellectual slum, but an inward grace which, like a seed hidden in the soil, germinates only when the conditions are right.¹⁸

In this play, Shaw indirectly pleads for the abolition of class distinction, by making the poor rise in society. He gives a chance to Eliza to improve herself by opening a flower shop and marrying a gentle husband Freedy.

In _Pygmalion_ Shaw creates the heroine, Eliza places her in middle-class society and makes her revolt against the conservative community. She is a simple, dirty, crude and rough girl, Higgins accepted the challenge to transform her into a lady. Higgins teaches her for a period of six months. She begins to speak excellent English with a fine accent. Nobody can recognize her as an ordinary girl. Shaw criticizes the structure of society, which he calls the capitalistic, as it is divided into classes, especially the rich represented by Higgins, the professor and his friend, the colonel, and the poor represented by Eliza and her father. According to his socialist doctrine, “the crime of poverty can be abolished and national capital can be equally distributed; these can be achieved only when we get rid of class discrimination.”¹⁹ At the beginning of the play, we find that Eliza is an illiterate and ignorant girl who sells flowers at convent garden and speaks the kind of cockney which no one can understand it except the native people. Here,
Shaw not only criticizes Eliza but the whole English community who speak English, he remarks: “The English have no respect for their language, and will not teach the children to speak.”

Although the process of Eliza’s education in phonetics is difficult but it gives her self-realization. For her it is brutal suffering but she has enough courage, aptitude and determination to face and overcome the ordeal. With the progress of her education, she realizes that the difference between herself and the flower girl is not how she behaves in the society but how the people treat her. She becomes a duchess in the eyes of others, except Higgins. In Act III of the play, Eliza’s progress in her education is tested when she goes to Mrs. Higgins’s home; she is dressed and behaves like a lady that makes Higgins tell his mother that she talks English almost as you talk French. Eliza is a talented student and has the ability to speak fluently and correctly like a high born lady.

In Pygmalion, Higgins refuses to understand that his ‘Galatea’ is a living person. He considers her as a material that he used to work on, a stupid creature that has no ability to understand his high conversation. Even when she behaves well in the embassy party, he never praises her; this shows clearly the difference between the classes in British society. Although she has changed, she still remains in his eyes an ordinary girl. The class distinctions should be eliminated according to Shaw’s socialist ideas.

Shaw clarifies the relationship between money and the social problem, including various social classes; poor and rich, it must be noted that money is considered the most important thing in a capitalistic society. Eliza's father, Mr. Doolittle, expresses the
importance of money especially for the capitalistic people, he observes:

When I was a poor man and had a solicitor once when they found a prom in the dust cart, he got me of, and got shot of me and got me a shot of him as quick as he could. Same with the doctors: used to choose me out of the hospital before I could hardly stand on my legs, and nothing to pay. Now they find out that I'm not a healthy man and can live unless they look after me twice.²¹

Shaw in an objective manner tackles some of the capitalistic features which are dangerous and destructive to man's body and soul. He not only depends on his own observations concerning the social life of contemporary capitalistic society but also the observations of other people in this regard. Money in this play permeates everything since it is considered the most important in a capitalistic society. Shaw's characters, especially the poor ones, are capable of changing their class in one way or another. The degree of their independence depends on how much money they can get. He is against woman’s dependence on man because it destroys the aim of the life force. For him, though poor woman is not good, she tries hard to be better than rich man in order to ensure economic independence. This play serves an important purpose; it preaches the importance of woman’s education and her right to be independent human being. Eliza seeks social and economic promotion. She realizes that knowledge is the key to all the glories in life, but also a bitter fruit, and reality is sometimes very difficult to deal with. From her experience, she emerges a more mature girl. With her self-knowledge she gains self-confidence.
Eliza and her father in spite of being poor manage to change their social class, Bernard F. Dukore in this respect observes:

For Eliza, the ability to earn more money promises to give her more independence. For her father, however, whose social class also changes between the beginning and the end of the play, a small amount of money creates independent spirit, whereas, a large sum of money saps that spirit's independence.22

*Pygmalion* is not merely a play about how an artist or a skilful person can create something great out of something trivial. In other words Shaw goes beyond the idea that Higgins manages to create a superior lady out of an inferior one that is a flower girl. Shaw tackles, throughout the episode of the girl, significant issues that not only touch the characters in the play but also mankind. Among the important issue dealt with, in the play is the question of survival. What makes man survive on the earth is money as it is indicated in the dealings of the characters in the play. Money in society can be obtained by many and various means, of which some are like teaching phonetics, selling flowers, borrowing, or selling one's body and soul to the devil.

Money in *Pygmalion* appears to be a major factor with which characters are very much concerned, for man cannot move without money and survive in this world. Many contemporary dramatists have allotted much importance to money as an essential ingredient for survival. For instance, Torvald Helmer in Ibsen's *A Doll’s House* was at the edge of death a few years before the play began, and therefore the lack of money meant non survival. In Brecht's *Mother Courage and her Children*, male and female bodies and souls, food, military supplies and the like are sold for the sake of money, which
means for the sake of survival. Bernard F. Dukore thinks that the three plays written by three dramatists already mentioned deal with the question of survival and at the same time they are linked to the question of dependence upon money and the independence from it. He puts it in the following passage:

In these plays, Ibsen, Shaw, and Brecht link money the question of survival, and they employ it to the subject of independence. In *A Doll's House*, money is part of the atmosphere of the house, its need and its permeations in society create the conflict that inform the play. It sustains or fails to sustain the home, a social institution suggested by the title. Dependence upon money creates questions about independence from it as well as from individuals and social conceptions of which it is a part. In *Pygmalion*, money means survival, and more of it a means to higher status, which characters try to search and maintain.23

In the play there are only two characters who represent the middle class, a nurse and a maid. The other characters are either very rich or very poor, to furnish the social ambience of the play, the garbage collector and the flower girl on the one hand, or the wealthy colonel and society matron on the other. The atmosphere and environment of the play is one of upper-middle-class society. Higgins treats Eliza as an object, a ‘live doll’ or like ‘a lost umbrella.’ This remark can be confirmed by Higgins's attitude and behavior towards Eliza. In this regard Higgins is identical with the mythical Pygmalion who made a statue or a large doll as it might be sometimes called. The statue of the myth turned to be perceived as a living woman. To recall the story how Higgins decided to create a lady out of a flower girl, it is revealed in the play that Higgins had a very high opinion of himself and said that he will
create "this thing," but later he says he has already created a woman.

It is worth mentioning that both Shaw and Ibsen in *Pygmalion* and *A Doll's House* respectively deal with the themes of survival and independence. In both plays woman is treated as if she were an object that is dependent on others in the same way as a slave depends upon his master. But Shaw goes deeper than this and projects the individual as one yearning for changing his/her social status as is the case with Eliza and her father who both try to sell themselves for the sake of survival, independence, and to change their social status. It is vividly clarified by Bernard F. Dukore in the following words:

But Shaw's major concerns include the impermanence the class system, a bastion of capitalist society, and fact that members of the lower classes can both change their classes and have them changed by others. He therefore treats these themes more explicitly than Ibsen does.... In their initial appearances, the lower-class daughter and her lower-class father try to sell. "How much" does each require for independence? As the play demonstrates, the relationship between money and independence differs for each.  

It must be noted that Shaw in *Pygmalion* makes money central to every Act and Scene because, as shown in the play, it is something crucial and fundamental to the continuity and survival of man in a capitalistic society. Money as displayed in the play touches every minute detail of man's daily life. The individual cannot satisfy his/her needs without the adequate amount of money necessary to keep his/her body and soul together besides good living and lodging. Therefore, in a capitalistic society as this,
the individual has to endeavor to find out the best source of money for the above-mentioned reasons. Both Higgins and Pickering can afford to live where they please, they tell Eliza that she can live where she likes. In this respect, Sarcastic Bystander says, ‘Park Lane, for instance.’ Bernard F. Dukore comments on the crucial aspect of money in a capitalistic society he observes:

Since money is a crucial aspect of capitalistic society, it is a crucial element of every act in this play. In the act, which represents a spectrum of society and which lays the ground work for the remainder of the play, it is part of every scene.25

Higgins's job is to teach phonetics. Being an individual living in a capitalistic environment, he is quite aware of the socioeconomic factors of his profession. That is, he knows very well how the new capitalists rose from the lower-class society and succeeded to move to a social class that was higher than their previous one, betrayed or acted deceitfully against their origins, and thus his profession as a teacher of phonetics is very profitable. In this connection the Sarcastic Bystander's remark can be recalled—‘Men begin in Kentish Town with 80 [pounds] a year, and end in Park Lane.’ Thus in a capitalistic society the individual is greatly concerned with collecting money for the sake of changing his/her social status and living a better life. In such a society respectability is always measured against how much money one possesses.

Another problem presented in the play is the predicament of Alfred Doolittle, Eliza’s father. He was a poor dustman who was addicted to drinking. He was contend with his life, society, considered him as an undeserving poor and did nothing for him. Mrs. Ezra D. Wannafeller, founder of Moral Reform Society
engages Doolittle with good amount of money which makes him rich. As a rich man he has to be associated with middle class morality and separate himself from his former class of dustman. Now he must get new social identity and sense of belonging to a higher class. He expresses his problem:

Who asked him to make gentleman of me? I was happy. I was free I touched pretty nigh everybody money when I wanted it, same as I touched you Higgins. I am warranted, and everybody touches me for money. 26

The middle class morality obliges him to marry his mistress which makes him give up his happiness, at the same time he cannot refuse the money, as it will help him to live happily. So he decides to accept the morals of middle class, though he would lose all his contentment.

Alfred Doolittle in Pygmalion narrates some aspects of his life that are illustrative of one bitter fact about the capitalistic environment in which money is considered very important and it is the measure of how much respectable the individual is. He says that he was badly treated by people when he was poor, but now he is treated very kindly and cared for simply because he is rich:

Doolittle...When I was a poor man and had a solicitor once when they found a prom in the dust cart, he got me of, and got shot of me and got me shot of him as quick as he could. Same with doctors used to choose me out of the hospital before I could hardly stand on my legs, and nothing to pay. Now they that I'm not a healthy man and can't live unless they look after me twice a day. In the house I'm not let do a hand's turn for myself: somebody else must do it and touch me for it.27
Through Doolittle, Shaw has expressed the futility and emptiness of environmental morals. Shaw has shown the unhappiness and melancholy of Doolittle for leaving his social environment due to his sudden wealth. He is deprived person and drunker, who can hardly distinguish between what is right and what is wrong. He is an irresponsible father; he goes to Higgins not to ask about his daughter's wellbeing but to take money from him because this is his only profession. He does not marry his mistress because he thinks that after marrying she will dominate him. Doolittle is a spokesman of Shaw’s conservative view. Through him, Shaw reveals the injustice and stupidity of unconventional principles of morality. He stresses that the wealth of society should be distributed among its members as they deserve. Doolittle says that he always needs the help but no one assists him, he may not deserve; but true morality means that society should offer him an appropriate work that will make him respectable, honest, and useful member in society. The reality is that nothing of this sort is done and he becomes more undeserving. By the sudden gaining of wealth, Doolittle loses his social identity and gets rid of slum by Prof. Higgins, who once mentioned him as, “The most honest original moralist at present in England”. Despite of gaining large inheritance, Doolittle remains antagonistic to middle class morality, feeling that it will crush his life; his new social condition frightened him. He is unhappy and disconsolate because he is alienated from his earlier social environment. To confirm such a faith, he dresses well as a bridegroom and goes to Church to marry his mistress.

Although Doolittle appears only two times in the play, he is vital and a comic character. Through his characterization, Shaw makes fun of middle class morality. He says that he feels sad because of the sudden
acquisition of wealth. Shaw makes a comparison between those who
did little work but did it honestly and those who did equally little but
become rich because they have undeserved incomes. To share the large
dividing line in the world is not between poor and rich nor between
socialist and capitalist; it is between those who did some hard labor in
the world and those who did little or nothing. Through Doolittle, Shaw
criticizes the economic and social moralities. Becoming suddenly a rich
man, Doolittle a dustman, is changed into a lion of London city. The
play sees this as a romantic story but the reality is that this simple
man is changed into a victim of bourgeoisie’s morality.

Doolittle: Done to me? Ruined me destroyed my
happiness, leave me up and delivered me into a hand of
middle class morality……I will have to learn to speak
middle class language from you instead of speaking
proper English.28

Higgins makes it clear to Eliza that money and changing from
one class to another are closely connected to speech. He has taught the
nouveux riches, those people who have already become rich and are
ostentatious. Higgins boasts of his ability of teaching the flower girl
better English, which will enable her to have more money through a job
and social status higher than, what she really has at present. Thus, his
boast and his efforts to fulfill his project turn to be right. After Eliza
completes her education, she will not only become a lady but her soul
will also awaken. She acquires self-confidence and searches for identity
and belonging which is the most important problem she has faced after
the experiment of Higgins is successfully completed. Shaw always
presents serious thoughts, issue or social problem and obliges his
readers to think on them. He observed; “I write plays with the
deliberated object of converting the nation to my opinion…..I have no
other intention to write plays.” 29
Higgins as a mouthpiece of Shaw illustrates the truth that speech which varies according to locality is a great obstacle in social classes. The difference between flower girl and duchess is greater than the difference between the sounds they utter while they are speaking. If a flower girl can be changed into a duchess within six months, the only thing that distinguishes her from a duchess is hereditary, social stature and money none of them she has earned. This message clarifies that every flower girl can be made a duchess by suitable encouragement and aptitude.

Shaw is anti-romantic. Although the transformation of the dirty flower girl into a charming lady is romantic, but Pygmalion cannot be considered as a romantic play, for the hero and the heroine do not fall in love and do not marry at the end. Rather the heroine leaves the house and the hero is not at all a lover, he is like a scientist, and all his concerns are to achieve success in his experiment. Shaw makes Eliza marry Freedy an impoverished but devoted man. The play ends with such an unconventional ending. Pygmalion is regarded to be a highly critical Shavian drama. This ending is one of Shaw’s least successful pieces of writing as he did not give Pygmalion a happy ending. Through this determination to make his romance unromantic, Shaw twisted this play from what would have been expected by the standards of drama and made its ending real. Thus Pygmalion is not a romance, according to A. C. Ward:

Pygmalion is not a romance as it rightly could have been called if Higgins and Eliza had fallen in love and married. It is problem play. Every teacher who sets out to fight ignorance......But the element of romance is provided by the creation of Eliza into a
entirely new creation and the Eliza and Freedy love story.\textsuperscript{30}

Though Shaw uses the term ‘Romance’ to tell a story of legendary, it does not include love affair. Unlike Pygmalion, Higgins has no desire to keep a perfect woman for himself. Also unlike Galatea, Eliza does not choose to share love with her renovator, on the contrary, she shows her independence and declares that she will marry Freedy the man who loves her as soon as she can support him. The tragic flaw of Higgins is that he is just like all of Shaw’s heroes, he is not a gentleman. He is very unconcerned about other's feelings and desires. He is self-centered. He is cultured and dazzling but lacks good manners, believing himself to be superior and treats people arrogantly:

\begin{quote}
Higgins: I find that the moment I let myself make friend with women, I become selfish and tyrannical. Women upset everything, when you let them into your life, you find that the women is driving at one way and you driving to another.\textsuperscript{31}
\end{quote}

At the end of the play both, Higgins and Eliza continue their respective ways of opposites. Higgins' is to better the world through himself, whereas Eliza's purpose is to better herself through the world.

In Victorian England, women were sold; here Eliza is sold by her father to Higgins as if she is his property. This shows that inequality between two sexes is greater than between the classes. It is through independence Eliza has earned her own money as a flower girl, she has molded herself into such a strong woman that she is, able to say what she wants. This independence is taken from her when she becomes Higgins' experiment. Although she has gained many luxuries, she loses her freedom. For that reason, she refuses to be bought and sold, insisting to fight for her survival. Shaw sympathizes with Eliza who
fights to preserve her humanity in the face of Higgins's disgusting use of her as raw material for his experiment. During that time, the belief prevailed that only a man can turn a woman into a lady. This is illustrated in Eliza's helplessness and in the way Higgins treats her and his suggestion that she should marry. She is in a critical situation and has to decide between marrying and going out to work. This reflects the contemporary beliefs that it is undignified for woman to earn her living. Eliza starts to rebel against Higgins by throwing the slippers at him. This can be considered as a way of release to other ladies. In those days, Eliza's behavior might stand for women who were struggling for their rights. That was the time when women were trying to get rid of the Victorian ideals of womanhood and were seeking the right to vote. Here we can see women fighting for their independence. One can say that Shaw's criticism and ideas are expressed in Eliza who becomes independent and self-confident woman.

As a critic, Shaw searches and criticizes logical events, believing that art should be for the sake of life and should not be away from life and its problem. On the contrary it should deal with these problems and solve them. In this play, Shaw has shown the conventional morality and revealed that environment has many things to mould the personality. In addition, he has dealt with the social alienation and its consequences. Shaw's didacticism is brought out through various themes of the play, it is shown from the very beginning. He focuses on the environment as it is the most important and significant factor in modeling the character and behavior of human being. The education of Eliza in phonetics, her new environment and her training to live in middle class style and morals changed her from flower girl to duchess. She informs us the
value and significance of environment in learning the language by saying: “......you knew that when a child is brought to a foreign country it picks up the language in a few weeks.”

This play reflects Shaw’s socialist views as he is a great advocate of education for the working classes and social equality. As a member of the Fabian Society, he worked to educate the public through seminars, discussions, and lectures. He believed in evolutionary or democratic socialism; the idea that wealth should be gradually redistributed among all classes through public ownership of industry and business. Shaw’s political and social reformation is reflected in *Pygmalion*, which is a clever study of phonetics, and a good treatment of middle class morality and class distinction. It is a combination of the dramatic, the comic, and the social reform that gives Shaw’s comedies their special taste.

**Section Two: The Doctor's Dilemma (1906)**

The story of this play is complicated. It is a comical and delightful satire on doctors. It also criticizes the artistic nature and the place of the artist in society. At the first look the story of this play seems quite simple. Sir Colenso Ridgeon, a prominent research doctor and the supposedly discoverer of an antitoxin remedy for consumption finds himself with only one vacancy in his sanatorium and there are two patients. His choice implies a death sentence upon one of them, since the treatment requires his personal supervision, indeed this is very dangerous. The first act of the play takes place in Ridgeon's consulting-room where five doctors come to congratulate him for his last success. His five friends include Sir Patrick Cullen, a distinguished old physician; an Irish who has retired from his job. He is fifty years old, a
discoverer of a method of treating tuberculosis, he believes in the conventional morality. According to him:

there are two things that can be wrong with man. One of them is a Czech. The other is a woman. Until you know to which one man's sound, you know nothing about him.33

Then there is Dr. Schutzmacher, who has retired from practice and whose secret in trade has been the two words ‘Cure Guaranteed’. Mr. Cutler Walpole, an aggressive surgeon for whom every case of blood-poisoning is due to decaying matter in uniform bag, a thing which he has discovered to operate upon. He is not much different from Sir Ralph Bloomfield Bontington, a charismatic society doctor; known as B.B. in the medical world. He is a colossal hypocrite and believes that any vaccination is good for every disease. He can give anti-toxin for typhoid to a tetanus patient and anti-tetanus serum to a patient, suffering from typhoid, and can mistake into success. Another Doctor Blenkinsop, is a harmless poor but honest government doctor. Each one has his own favorite theory of illness and method of cure.

While they are all talking about remedies and discoveries, Jennifer comes and tells them that her husband, Dubechat cannot be admitted as the sanatorium is full. But when she shows them some of her husband's drawings, they are all astonished. Dr. Ridgeon is provoked to extort all his efforts in order to cure him. As shown in Act II, all the doctors have been charmed with the young artist's drawings and his wife, except Sir Patrick, who appears to be suspicious. After discussing, Ridgeon decides to save Blenkinsop, the other patient and leave Dubechat to the mercy of Sir Ralph. Then he admits to her that he has killed her husband because he loves her and wants to marry her. She is shocked by the
idea that he loved her all this time and has a dream to marry her: “you an elderly man!” The play deals with the question, whose life is more valuable, that of a normal artist of great quality, or that of an ordinary doctor who is decent, honest and good. This, however, has been left unsolved in the play because the doctor decides to sacrifice the artist’s life for irrelevant reason, that is, his love for his wife.

At first sight, the doctor seems to be an honorable man and works in a common place, but his admiration of the artist's wife makes him ask himself a question as to which life he should save, and thus his dilemma turns to be very complicated one simply because he has taken a great fancy to the artist's wife. He definitely knows this situation should not affect his decision, whether directly or indirectly. He discovers that the artist's wife does not know that her husband is of no value. Despite this reality, his ways have often landed them both in a painful predicament. She is bound to find him out and then what a tragedy for her! This consideration “paves and makes the way easy for him to take a decision against the artist.” In this dilemma, his friend, old Sir Patrick Cullen, is his principal advisor, who is an old fashioned doctor, His speech is shrewd, for him moral work has become a kind of intellectual power. When Sir Ridgeon confesses that his dilemma is complicated as he wants to marry the artist's wife, Jennifer, in the event of her husband's death, Sir Patrick tells him clearly that he must get rid of this thought as it is a plain case of a good man. In addition to that, Ridgeon is still half wishing for Jennifer, yet half genuinely in doubt, hesitates to take the right decision about the choice for good art over good man, Sir Patrick says:
Don’t talk your clever rubbish to me. If you live in an age which turns to pictures, plays, and brass bands, because it can find nothing in humanity to ease its poor aching heart, then you may be thankful that you belong to a noble and great profession, whose business it is to heal men and women.  

Dubechat is condemned to death; Ridgeon explains the principal consideration that has made him decide to cure Blenkinsop, the other patient. It was that Jennifer might never be disillusioned. Sir Patrick comments by saying how can a young man precisely a patient be killed because the doctor admires his wife, wishing not to be in that position. Ridgeon thinks that he has made the right decision, but he has made it on the wrong grounds.

Shaw's hatred of doctors stemmed from a failed operation on his foot. He explains his dislike for science and medicine, saying that doctors live on disease just like charity lives on poverty. If there is no poverty, there will be no disease and also no medicine. As a matter of fact, disease is against nature and so Shaw is against capitalism which is responsible for disease, and against the medical profession doctors, who flourish on disease. The poor people fear from disease and they want to be cured cheaply, on the other hand, scientific measures cannot comprehend the excessive increasing of rates. No doubt every person in this world has endless value, and if we save his life by intelligent social organization, means to protect him from pains and danger, he will serve the society for its well being. Being a doctor not only means the art to keep people in health, but it is the art to cure illnesses. Here Shaw blames the doctors for their lack of knowledge; emphasizing the simple demand of the people, especially the poor, who are to be protected and cured from diseases.
In this play there are many dilemmas, one of them is that of a doctor who has developed a new cure for tuberculosis, but the problem is that the cure is only enough for one patient. He then has to choose which patient he should give it to; a kind poor medical coworker or to unpleasant young artist who has cheerful wife by whom the doctor is fascinated. The recent concern is about a deadly disease and shortage of vaccines. In each of these cases there is a problem of distributing justice. If the resource is life-saving, then the question is especially poignant; who shall be saved when not all can be. This was the problem faced by Dr. Ridgeon. For the doctor, to take a decision is very difficult as he has to disassociate his feeling from his mind; though at the end he decides not to give the medicine to the artist as he loves his wife. The physician should care for every patient with scrupulous attention to the requirements of good medical practice. When Jennifer seeks help for her husband from Ridgeon, who has evidently found a way to cure consumption, he initially refuses, but later on he changes his mind for two reasons; Dubechat is a fine artist and he is besotted with his wife. In addition, after knowing the truth about Dubechat that he is a dishonest scoundrel, Ridgeon makes use of this as a strong reason to send him to another doctor for treatment, which guarantees that he will die. In the end, Ridgeon justifies his behavior as a plan to let Dubechat die before his wife finds out what an immoral cad he actually was.

Shaw calls this play a tragedy that deals with the allocation of limited medical resources. The problem posed in the play for which an answer should be supplied. The answer to this question may form the essence of the entire drama and cause the audience to
think deeply about it; the question may be formed as follows: “which of the two men, Blenkinsop or Dubechat, will Sir Ridgeon save?” The scientist resolves this problem with an interesting moral twist, saying that Dubechat's death will be beneficial and useful because it will preserve his reputation against any attempt to regard him as a deceitful physician, allow Jennifer to live on her earnings. Besides, it will offer Jennifer as a wife to another man, and he himself will exploit her charms.

There is no doubt that the medical profession deserves critical review every decade, as Sinclair Lewis and A.J. Cronin demonstrated in 1920 and 1930. The fact that doctors can show more interest in making lots of money than in curing the patients is constantly figuring out in our minds. But Shaw's attack in this play is something different; the plot involves the old question of who should live and who should die. Despite the fact that Dubechat is a great painter and has a devoted wife but he is a villain. He is dying of tuberculosis and his wife asks Ridgeon if he can cure him. At the beginning Ridgeon seems willing to help him but slowly he begins to dislike him and wonders if his life is worth saving or there are other patients who need help more than he does.

Shaw's representation of events depends on actual happenings in real life which are always documented by factual accounts to be found in newspapers and magazines or displayed by the dramatist himself according to his observation of reality, so that what he presents on the stage can by no means be accused of being unreal. Consequently, Shaw makes a commentary on the recent failure of the British surgeon, Sir Almroth Wright who tried to find a method of eradicating tuberculosis in London city. Wright
was on the cutting edge of his scientific study on this disease. He tried to convince the public and the authorities of his new experiments so that he would get a permission to inoculate many people with tuberculin injections. He was certain that it would get rid of this horrible disease. But the disease remained “as prevalent as ever; actually his experiments just helped to show the failure of tuberculin as a cure.”

Shaw the cynical satirist discovers a new subject matter for his drama and makes use of this event to attack the intellectual pretensions of the medical profession on curing the disease. He goes beyond the tuberculosis issue and attacks the medical profession. He says that simply you have doctors visit you, examine you, tell you what is wrong, and then leave without doing anything for you, except if you are dying they make you comfortable. This is hardly what is expected of doctors in any society; people want to be better. Shaw believes that the life force may need support to cure itself

In his ‘Preface’ to The Doctor's Dilemma, Shaw undermines and reinforces the view of good doctors. The play's protagonist, Sir Ridgeon, has the ability to kill the husband of the woman he desires to wed simply by referring him to Sir Ralph Bloomfield Bontington called BB for anti-tuberculosis treatment. One can have competence or method but never both. Shaw clarifies that both scientific intelligence and sympathy are very important and necessary qualities of good doctors and bitterly criticizes the fact that they do not assume any presence in contemporary society.

Poor doctors are another important problem that is discussed in this play. Poor doctors are easily tempted to perform costly, but
futile and useless operations or treatments on their patients just to gain money and get personal benefits. This is evident by the behavior of well-known doctors in London who performed simple and nontoxic operation that was of no advantage to the patient except to the surgeon who gained large amount of money. What makes matters worse is that doctors are very poor, their poverty might urge them to do anything just to achieve their interest; thus the difficulty is how to trust the honor and the conscience of the doctors. Most of them have no honor and no conscience, so we have to be aware of thing, and not trust them blindly. Sometimes the doctor kills his patient, but no one knows that and the doctor assures that he did all his best to save him. The best solution to avoid harm to the patient is the law of society that must take care and look after the doctors’ economic conditions. This means to improve and increase their salary. The realism of Shaw’s play is very clear; he concentrates upon social and economical evils and wants to change society for better. He openly condemns:

the social institutions which are mainly responsible for increasing and spreading economical inequality; seeking reality behind fake means of economic disorder with global mockery.  

Shaw advocates that what should be relevant to scientific experience is both a clear understanding of biological mechanisms and the statistical study of the outcome. This places him in synchrony with today’s evidence-based medicine. In his plays and his prose writings, he attacks animal vivisection also because he thinks that “a profession which justifies the torture of animals cannot be trusted to treat human compassionately.” The new developments in the hypothesis of disease are mentioned in this
play, namely socialist and vivisectionist viewpoints. Especially, it defends a National Health Service that was established in England four decades later when the government assigned the doctor and gave him salary to cure the people in order to prevent the dilemma of poverty.

The theme of this play is universal; the treatments are so expensive that only some people can afford whereas others cannot especially the poor. This play is a violent medical satire against some doctors who are torn between performing their duty efficiently and achieving their self-interests and increasing their income on account of the patients by performing needless operations. There are many poor men in the medical profession who get their income regularly and do not depend on disease. No one can deny the reality that any new individual born into the society healthy or not is dependent on doctors. The medical profession represents “not science, but the hopeless anti-science,” which means that the matter will become worse unless the situation of the doctors is improved by assigning them jobs in the Public Health Service just to help them to raise their income.

Shaw dissects the contribution of poverty and deprivation to ill health urging greater attention to be paid to the poor and the deprived. He would have reacted to the social forces which are shaping global health today as well as to the new threats to public health that have emerged since his time. The epidemics of non-communicable diseases now sweeping across the world are being driven by some of the undesirable elements of industrialization. The language of trade threatens to dominate the discourse on public health. The agents of ill health are marked aggressively by transnational mega-corporations as
they fight to win over the minds and the money of consumers spread over many countries

In science, the concept of compassion may be defined as feeling for the sufferings of others. Shaw points out certain misunderstanding and ill-treatment. Scientists prove themselves to be ambivalent when dealing with important and grave issues. They show their cruelty towards animals when vivisecting them during their scientific experiments pretending that what they are doing is for the sake of the happiness of man, forgetting all about the sufferings of that particular animal already cut to pieces, and at the same time they pretend to help man and make him happy. They just look for their interests and the gratification of their sexual appetite, which they try to bring about even though it requires them to kill a human being or more in this regard. Shaw attacks this duality as he observes many deficiencies in the medical profession of his day. For him good doctors must practice their profession and scientific experiments within a good system free from vicious incentives that drive “widely beyond the ascertained strain which human nature will bear.”

A good doctor would tell the poor patient that he does not need a bottle of medicine for good health but decent housing, clothing, food, good air to breath, and a host of other things that he is quite unable to obtain. But for the rich people the matter is different. In both cases, the doctors who are paid for providing drugs and who must compete with their fellows to attract patients will face poverty if they give sound advice. In addition to poverty that affected a good portion of the profession in the early 1900, Shaw saw it to be inhumane to ask the doctors to stay for
emergencies all day and night. His solution is that the government should provide a finance system in which doctors are paid a good salary to avoid the corruption in the medical profession and to promote public health. For advice and medicine, the doctor should not charge exorbitant price because the patient may be so poor that he could not pay that amount, but he needs his advice. If the doctor is poor, he should appreciate the situation of the poor patient and accept the little money from him. By taking less amount, the doctor should urge the patient to visit him once again so he can gain more money. By accepting to treat people with less amount of money, the doctor will not only increase his income by getting further patients, but also he will be well-known. Shaw might feel happy with how the problems of the doctor's poverty and their working hours can be solved. He might disagree that we still have a long way to go in the line of science and compassion, especially because he thinks that "a truly scientific and compassionate attitude would naturally breed humility, a virtue he might find in as short supply in today's medicine as in his own time."  

Looking back over the tradition of science plays, we can trace specific currents in the emergence of the genre. Shaw, Brecht, Durrenmatt, and other earlier playwrights focused on physical problems and issues as the substance of the scientific drama. Often, they are primarily concerned with the moral role of the doctor or the scientist, the public responsibility as well as the personal pursuit of scientific facts. Most important is the fact that many of the recent plays explore other concepts, such as moral ambiguity and the unreliability of memory by expanding that pursuit. In an age of scientific progress, from mapping the human genome to
elucidating brain mechanisms, contemporary playwrights seem paradoxically attracted to some mysterious and unstable scientific and mathematical doctrines.

Bernard F. Dukore presents a comment on what Ibsen, Shaw, and Brecht may have much in common. He realizes that “all of them have displayed to contemporary society a challenge of social values in all their plays and presented their stand from the radical-left point of view.”

Thus, in the ‘Preface’ to his play *Major Barbara* Shaw expresses his challenge to and criticism of the existing social ideals and calls for a revolutionary remedy as a spring board for fundamental changes in society:

> I am, and have always been, and shall now always be, a revolutionary writer, because our laws make law impossible; our liberties destroy all freedom; our property is organized robbery: our morality is impudent hypocrisy..... I am an enemy of the existing order.  

*The Doctor's Dilemma* reveals one of the most vicious evils which may flourish among physicians who work for the sake of their self interest and personal cravings to the extent that they are ready to kill people in order to achieve their aims. Although their noble profession demands that they must be humane, sympathetic, love humanity, and be ready to help people at any time and during any circumstances and conditions. The position of physicians among people is always sublime to the extent that they may be considered as sacred. Bernard F. Dukore makes an excellent comment in this respect as he compares them to gods:

> If a man whose profession is to build up houses can consider himself among 'special people,' what of a man whose profession revolves around matters of life and death? Is not such a professional man more
special? A doctor might consider himself to be a god? 46

Besides, Ridgeon considers himself a little god, and so do all the members of the medical profession as clearly shown in the play—a very sarcastic yet ironical situation intended to display the wide gap between what the medical profession should actually dictate and what the reality of doctors is. Thus with an ironical remark Ridgeon's colleague Sir Patrick Cullen calls him the savior of lives. In this play, Shaw unfolds these horrible practices and considers them social evils that should be eliminated from society—a theme which may sound unpleasant to physicians like Ridgeon in The Doctor's Dilemma and Paramore in The Philanderer. Jennifer uncovers one aspect of Ridgeon's attitude towards people, that he considers them as clever animals:

Jennifer: Clever brutes? Do you know doctor, that some of the dearest and most of my faithful friend I ever had only brutes!
Ridgeon: Well did you find us so very cruel after all? 47

In the same mood Jennifer insists upon unrevealing Ridgeon's nefarious deed which is the act of murdering, proving one of the serious crimes a doctor may commit against those patients whom he is supposed to cure. Jennifer proceeds to say:

But there are doctors who are naturally cruel; and 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. You made a dreadful mistake about Louis; but you would not have made it if you had not trained yourself to make the same mistake about dogs. You saw nothing in them but dumb brutes; and so you could see nothing in them but a clever brute.48
It may be suggested that physicians are human beings, not completely perfect, as they have human weakness. Thus Shaw wants to attract the attention of his readers and audience to the reality that weaknesses are naturally associated with the physicians' profession which people unwittingly and greatly idealize and appreciate. Throughout her conversation with Ridgeon, Jennifer wants to find out an important fact, a confession that Ridgeon has intentionally killed her husband, Louis Dubechat. Despite his clever and witty procrastination, Ridgeon is made to confess that he has killed him on purpose:

Ridgeon: ...It is a dangerous medicine: it cured Blenkinsop: it killed Louis Dubechat. When I handle it, it cures. When another man handles it kills-sometimes.
Jennifer: [Naively, no yet taking it all in] then why did you Sir Ralph give it to Louis?
Ridgeon: I’ m going to tell you. I did it because I was in love with you. 49

Upon hearing this, Jennifer is innocently surprised and she with the audience realizes how much wide the gap and contrast between what the physician is supposed to do, and what he has really done. This is what, as a matter of fact Shaw wants to criticize—nefarious aspirations intrude into the medical profession and destroys all signs of love, compassion and mercy that should have been inevitably and persistently associated with it. This event which has already been documented by the dramatist himself in his writings with authentic evidence from daily happenings proves to be one of the ironies of the time. Ridgeon's profession is not in any way to make him face a dilemma, and to make an immoral decision concerning which patient he should save. His profession dictates that he should be merciful to all patients without any exception. Also, an artist like Dubechat needs not to be a dishonest person in
order to earn money for his living. Shaw makes a good comment in this connection:

Under a more socially responsible form of government, an ineffective doctor in a poor neighborhood can become effective; a dedicated scientist, who is in a capitalist society where private medical practice prevails considers himself a special person and his patients his 'chosen people,' need not face a dilemma that pushes him into immoral alternatives and forces him to become a hypocrite to salvage his self-respect; and an artist, who considers himself special and above the common herd, need not be dishonest. Under socialist conditions, says Shaw, all professions can become socially responsible.50

What Ridgeon has done for the sake of humanity as a physician, is the question that persists. It seems that throughout this episode which shows the absence of religion and moral values among important pillars of society like physicians, Shaw wants to point out that the more one is away from morality, the greater a victim of evil.

The position of a physician among people is supposed to be very sublime, and the service he provides when curing people should be greatly appreciated. Therefore this profession is highly humanistic, as it is wellbeing, for the welfare and happiness of man. Hence, one can only imagine the great danger when this humanistic profession turns to be devilish or mischievous at the hands of corrupted physicians like Ridgeon in The Doctor's Dilemma and Paramore in The Philanderer; that is to say, the one who kills his patient for the sake of satisfying his sexual appetite with his wife after his death, the other cares much more for his scientific experiments which may make him famous among his patients. This is one of the social evils of contemporary society which Shaw
faithfully depicts in *The Doctor's Dilemma*. Because of Shaw's awareness of the human nature and psychology and his understanding of man's impulses and aspirations, he makes use of other people's remarks and observations about those negative aspects that may confront man in society. At the same time, as indicated in most Shaw's prose writings that he does not only depend on what he observes in his environment, but he also depends on those records that have already been registered, regarding evil and the nefarious aspects of the capitalistic society. Consequently, Shaw finds it significant to bitterly criticize those dishonest physicians whose presence among people in society is supposed to be very dangerous. Colin Wilson observes in his book entitled *Bernard Shaw: A Reassessment* that Shaw “attacks and criticizes the dishonesty of those people who are related to the medical profession.”

It is worth mentioning that the subject matter of *The Doctor's Dilemma* is unpleasant; perhaps it is more unpleasant than the subject matters contained in *Plays Unpleasant* when looked upon collectively. To kill a human being for the sake of ravishing his wife can be considered satanic and vicious. Hence, the play does not show any sign of a happy ending. It must be noted that the play does not only criticize the dishonesty of the supposedly honorable physicians, but it also implies significant moral implications as to the lessons the medical professionals may get when reading or watching this play on stage:

All this makes *The Doctor's Dilemma* more unpleasant than any of the three Unpleasant Plays. It is oddly negative. It is also the first case of Shaw refusing to toss the audience some kind of a happy ending.... The fact that Ridgeon does not marry
Jennifer and cannot even convince her that her husband was a scoundrel, produces an odd frustration in the audience, which in turn emphasizes that Ridgeon is no hero either. A happy ending might have removed this odd flavor of bitterness, but it would be irrelevant to the theme of the play, the doctor's dilemma' which is intended to give the play weight and substance.

Most rational humankind have expressed their detestation about the meanness of vivisection. If the medical profession overcomes the anti-vivisection and the society opposes the practice and philosophy of vivisectors, every doctor will be given rest and gain sufficient amount of money. The reality is that the doctors respond easily to the professional fashion and defends the vivisection. The obscurity is how this bad practice becomes fashion although it takes the life of vivisectors. Some doctors might learn from the vivisection which helps them to guide the people how to treat specific disease from which desolate patients suffer and assure them that the practice is simple under the law. If the effect of such shameless lying is permitted, “it will not be easy to discover any civilized motivation in which the medical profession sacrifices everything and gains nothing for the sake of the miserable patients.”

Men of science have to struggle hard to maintain their respect by avoiding anything that hurts simple people. They must encourage and defend scientific research since it is for the benefit of ordinary and desperate people.

By deciding to kill his patient, Sir Ridgeon deprives himself from any kind of humanity, passion, and pity. He used all his cruelty which is considered one of the mankind’s primitive pleasures. In the entire world no one admits his loving cruelty for its own sake or giving a logical reason of being cruel, as there is a
rule to reject cruelty, but law allows vivisection only. For Shaw, vivisection is not bad. He is not against vivisection but against its cruelty. As a matter of fact, he remarks:

That we are a cruel nation; and our habit of disgusting our vices by giving polite names to the offences we are determined to commit, does not unfortunately for my own comfort, impose on me. Vivisection can hardly pretend to be better than the classes from which they are drawn, or those above them; and if these classes are capable of sacrificing animals in various cruel ways under cover of sport, and fashion, education, discipline, even, when the cruel sacrifices are human sacrifices political economy, it is idle for the vivisector to pretend that he is incapable of practicing cruelty for pleasure or profit or both under the cloak of science. 54

Some men can feel pleasure only through cruel sport and achieve their necessities by using villainously cruel traps. So we have to object and complain against being cruel and inventors of horrifying means and tools of torturing. It is shameful to deal with such type of men whose basic aim is only their interests, they simply ignore others and cause suffering to the innocents. Most people would know that good and respectable men do not act disgracefully even with the animals. Shaw does not prefer the private medical practice as according to him it comes out of the poverty and exploitation, suggesting that:

The social solution of the medical problem depends on that large, slowly advancing resisted integration of society which is called socialism. Until the medical profession becomes a body of men and paid ..., keep of the country in health. 55

Shaw thus critically takes into account every minor and major flaw/foible/folly or weakness of a man, magnifies it even ridicules it. His dramatic presentation of stark realism is redeemed because of his
intellect, humor and irony. The gloomy sides of human existence and social disruptions caused by human villainy, wickedness or weakness passing through his intellectual furnace and fires of irony and satire assume enduring realistic and metaphorical expressions of evil. Evil that Shaw believes need to be confronted with.
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