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Under the 'Sociological' heading we could place the following plays:

*Man and Superman, The Doctor's Dilemma, Getting Married, Misalliance, and Fanny's First Play.*

*Man and Superman* took about three years to be completed (1901-3) and the preface to the play was written in 1903, the year of the publication of the play. The 19-page preface (P. H. Ed.) written by way of a letter to Arthur Bingham Walkley, an English dramatic critic and essayist, is an important piece of writing as it contains some of the important Shavian beliefs and doctrines.

*Man and Superman* was written as a reply to Arthur Bingham Walkley's challenge that Shaw should write a Don Juan play. Walkley's challenge confronted Shaw with the problem of writing a sex drama on the Don Juan theme. In the preface Shaw deplores that there is genuine dearth of sex dramas in the English language. He says that there are no plays in England in which "the natural attraction of the sexes for one another is made the mainspring of action." Shaw comments that the beautiful appearance of the heroine and voluptuousness do not make a sex drama. Again the conflict of individuals with law and convention are judicial matters; such conflicts in respect of sexual relations cannot constitute a sex drama. A sex drama has to work on the basis of the natural attraction of the sexes for one another.

Bernard Shaw's second and the famous statement in the preface says that initiative in sexual matters is taken not by men but by women. A woman's position is that of a spider patiently waiting
for the quarry. Shaw's third important statement is that Women's business is to continue the flow of life by way of procreating children and men's business is to provide nutrition. Again nature's intellectual works are carried on by men of genius who incarnate 'the philosophic consciousness of Life'. As men of genius are intellectual agents of the Life Force, they are in a position to supersede sex in the field of art. (p. 157).

*Man and Superman* has been presented as a sex drama in which one could legitimately expect to see 'the natural attraction of the sexes for another' made 'the main spring of action'. There are two love affairs in the play - one is the triangular love of Octavius, Ann and Tanner and the other is straight love between Violet Robinson and Hector Malone.

In the case of the triangular love it is seen that Octavius loves Ann, but Ann cannot bring herself to love him; on the other hand Ann loves Tanner, but Tanner tries to flee from her, because he is frightened of the serious intention of the Life Force behind her love. The second illustration of the Life Force activity in the field of sex shows that the lovers are in their desperation to overcome social barriers have resorted to a secret marriage to be revealed at an appropriate time afterwards. In the case of the triangular love, the courtship of the lovers, namely Octavius Robinson and Ann Whitefield has been elaborately portrayed by which the dramatist has tried to realise 'the natural attraction of the sexes for one another', but in the case of sub-plot the courtship of the lovers has not been presented at all. In the case of the triangular love, Shaw has taken special care to dramatise his contention that in matters of sex it is women, not
men who take the initiative. A long cat and mouse game ensues between Ann Whitefield and John Tanner, the two agents of the Life Force, the former representing Life's procreative will and the latter representing Life's intellectual passion. Ann leaves no stone unturned to capture Tanner for her husband, because only through that union, her will of procreating better human being (Superman) could be realized. As an artist and a man of genius, Tanner considers marriage to be a hindrance to his intellectual pursuits. But, all along, Tanner knows that it is the Life Force that has set Ann after him and there is no escape for him. The Life Force has machinated to make both more and more attractive to each other. When Ann asks Tanner why he looks so fascinating to her, Tanner replies, "The Life Force. I am in the grip of the Life Force." (Act IV, p. 402). From the manner Ann pursues Tanner to Sierra Nevada of Spain, Tanner draws the conclusion that the Life Force is very very earnest with its design against him. Again the clause of the will of Ann's late father appointing Tanner a joint guardian with Ramsden was dictated by Ann herself. Thus Tanner comes to realize that the Life Force set the trap for him from the very beginning of their acquaintance. The doctrine of woman's initiative in sexual matters is clearly demonstrated through the strategies and strategems adopted and

1 - The apparent conflict between man and woman is resolved in the integrated scheme of the Life Force. St John Ervine observes, "If the creation of life is the supreme form of art, we perceive that there is no war in any significant sense between man and woman, each fighting for a dissimilar purpose, but an essential union not only of bodies, but of minds and spirits in a great effort to make the creatures begotten and conceived finer than the man who begot and woman who conceived them." - Bernard Shaw - His Life, Work and Friends (Constable, 1956), p. 389.
earnestness shown by Ann in her efforts to win over Tanner for her husband. However, the same has not been clearly shown in the case of Violet-Hector love affair. There is some amount of romanticism in Hector Malone's effort to marry beneath his position and his option to be a 'worker'. On the other hand, Violet's attempt to keep the marriage a secret until she succeeds in melting down the opposition of her millionaire father-in-law reveals her dash, determination and calculative mind. While Ann captures a man of genius for her husband, Violet grabs a rich man with little richness of mind. In the preface Shaw says, "Money means nourishment and marriage means children; and that men should put nourishment first and women children first is, broadly speaking, the law of Nature and not the dictate of personal ambition" (p. 154). As against this declaration in the preface, it is seen that it is not the question of children or sexual attraction, but the question of money that seems to control chiefly Violet's behaviour in the play. The preface again declares, "The Don Juan play, however, is to deal with sexual attraction, and not with nutrition, and to deal with in a society in which the serious business of sex is left by men to women, as the serious business of nutrition is left by women to men" (p. 155). The Violet-Hector affair does not seem to conform strictly to the declared purpose of the play, because Violet seems to transcend her role and think of nutrition more seriously than of anything else. In both the cases of love affair the question of breeding better children, i.e. supermen, remains only a speculation.

In the preface Shaw has reviewed the legend of Don Juan and discussed the change it has undergone from age to age. The Don Juan of the sixteenth century as portrayed by the Spanish monk
Tirso de Molina was a reckless pursuer and seducer of women. He defied the morals of his time, and dared to be the enemy of God and died an unrepentant sinner. Shaw refers to the different versions of Don Juan story produced by Moliere, Mozart, Byron and Goethe. Shaw has argued in the preface that the image of Don Juan has changed substantially in the modern times. He says that in this age of Democracy where men and women are acutely conscious of their rights, the idea of a libertine Don Juan is highly unacceptable. Shaw maintains that the modern Don Juan is more a Hamlet than anything else. He has lost his Casanovaisms. The modern Juan is a pursued fellow instead of being the pursuer.

Referring to A. B. Walkley's hatred of vulgarity, Shaw says that while challenging Shaw to write the Don Juan play, he must have meant a Juan not in vulgar sense, but "in philosophic sense." By Don Juan image Shaw means a person of rebellious nature who follows his own instincts and is exceptionally capable of distinguishing between good and evil and is in mortal conflict with the existing institutions despite his innate good nature and intent, and defends himself with 'fraud and force' unscrupulously when challenged by the forces of convention. John Tanner is projected as the modern Don Juan in the play. He is a genius and a revolutionary with all sorts of radical opinions about social change which is testified to by the pamphlet called Revolutionist's Handbook of which he is supposed to be the author. Tanner is up against the convention in so many respects. He is against the convention of parental domination of children, the conventional system of marriage and all other conventional taboos. He is also against the exploitation of the poor by the idle rich and Democracy.
running on the votes of Yahoos, and distrustful of the much-trumpeted progress and civilization of his time.

In the play Tanner has been projected as a kind of philosopher who preaches the philosophy of the Life Force. In the dialogue in the dream scene, Tanner who speaks as his historical self of Don Juan discusses the heavenly and the hellish ways of men and women and points out the ways along which men should proceed so that they can evolve into a better species. In the *Revolutionist's Handbook* Tanner has advocated socialization of selective breeding of the human beings. Thus, Shaw's Don Juan image reveals a man who is a lover of life and an ardent evolutionist.

In the preface Shaw has divided the artists into two classes - artist philosophers and non-philosophic artists. He further states that the artist philosophers are the only sort of artists that he takes 'quite seriously'. The touchstone of a good work of art is that it should have some philosophy to preach. Shaw says that the "the main thing in determining the artistic quality of a book is not the opinions it propagates, but the fact that the writer has opinions" (p. 165). Shaw quotes *Everyman* and Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* as works of artist-philosophers and charges Shakespeare and Dickens with the failure to deliver a definite philosophy of life. Shaw says that he wanted for long a 'pit of philosophers' and *Man and Superman* has offered as such a 'pit' (p. 161).

Shaw's statement as regards artist-philosophers in the preface is not irrelevant to the play. *Man and Superman* is clearly a didactic play which has preached the philosophy of the Life Force and demonstrated the roles of men and women under the universal scheme of the same.
In the preface Shaw has acknowledged the sources from which he took the ideas of certain characters of the play. The references to the sources of the characters are definitely helpful from an academic point of view.

Shaw's comments on style in the preface has apparently nothing to do with the play; however Shaw has considered the question of style because according to him style is directly linked with an artist's philosophy or conviction.

As the play is sandwiched between the preface and the Revolutionist's Handbook, one has to look both ways for a better appreciation of the play. The theory of the Life Force, the idea of Superman, the questions of eugenic breeding and the failures of Democracy have been more elaborately discussed in the Revolutionist's Handbook than in the preface.

Shaw's comments in the preface in regard to sex drama, the roles of men and women under the scheme of the Life Force, the attitude of the men of genius to married life provide guidelines for the play. Shaw's review of the Don Juan legend in the preface has both thematic and guideline importance. The criticism of Democracy in the preface and the question of breeding a better race of political animals have almost nothing to do with the play. So, one could conclude that it is not themetically, but by guideline account that the preface offers more tangible links with the play.

The Doctor's Dilemma was written in 1906 and the preface to it was written in 1911, that is five years later. In the long forty-five page preface (P.H. ed.) Shaw has elaborately discussed the different aspects of medical science and medical profession.
Certain aspects of the medical profession have been sharply criticised in the preface. The basis of Shaw's criticism has been that the medical profession, run on the mechanical Darwinian conception of the universe, has no conscience and no sense of honour. In other words, Shaw means to say that the medical science is not inspired with the cosmic and the creative purpose of the Life Force.

Thus, the medical profession, run on the mechanical Darwinian conception of evolution has become a cause of worry to all lovers of life.

In the preface Shaw has elaborately discussed the popular illusion about doctor's infallibility, the questions of surgery, vivisection, inoculation, vaccination, the evils of private medical practice and has demanded nationalization of the medical profession.

The Doctor's Dilemma has been sharply criticised by different critics, chiefly, on two grounds—firstly that the play has scantily link with the voluminous preface, and secondly that the play has no real dilemma at all as the title suggests. The preface does not say anything about the so-called dilemma in the play. Dr Colenso Ridgeon can provide only ten beds in his hospital for treatment of tuberculosis cases with his newly discovered opsonin.

The dilemma is about the tenth case. As the opsonin he has is just enough to meet the needs of only one patient, Dr Ridgeon has to choose between Dr Blenkinsop, an 'honest decent man' and Louis Dubedat, 'a rotten blackguard of an artist' (Act II, p 524).

---

1 - Attacking the very basis of the dilemma in the play, Chesterton comments, "I should recommend the doctor in his dilemma to do exactly what I am sure any decent doctor would do without any dilemma at all: to treat the man simply as a man, and give him no more and no less favour than he would to anybody else." George Bernard Shaw (London, Bodley Head, 1961), p. 218.
Dr Blenklnsop exactly a man of the world, is humble and diffident because of his penury. On the other hand, Louis Dubedat is an artist of the first order but utterly immoral as regards money and woman. The artist is an extremely selfish fellow who can sacrifice everything, including the moral principles, for his art. In the preface to *Man and Superman* Shaw says, "Accordingly, we observe in the man of genius all the unscrupulousness and all the "self-sacrifice" (the two things are the same) of the Woman". The artist, Louis Dubedat, has been portrayed as one who is in the habit of borrowing money recklessly and changing lovers at his sweet will in defiance of the conventional sexual morality, but all these he appears to do in concurrence with his conscience. In the preface to *Farfetched Fables* Shaw says, "The Life Force, when it gives some needed extraordinary quality to some individual, does not bother about his or her morals". Dr Ridgeon recognises Louis Dubedat to be a man of genius, but he has no understanding of art or of the life of an artist. The problem of choosing between an honest worldly man and an immoral artist has been bedevilled by the introduction of a bewitching beauty who happens to be the wife of the artist. He falls in love with her at the first sight and loses the power of fair judgement. Sir Patrick advises him to choose in complete disregard of the physical charms of the lady, but he fails and admits to him, "Mind : it's not clear to me. She troubles my judgment" (Act II, p. 524). Thus, in effect, the choice for Dr Ridgeon turns out to be not between Dr Blenkinsop and the artist, but between the artist and his beautiful wife.

---

2 - The preface to *Farfetched Fables* (Ibid.), p. 896.
He begins to wish for the death of the artist so that he can have his widow for his wife. Thus the very essence of dilemma of choosing between an honest worldly man and an immoral artist is lost upon him. There is truth in Dr Sen Gupta's comment that the introduction of the an exceeding beautiful woman as the wife of an artist has "spoilt the unity of the story." The artist, a pursuer of beauty considers his wife as the living embodiment of beauty and in his death bed urges his wife to grant him "immortality" after his death, by carrying on "a great tradition of beauty, a great atmosphere of wonder and romance" which she is expected to maintain by wearing "beautiful dresses and splendid magic jewels" and looking beautiful (Act IV, p. 538). As Dr Ridgeon's attention is already captivated by this beautiful lady, he fails to understand the artist's vision or his way of life. He arranges for the early end of his career by relegating his treatment to Sir Ralph Bloomfield Bonington, a humbug of a doctor.

In the preface Shaw says that "medical profession has not a high character; it has an infamous character" (p. 237). Shaw also maintains that most of the doctors "have no honour, and no conscience (p. 238). This image of the doctors has been sought to be presented in the play through Dr Ridgeon's heinous conspiracy of doing away with the artist. Shaws view of Darwinian biologists seems to have impact on the portrayal of the character

---

of Dr Ridgeon.¹

In the preface Shaw discusses how doctors have taken full advantage of the popular superstition that doctors are omniscient and infallible beings.² Shaw notes in the preface, "The doctor never hesitates to claim divine omniscience, nor clamour for laws to punish any scepticism on the part of laymen." (p. 239).

Doctors enjoy the privilege of having an entire population under their power and mercy.³ Dr Ridgeon says to Mrs Dubedat in the play, "I am a doctor: I have nothing to fear" (Act V, p. 544).

The Darwinians who banished God from the universe seemed cozy with the divine attributes thrust upon them. In the play when Mrs Dubedat raises the issue of soul, Dr Ridgeon coolly says, "The soul is an organ I have not come across in the course of my anatomical work" (Act V, p. 543).

The preface discusses at length the miserable condition of the poor private medical practitioners. It appears that Dr Blenkinsop has been introduced in the play as a specimen of poor private doctor. Dr Blenkinsop admits that he has forgotten all science because he cannot afford to buy the costly medical books and papers. Speaking about the poor doctors, Shaw says in the preface, "The only way in which he can preserve his self-respect is by

---

¹ Shaw says in Sixteen Self-Sketches, "Darwinians who would have faced martyrdom sooner than deny their faith in Darwin or affirm a belief in God, were sometimes, when women or money were concerned, conscienceless rascals" (Constable, 1949), p. 76.

² Shaw says in Everybody's Political What Is What that when Darwin abolished God quite unintentionally, doctors "claimed all credit for themselves, including such divine attributes as Omniscience, clinical Omnipresence and Infallibility" — (Constable, 1950), p. 215.

³ In the preface to Heartbreak House Shaw says that the General Medical Council was more powerful than the Inquisition, p. 382.
forgetting all he learnt of science, and clinging to such help as he can give without cost merely by being less ignorant and more accustomed to sick-beds than his patients" (p. *244*). Dr Blenkinsop begs one rejected 'frock-coat' from Dr Ridgeon. This shows how 'hideously poor' Dr Blenkinsop is.

In the preface Shaw describes the medical profession as a 'conspiracy' against the laity. Dr Ridgeon who knows the medical profession from inside has the honesty to admit in the society of the doctors, "We are not a profession: we're a conspiracy" (Act I, p. *515*). In the preface Shaw says that medical theories are a 'matter of fashion' and they are modified very rapidly.

In the play, different doctors are seen to advocate different ways of treatment. The preface refers to Sir Almroth Wright who discovered that a pathogenis inoculation called Opsonin can benefit a patient if his or her phagocytes are on the upgrade trend and are in a position to cook the Opsonin. He also maintained that an infinitesimal dose of inoculation might procure better result than the conventional heavy dose. But the private practitioners refused to accept this view. Dr Bloomfield Bonington in the play believes in stimulating the phagocytes without caring to know whether the phagocytes are on the upgrade or downgrade trend. Dr Walpole believes in extracting the nuciform sacs by operation in all kinds of diseases. According to surgeon Walpole the theory of phagocytes is 'pure rot' (Act I, to p. *514*). Again according Bloomfield Bonington the theory of nuciform sac is 'utter nonsense." (Act I, p. *514*).

The preface discusses at length the different aspects of vivisection, but the same has not formed any part of the theme of the play. In Act V Mrs Dubedat is seen to charge Dr Ridgeon and
other doctors with cruelty to animals. The surgical branch of medical profession is represented in the play by Sir Cutler Walpole without any actual incident of surgery in the play. He attributes all diseases to the growth of nuciform sac and his only remedy is removal of the nuciform sac by operation. A case of negligence and irresponsibility has been described by Walpole himself according to which Walpole after the operation upon Lady Gorran "forgot to take the sponges out, and was stitching them up inside her when the nurse missed them" (Act I, p. 510). The evil effects of the private medical practice have not been adequately dramatised in the play. The only victim of the private medical practice has been the artist himself. There could have been a socialistic solution to the dilemma presented in the play. Instead of insufficient production of Opsonin vaccine at individual level for treatment of only ten cases, there could have been a large scale socialistic production of the said vaccine for treatment of other countless cases. The benefits of public doctor have not been dramatised in the play. It is simply left to the reader's speculation. The preface has elaborately dealt with the perils of inoculation or vaccination, but the dramatist has not cared to dramatisre the same in the play.

In the play a Newspaper man has been satirised, and the preface has nothing to do with it.

It is clear that thematically the play has a very weak link with the preface which contains a serious discussion of medical profession. The first Act of the play presents some individual doctors's problems and their differing ways of treatment, but the remaining four Acts proceed to portray artist Louis Dubedat's life, the problem of his treatment, the courtship of Mrs Dubedat
by Dr Ridgeon and his ultimate delusion. Dr Sen Gupta finds no organic unity of the theme of the play and comments, "It is very difficult to ascertain what Shaw really wanted to 'express' in this drama". However, if Shaw's views on Darwinism and Darwinist biologists are considered as expressed in the prefaces to *Heartbreak House* and *Back to Methuselah*, and in other works such as *Every Body's Political What is What*, it is not too difficult to catch the purpose of the play. Dr Ridgeon, a Darwinist thinker and biologist, is confronted with the problem of choosing between an honest, decent, worldly man and a powerful artist when the artist has an 'arrestingly beautiful' wife. The play shows the behaviour of a doctor who has no honour, conscience or religion. Dr Ridgeon's admission at the end of the play that he has committed "a purely disinterested murder" shows what harms the irreligious philosophy of Darwinism can do (p. 546).\footnote{Sen Gupta, S. C., *The Art of Bernard Shaw* (Calcutta, 1965), p. 66.}

As regards the weak link between the play and the preface, it could be contended that Shaw did not feel bound to dramatize everything he wrote in the preface. It is quite natural for him to take up a part of the problems discussed in the preface for dramatisation in the play. However, the preface remains a good background thesis for the play.

In the play Shaw seems to grapple with the deeper problems of the medical profession than those with which he has dealt in the preface. In the play Shaw seems to be concerned with the serious impact of the mechanical world outlook of the medical science on human life and civilization.
Getting Married was written in 1908 and the preface to the play was written two years later (twelve years after Shaw's marriage). In the long forty-four-page preface (P. H. ed.) Shaw has attempted an exhaustive discussion of the various aspects of the marriage question. Among the matters discussed are: idealism about home life, domestic manners, small and large families, utilitarian and eugenic view of marriage, kinds of marriage, the case of unmarried motherhood, economic dependence of the married partners, the impersonal nature of sex, the dangers of unbreakable marriage tie, the necessity of easy and cheap divorce, children as obstacles to divorce and adaptation of marriage to human nature. In the preface Shaw has tried to analyze the faults of the traditional marriage system, discussed how the tradition of unbreakable marriage bond is in conflict with human nature and is detrimental to the evolution of better human race and civilization, and has underscored the necessity of founding marriage on the basis of human nature.

The preface to Getting Married is a classic document by Shaw on the question of marriage. It would be wrong to say that the preface to Getting Married was written with particular relevance to the play; rather the preface could be regarded as Shaw's treatise on the marriage question in general. However, as will be seen, the link of the preface with the play turns out to be quite strong because the preface offers both thematic and guideline accounts.

In Getting Married several pairs of men and women have been introduced into the theme which represent different kinds of marital and sexual relations. The pairs are: (1) Bishop

---

Bridgenorth and Mrs Bridgenorth, an elderly couple, (ii) Leo and Reginald, a divorced couple, (iii) Edith and Sykes, a newly married couple, (iv) George Collins and Mrs George, an unconventional couple, (v) General Bridgenorth and Lesbia Grantham, a pair of old lovers - unable to reach an agreement about marriage between them.

Mr and Mrs Bridgenorth are an elderly couple who have given out several daughters in marriage of whom Edith is the last. Bridgenorths are a happily married couple experienced in worldly ways and with deep understanding for each other. Though by profession a Bishop, he is not one of the ordinary run of the Bishops. He seems well aware of the maladies that afflict the conventional system of marriage and feels acutely the need of reform. He is one who demands enactment of laws to 'make divorce reasonable and decent'. What he wants is not the abolition of marriage, but reform in marriage laws in conformity with human nature. When Leo says that to get married is a mistake, he replies that not to get married is a 'bigger mistake'. In all these he only echoes what Shaw says in the preface. Shaw says that "there is no question of abolishing marriage, but there is a pressing question of improving its conditions." (p. 2).

Bridgenorth waits for the day when 'deeds of partnership will replace the old vows'. He receives love letters from an unknown Incognita Appassionata who wants him to 'meet her in heaven'. He maintains platonic love with the unknown lady who is afterwards

---

1 - Referring to his own infatuation with May Morris, Shaw says that on his first seeing her, he became "immediately conscious that a Mystic Betrothal was registered in heaven, to be fulfilled when all material obstacles should melt away." Minney, R. J. - Recollections of George Bernard Shaw (Prentice Hall, New Jersey, 1969), p. 30.
known to be Mrs George and she insists on his keeping up the spell by not trying to meet her. All these have reference not to the preface, but to Shaw's own personal life. Mrs Bridgenorth is a conventional lady who does not understand the marriage laws, but insists that marriage must continue in order to keep the world peopled.

When Bishop Bridgenorth says that kinds of marriage widely differ in the British empire, he only echoes Shaw's own arguments in the preface. When the Bishop says to Lesbia that quarrelling is the British family life, he only voices what Shaw says in the preface about the family life. In the preface Shaw maintains that home life is a danger to the nation because of "its narrow views, its unnaturally sustained and spitefully jealous concupiscences, its pretty tyrannies, its false social pretences, its endless grudges and squabbles..." (p. 8). Love letters to Bridgenorth are read out to him at breakfast by his wife. This has reference to Shaw's own life; however Shaw contends in the preface that marriage must not bar human relations of married partners with other people of the rest of the world.

Edith Bridgenorth and Cecil Sykes arrange to get married, but on the eve of marriage, they decide to back out from their decision to the astonishment of all, the reason being that two revolutionary pamphlets, one by Balfort Bax and the other by an

1 - Shaw's affair with Ellen Terry was a Platonic one. Though they were "all the time within a shilling hansom ride of one another's doors", still they did not see one another in private for fear of spoiling the illusion. Minney, R. J. - Recollections of George Bernard Shaw, 1969, p. 35.

an unknown lady fall into their hands and awaken them to the horrors of the conventional marriage. They come to realise that the conventional system of marriage conflicts with human nature, curbs individual freedom, forces people of opposite nature to live together to the loss of both and provides no escape route for the partners when they find joint life impossible. They proceed to draw up a deed of contract for their marriage. Edith insists on inclusion of a condition that Cecil must allow her a monthly pay against her house-keeping. This is in keeping with the argument in the preface where Shaw has advocated placing of "work of a wife and mother on the same footing as any other work" (p. 43). After they draw up the deed of settlement, they discover that the deed cannot cover up all their difficulties. They at last find a solution in the provisions of The British Family Insurance corporation which "insures against poor relations and all sorts of family contingencies". Dr Sen Gupta has asked in this connection whether the play is an advertisement on behalf of the insurance corporation. The preface does not speak of a solution of this kind. This is simply a flight of imagination by Shaw in search of a solution to the varied and complicated problems of conjugal life. It would be a highly unpleasant and embarrassing task for the husband (or any of the partners) to pay money in advance as premiums against a possible separation without knowing when it would come. A system of divorce with the minimum of financial loss and mental trouble would be welcome to all.

A representative couple of conventional marriage is Mr Collins the Alderman and greengrocer and his wife Matilda Collins.

Alderman Collins, a sociable and jovial fellow, is tied down to an utterly conventional wife - a 'regular old hen' who likes to 'have her family within sight of her'. She is a 'born wife and mother' because of which Collins's children all ran away from home (p. 548). She does not know anything beyond family life. She is 'like a bird born in a cage, that would die if you let it loose in the woods' (p. 548). Shaw says in the preface, "Slaves are very often much more comfortable both in body and mind than fully responsible free men. That does not excuse anybody for embracing slavery" (p. 38). She bores her husband to the extreme who puts off 'running away till the next time' with great patience. According to Collins, his wife is "hardly a responsible human being out of her house, except when she's marketing" (p. 549). In the preface Shaw says, "A wife entirely preoccupied with her affection for her husband, a mother entirely preoccupied with her affection with her children, may be all very well in a book (for people who like that kind of book); but in actual life she is a nuisance" (p. 9). Shaw also has noted how modestic manners when taken into general society, can find people "without a friend or even an acquaintance in the world" (p. 25). The marriage for Mr Collins has become a life-long problem of toleration.

Leo and Reginald Bridgenorth are a couple that know the limits and dangers of conventional marriage - both come into sharp conflict with the laws of conventional marriage. Leo falls in love with Hotchkiss, a regular visitor to her house and a past-master in philandering. She is mistaken about the philandering nature of Hotchkiss's love and goes to the extent of obtaining a divorce from Reginald in order to marry Hotchkiss, but Hotchkiss, in turn,
is in love with Mrs George, a most wonderfully interesting, passionate and 'intensely alive' woman. She decides to leave her husband for his 'low tastes' as expressed in his allegedly illicit relation with a 'poor' and 'hateful' lady. Before long, Leo discovers that she is equally in love with both her husband and Hotchkiss and expresses her desire to marry both as a polyandrist if law will only allow her. She says to the general, "Well, I love them both. I should like to marry a lot of men. I should like to have Rejby for every day, and Sinjon for concerts and theatres and going out in the evenings, and some great austere saint for about once a year at the end of the season, and some perfectly blithering idiot of a boy to be quite wicked with." (p. 555). This shows that she believes in the philosophy of changing partners in accordance with the varied moods and necessities of human life. Shaw has noted in the preface, "The impersonal relation of sex may be judiciously reserved for one person; but any such reservation of friendship, affection, admiration, sympathy and so forth is only possible to a wretchedly narrow and jealous nature" (p. 25).

Leo expects Reginald, her first husband, to remain a visitor and friend to her after her marriage to Hotchkiss. However, she is disappointed when Hotchkiss declares to her that he has fallen in love with Mrs George and he "would rather have one of her bootlaces than a lock of her hair" (p. 585). Leo learns a lesson that philandering is not something for which one should throw over one's husband. She decides to go back to her earlier wedlock with Reginald and asks Reginald to get their 'odious decree' of divorce annulled. Reginald who also believes in extra-marital passion decides to overlook his wife's passion for Hotchkiss as
a passing phase and continue conjugal life as before. In the preface Shaw maintains that marriage is not a 'magic spell' to turn the husband and wife into permanently unshakable lovers. Shaw says that the so-called intimacy and affectionate relation which is supposed to exist between the husband and wife can also exist "between entire strangers, different in language, color, tastes, class, civilization, morals, religion, character, in everything, in short, except their bodily homology and the reproductive appetite common to all living organisms" (p. 21).

Hotchkiss and Mrs George form the most vivacious, most conscious and most interesting pair in the play. Though Hotchkiss loves her intensely, he has not been able to make Mrs George seek divorce from her husband, because Mrs George will have him not as a husband, but as friend who would amuse her husband with his pleasant company and lively talk. Hotchkiss, an advanced thinker on sexual relations rejects Christian morality of marriage in favour of humane relationship with Mrs George, but under no circumstances he would betray Mr George whom he regards as his friend. As Hotchkiss says to Soames, "To disbelieve in marriage is easy; but to betray a comrade, to be disloyal to a host, to break the covenant of break and salt, is impossible" (p. 588). For Mrs George, her husband is the pole star in her life that will never change. As she says to Hotchkiss, "Other men may come and go; but George goes on for ever." (p. 577). Hotchkiss condemns the traditional morality of marriage which seeks to cut off a married couple from all human relations with other people. He says, "I

1 - Shaw declared that none of his friendships with women whose husbands were alive was ever of adulterous kind. Ivor Brown, Shaw in His Time (Nelson, London, 1967), p. 80.
loathe the whole marriage morality of the middle classes with all my instincts" (p. 588). It is with full conscience that he determines to remain a friend to her and Mrs George also accepts him as her friend and both decide to continue their relationship as a kind of 'Christian fellowship'. Mrs George finds it 'refreshing' to have met once in her life a man who is not 'frightened by her wedding ring'. All these are in conformity with Shaw's contention in the preface where he says that conjugal relation cannot embrace all other 'high human relation' (p. 21).

Boxer Bridgenorth, the ex-General, has been in love with Lesbia Grantham whose attitude to love and marriage are sharply different from each other. The General, 'a sentimental noodle', who keeps on wearing uniform and medals to show the importance of his past profession, is far beneath Lesbia Grantham in intellectual capacity. He is an idiot who does not know the intricacies of the institution of marriage. Lesbia Grantham is fully aware as to how the conventional marriage curbs individual liberties and that is why she decides not to get married at all. She wants to bear children without a legal husband, that is to say, she will have none in her house to dominate over her and curb her personal freedom. She says, "I want children; and I want to devote myself entirely to my children, and not to their father. The law will not allow me to do that; so I have made up my mind to have neither husband nor children" (p. 551). She objects to the General's smoking, but the General fails to give up the habit. She cannot stand 'the great lout of a man smoking 'all over her place'. She is 'proud of her independence and jealous for it'. Hence, she decides to remain her own mistress and a 'glorius
In the preface Shaw has made out a strong case for unmarried motherhood and comments, "The best mothers are not those who are so enslaved by their primitive instincts that they will bear children no matter how hard the conditions are, but precisely those who place a very high price for their services, and are quite prepared to become old maids if the price is refused." (p. 18).

Soames in the play upholds orthodox Christian views on marriage. He insists on maintaining the 'sacredness of marriage' and calls extra-marital relationship a 'deadly sin'. When Soames calls Mrs George a 'sinner', Mrs George defends herself saying, "...Never in all my life have I done anything that was not ordained for me. (More quietly) I've been myself. I've not been afraid of myself..." (p. 582). The Christian view of sex and marriage has been elaborately discussed in the preface and there Shaw has shown how Christianity has failed to provide people with a realistic line on the marriage question.

The play has been subject to criticism for its weak dramatisation and lack of necessary action. However, as far as link between the play and the preface is concerned, the play could be said to be well-linked with the preface because the preface offers substantial links by its thematic and background accounts.

Misalliance was written in 1910 and the sixty one-page preface (Ed. Hamlyn ed.) to the play entitled Parents and Children appears to be written in the same year. This is one of the most important prefaces as far as Shavian belief or philosophy is concerned. The preface could be called a Shavian manifesto on children's relation with parents and society. The preface exhorts people to view children as fresh agents of the Life Force that creates new and
newer human beings for its purpose of achieving complete self-realisation. The preface forbids parents to mould the character of their children after their fancy figure. It views family ideal as a humbug and rejects the traditional system of school-teaching. Among the other important matters discussed in the preface are taboos in school teaching, teaching of toleration, voluntary education, inculcation of adventurous spirit in life, the difference between the ways of life of children and adults, providing children with books of art and assumption of realistic attitude to life. The preface provides a complete set of guidelines for bringing up children.

Johnny and Hypatia are brother and sister from the same parents, the Tarletons of Tarleton's Underwear. Though they belong to the same parents, they are poles apart in character and way of thinking. Shaw wants to show that the same family and the same parents cannot produce the same sort of children. Johnny Tarleton, the son of John Tarleton, is a conventional fellow, a man of the rut. His sister is totally unlike him and a rebel against bourgeois morality. She is 'tired of good manners' and 'fed up with nice things; with respectability, with propriety.' She wants to live and live abundantly instead of 'being good and nice and ladylike' (p. 618).

While Johnny Tarleton is 'all body and no brains', Bentley Summerhays, the sensitive son of Lord Summerhays, is 'all brains and no more body than is absolutely necessary'. Though Lord Summerhays is 'the strongest man' of England', still his son, though intelligent and sensitive, is a 'weakling' physically. The difference among the children on the one hand and the difference
between the parents and the children on the other justifies Shaw's contention in the preface that every child is an experiment in the hands of the Life Force (pp. 46, 47, 71). The portrait of Hypatia is the portrait of a girl determined to assert her will and independence at all costs. The preface has strongly advocated in favour of uncurbed growth of children. "A child should begin to assert itself early, and shift for itself more and more not only in washing and dressing itself, but in opinions and conduct" (p. 78). Hypatia dislikes the idle talk of their parents and the elders. She wants business, she wants action. An uncontrollable hunger for action makes her wild and restless. Lord Summerhays makes love to her without knowing that she is in love with his son. When she exposes him he calls her a "a glorious young beast" (p. 619). She regards all these as of some meaning in a house where there is only idle talk. Bentley and Hypatia are said to be in love with each other, but before this develops into a marriage, Bentley is brought into the house of the Tarletons and put on trial in order to see the feasibility of having him as a married partner. But it is seen that she considers him as a baby that asks for her love. When Joey Percival lands into the house of the Tarletons, Hypatia madly falls in love with him. She throws modesty and prudery to winds and invites him to a chase-and-kiss game with her in the heather. While her brother Johnny supports conventional morality, Hypatia goes on flouting it. Shaw says in the preface, "A nation should always be healthily rebellious" (p. 78). Being snubbed by Mina Scezepanowska, both Johnny and Lord Summerhays foolishly agree that economic independence should not be allowed to women. When
Johnny says that an open mind in matters of business is wrong, Hypatia wishes that Johnny should have been born an animal so that he could remain mute. The difference between Hypatia and Johnny supports Shaw's contention in the preface that blood relations should not be seen separately from the natural human relations. According to the preface, the day is not far off when men would deny any such relationship. Shaw says in the preface, "But to have a person imposed on us as a brother merely because he happens to have the same parents is unbearable when, as may easily happen, he is the sort of person we should carefully avoid if he were any one else's brother" (p. 91). Shaw is in favour of ignoring blood relationship. He says, "The civilized man has no special use for cousins; and he may presently find that he has no special use for brothers and sisters" (p. 92). Hypatia revolts against the institutions of family, home, parents, and says sneeringly, "Oh, home! home! parents! family! duty! how I loathe them! How I'd like to see them all blown to bits!" (p. 618).

John Tarlston, the cynical head of the family and an advanced thinker, seems to have no faith in the bourgeois institutions. He is a father who favours free growth of his daughter without any interference from his side. His procedure of bringing up his daughter has been in his own words, "let her read what she likes, let her do what she likes, let her go where she likes" (p. 619). Tarlston's view of bringing up children is in conformity with what Shaw has propagated in the preface. Shaw maintains in the preface, "If you once allow yourself to regard a child as so much material for you to manufacture into any shape that happens to suit your fancy you are defeating the experiments of the Life Force" (p. 50). Discarding interference of any kind, Shaw says, "Every child has
the right to its bent" (p. 50). When Lord Summerhays asks Tarleton whether he knows his children, he answers that he is not sure of that. When children grow to the stage where they acquire a sense of decency, the relation between parents and children becomes practically over. Even an advanced thinker like Tarleton who allows his daughter Hypatia too much individual liberty, is shocked by the realities of her adventures with Joey Parcival, as if his progressiveness was not enough. When he comes to know that his advanced views about the growth of children are outdistanced by the realities, he exclaims, "No man should know his child. No child should know its father. Let the family be rooted out of civilization. Let the human race be brought up in institutions." (p. 642). The bitter truth that Tarleton realizes in the play has been voiced by Shaw in the preface, "The family ideal is humbug and a nuisance: one might as reasonably talk of the barrack ideal or the forecastle ideal..." (p. 93). Similar view has been expressed in the preface to Getting Married where Shaw has said, "If a family is not achieving the purposes of a family it should be dissolved just as a marriage should, when it, too, is not achieving the purposes of marriage" (p. 42).

When Lina Scezepanowska lands at the house of the Tarletons, along with Percival, all the male persons get carried off by her beauty and personality. She is an incarnation of vitality, a child of adventure. For full one hundred and fifty years it has been the tradition of her family to risk life daily in some dangerous work. Her crashing down into the garden of the Tarletons along with aviator Percival is one of the numerous adventures of hers. Her character is in perfect consonance with Shaw's advice
to the young people "Do something that will get you into trouble"  
She symbolises Shaw's conception of the ideal boss type character.  
She is independent, energetic, mistress of her own self, and 
erner of her own bread. She is representation of what a woman 
can be when free growth is allowed. She is symbol of revolt 
against the bourgeois institutions of marriage, family, filial 
duty and the bourgeois illusions about family.  

She is a born risk-taker: she takes inordinate risks, not 
only to live, but to live abundantly. In the preface to 
Misalliance Shaw says, "A man who is not free to risk his neck as 
an aviator or his soul as a heretic, is not free at all" (p. 68).
Lina is a genius who is singleminded in risking her life daily in 
some frightful adventures and see what she is capable of. Shaw 
says in the same preface, "But people who are not educated to 
live dangerously have only half a life, and are more likely to 
die miserably after all than those who have taken all the common 
risks of freedom from their childhood onward as a matter of 
course" (p. 80).

Lina rises far above the ordinary sexual passions of love 
and her love has taken the shape of the love of adventure. She 
is all that a vitalist woman is capable of becoming. All the male 
characters, irrespective of their age and relationship, namely, 
John Tarleton, his son Johnny Tarleton, Lord Summerhayes and his 
son, Bentley Summerhayes fall in love with her and propose to her 
within the brief period of her stay. Lina indicts them all in 
biting terms and her indictment is the indictment of two genera-
tions of people belonging to bourgeois culture and civilization.

1 - The Preface to Fanny's First Play (The Complete Prefaces 
It is false bourgeois tradition and culture that have made them unable to think beyond sexual passion. In the preface to *Getting Married* Shaw says that love is a tyranny requiring special safeguards and cases of "chronic lifelong love, whether sentimental or sensual, ought to be sent to the doctor" (p. 37). Lina declares to their faces that she would stoop to the ugliest possible level of life sooner than barter her life of action and adventure for an idle romantic love with the agents of the rotten bourgeois world. She goes away with intelligent but inexperienced Bentley with a view to converting him to her religion of adventure.

Joey Percival, a fellow adventurer of Lina Sczepanowska's, gets involved with vitality-girl Hynpatia and decides to marry her 'blindfolded' because he believes that sex is impersonal. Shaw also has said about the impersonal nature of sex in the preface to *Getting Married* (pp. 21-24). Percival also claims the benefit of being educated by three fathers. In the prefaces to *Getting Married* (p. 9) and *Misalliance* (pp. 50, 93) Shaw has spoken about the benefits of the large families and also in the preface to *Getting Married* he has spoken about the utilities of having too many parents. He says, "There is something to be said for the polygynous and polyandrous house-hold as a school for children; children really do suffer from having too few parents" (p. 41).

As regards the Gunner episode in the play Dr Sen Gupta has asked, "The situation is certainly interesting, but what connexion has it with the main theme of the play; Parents and Children?"

---

The fact is that Shaw refused to be content with dramatising a simplified story of the relation between parents and children. The texture of the fabric of human life is composed of diverse threads; Shaw would concentrate on the relation between the parents and children, but that would naturally get intertwined with other matters, in his naturalistic presentation of life. The Gunner episode shews up a bourgeois great man who conceals from others a shady past. Socialist Gunner, who is full of praise for the revolutionary activities in Russia, gives out two shocking secrets one about John Tarleton, the father and the other about Hyapatia, the daughter. It is alleged that John Tarleton had a tragic love affair with one Lucinda Titmus which ultimately destroyed her; again Hyapatia has a chase-and-kiss game with Joey Percival in the heather without the knowledge of her father. Shaw discusses in the preface how different taboos inhibit the relation between the parents and children because of which they cannot discuss among themselves their personal matters. Tarleton himself knew that there stands "a wall ten feet thick and ten miles high between parent and child" and the relation between parents and children is never 'innocent'. Still philosophical Tarleton is shocked to learn of his daughter's indecent but adventurous chase-and-kiss game with Percival in the woods. By bringing to light Tarleton's tragic love affair with Lucinda Titmus that led to her destruction and Hyapatia's chase-and-kiss game with a surprise visitor, Gunner has caused the relation between parents and children to be seen in a new light. In the preface to Misalliance Shaw says that he and his mother lived together until he was forty two years old, still when his mother died he realized that he knew "very little about her" (p.89)
Thus, it would be seen that Misalliance is not only connected with its preface Parents and Children, but also with the preface to Getting Married and the link can be said to be based on the thematic and background accounts given in the said prefaces.

Fanny's First Play written in 1911 has a short preface. It comments on the theme of the play and serves as guideline. The preface says that society has substituted custom for conscience in the name of morality. Morality has to be revised in tune with the pace of time. When that is not done, morality gets reduced to certain habits which are maintained by the members of society that do not care to know whether they are right or wrong. The habit of repeating what was done previously in the name of morality creates a condition of stagnation in society. There is a crying necessity for breaking the stalemate and create an atmosphere of change for the progress of society. Hence, Shaw's advice to the young generation is—'Do something that will get you into trouble'. However, Shaw is aware that the principle of getting into trouble involves certain hazards. The problem is that of combining loss of respectability with integrity of selfrespect. Shaw has observed in the preface that our middle-class people are already as dead as mutton and he does not like to see the dead people walking about.

Robbin Gilbey and Mr Knox are two 'respectable' business partners who are anxious to maintain their 'respectable' standard in society. But their children, with their unco-operative attitude have caused them greatest worry. Bobby Gilbey and Margaret Knox are engaged to be married, but the plans are upset by their unusual behaviour. Bobby makes the acquaintance of one Miss Delany Dora and soon gets into trouble. Dora takes too
much of champagne and goads Holy Joe into a sprinting business in Jamaica Square. Dora knocks the helmet off a policeman on the latter's failure to give certain information and the sprinting begins. Holy Joe makes good his escape, but Bobby and Dora are nabbed and put to jail on charges of assault on the police, disorderly behaviour and exchanging hats. Both Bobby and Dora are sentenced to imprisonment, the former for a month and latter for a fortnight.

On the other hand, Margaret Knox makes the acquaintance of a Frenchman, Duavallet by name, and gets into a worse trouble with the police. On a boat-race night they dance together and drink champagne. A melee occurs following the unruly behaviour of the Oxford and Cambridge students in which Duavallet and Margaret take part. Duavallet swings his 'leg like a windmill' and knocks a policeman down and Margaret gets in a bang on the face of another policeman and removes two teeth of his. Duavallet is sentenced to imprisonment for a fortnight and Margaret for a month.

These two incidents greatly unnerve and upset their 'respectable' parents, because it is not 'respectable' to have children in and out of the jail. Gilbey is perturbed at letting down 'respectability' and 'right reason'. Knox is greatly put out at the 'disgrace and shame' of the 'hussy' of his daughter. Knox can no more maintain his high brow attitude in front of Vines & Jackson who were refused permission to put up hygenic corset advertisement on the window. Thus, both the families fear being social outcasts.

Dora, the girl-friend of Bobby Gilbey is a vivacious young woman who follows only the dictates of her own heart. She claims
to have educated Bobby who is brought up too strictly by his parents, and in her hands he is no longer a 'mollycoddle'. According to her it was 'dull for him at home'.' She says that she is 'all the better for being kept a bit quiet' in the jail (Act I, p. 661). Margaret is not the least repentent of the incident or the disgrace of imprisonment; rather she is proud of the whole affair. She does not mind the ruthless police action and claims to have slept 'sounder' in the cell than she ever did at home. She admits that her experience has been like a 'sort of descent into hell'. The so-called 'respectability' of her class is 'pretending, pretending, pretending' and she is proud of having it 'knocked out' of her. She says to Bobby that her part in the incident was done in one of her 'religious fits'. She confides to her mother that a prayer meeting inspired her to behave in that violent manner with the police. She further says that her violent part in the incident was 'glorious' and 'so real satisfactory' to her (Act II, p. 667).

The character of Bobby Gilbey is a bit different from those of Dora and Margaret. The strict parental rule leaves a permanent mark on his character. He is dogged by inhibitions regarding good conduct and finds it difficult to approve of girl's violent action against the police and going to jail. He does not think that she is 'that sort of girl'. He also does not approve of Margaret's talking of 'religion in connection with it' (Act III, p. 671).

In the preface Shaw has said that blind adherence to morality as the test of conduct without caring to know its relevance or appropriateness has created a deadening stalemate in society. So, Shaw feels that the young had better awaken their
soul "by disgrace, capture by the police, and a month's hard labour" than drift along in the usual manner. Both Bobby and Margaret defy accepted rules of conduct and wound the respectability of their parents by unruly behaviour and consequent arrest and imprisonment. The play, dramatises the conflict between the forces of vitality and those of stagnation. The young people in the play, namely, Dora, Margaret and Duvallet are the agents of vitality and the parents with the exception of Mrs Knox are the puppets of traditional morality, customs and habits. In the preface to Misalliance Shaw has dwelt on the importance of defiance of convention and custom for the sake of progress and says, "A nation must be healthily rebellious" (p. 78). Shaw emphasizes the importance of responsive vitality in children. He says, in the same preface, "Such unamiable precepts as Always contradict an authoritative statement, Always return a blow, Never lose a chance of good fight, When you are scolded for a mistake ask the person who scolds whether he or she supposes you did it on purpose, and follow the question with a blow or an insult or some other unmistakable expression of resentment, Remember that the progress of the world depends on your knowing better than your elders are just as important as those of the Sermon on the Mount" (p. 78). This sort of responsiveness is seen in the children in the play in their encounters with the police. These encounters also have shown how the free children behave and brave dangers. A sense of freedom and adventure has to be infused into children so that they become capable of spiritual adventure and challenging ideas. To quote Shaw in the same preface, "A man who is not free to risk his neck as an aviator or his soul as a heretic is not free at all; and
the right to liberty begins, not at the age of 21 years but of 21 seconds" (p. 68).

When Dora says that Bobby Gilbey is no longer a 'molly-coddle' in her hands, she only echoes what Shaw has said in the preface to Misalliance. He says, "In practice what happens is that parents notice that boys brought up at home become molly-coddles, or prigs, or duffers, unable to take care of themselves" (p. 78). Shaw portrays Dora and Margaret Knox as characters guided by the Life Force or vitality-Inspiration. When Mrs Gilbey asks Dora why she changed hats with Bobby Gilbey she answers, "I don't know. One does, you know" (Act I, p. 662). Again when Mrs Knox asks her daughter Margaret Knox how the incident began she replies, "Oh, I don't know" (Act II, p. 665). Thus, both appear to be moved not by reason, but by vitality-Inspiration. In the preface to Misalliance Shaw says that every "child feels the drive of the Life Force (often called the Will of God)" and other persons cannot "feel it for him" (p. 50).

Duavallet praises the English way of life because in England people have made an end of the despotism of parent and there is no family council and everywhere in these islands one can enjoy the exhilarating, the soul liberating spectacle of men quarrelling with their brothers, defying their fathers, refusing to speak to their mothers" (Act I, p. 679). This has reference to what Shaw says in the preface to Misalliance about the necessity of inculcating the rebellious spirit in children (p. 78).

In the brief preface to Fanny’s First Play, Shaw has referred to Mrs Knox and says that through her mouth he has delivered the judgement of God. Mrs Knox says that people like Gilbeys and Knoxes who form the bulk of the society are
unthinking slaves of conventional morality and morality means for them only certain habits. They are incapable of distinguishing the right from the wrong. When their 'habits' are upset, they feel disjointed. They have nothing to hold to at the moment of their fall. They have no 'religion', no 'inner light' to guide them. The preface has nothing to say about the satire on the critics in the Induction and the Epilogue attached to the play. Shaw's advice to the young people in the prefatory note, 'Do something that will get you into trouble' has been dramatised beautifully in the play. The comments on morality in the preface have a direct bearing on the play. The preface, though a brief one, has both thematic and guideline importance. Desmond MacCarthy also observes that in the prefatory note, "unlike most of his prefaces" Shaw has gone "straight to the point of the play itself".¹

However the short preface is not sufficiently expressive of the Shavian philosophy expressed in the play. It will be seen from the discussion made above that one has got to refer to the preface to Misalliance called Parents and Children for a better and clearer understanding of the play, because in that preface alone Shaw has exhaustively dealt with the parent and children question.