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Introduction

The political philosophy of Bernard Shaw had great influence on the thought of two generations of Englishmen. He helped to develop the guiding philosophy of the British Labour Party, and to furnish it with a program. He helped to change socialism from a creed for wild-eyed revolutionaries, to a set of constitutional measures which the most respectable members of any class might support. Shaw saw many of his pet reforms change in status from utopian dreams to the law of the land.

Even though Shaw's political ideas remain current, his reputation has steadily waned from the high point it reached before the first World War, when many progressive social thinkers acknowledged debts to Shaw for their political ideas. Because of the controversial stands he took on foreign affairs, Shaw was considered eccentric and superficial.

It is the purpose of this study to sort out the various strands of Shaw's political thought, to discuss his contribution to Fabianism and his shift from liberal ideals to approbation of Fascism and his final shift back to liberalism. This paper proceeds on the hypothesis that Shaw's statements on foreign affairs were not irresponsible, but that they were grounded in his profound belief in socialism, that he never would have endorsed Fascism had he not believed it a short-cut to socialism, which would resolve itself into representative government.

This study will attempt to evaluate Shaw's political philosophy, not so much in terms of its originality, because Shaw claimed
freely admitted his debt to John Stuart Mill, Henry George, Karl Marx and others; but in terms of its influence on political movements, as well as its contribution to morality.

This study falls into five chapters; discussing the underlying moral philosophy; Shaw's socialism as a contribution to Fabianism; later manifestations of his socialism; Shaw's foreign policy; and the final statement of Shaw's political philosophy, in which he restated his socialist aims, and came to terms with democracy.

This paper maintains that Shaw's contribution to political thought and development is presently being undervalued, that Shaw was a great adapter and popularizer of political ideas, that he made the moral basis of socialism clear by illustrating the human problems behind economic graphs and statistics; that he made it difficult for anyone who came in contact with his writings, ever again to divorce politics and economics from social conditions.
Chapter 1. Shaw's Moral Philosophy

Political economy, as Shaw saw it, was not a study divorced from social conditions or moral issues; but it was, instead, inextricably bound up with both, emanating from the former, and depending on the latter for direction and judgment.

Shaw's moral philosophy is basic to his political theories; it dictates his concept of human nature, and with it the political accomplishments man is capable of. His belief that human nature was capable of infinite improvement, dictated Shaw's choice of socialism as his political philosophy.

Shaw's socialism was advanced at first, as a creed in itself. Its moral tenets seemed to be self-evident propositions: Socialism merely extended the truths of democracy to their logical conclusions; if political equality were right, then social inequality which makes political equality impossible, is clearly a wrong.

If social democracy is merely the extension of political democracy, it is, nevertheless, an intensely moral creed. Shaw recognized that all of the critical judgments which socialists made of capitalist institutions and capitalist morality, were not scientific, but moral in essence. He called Karl Marx, who was supposed to be purely scientific, an old testament prophet.

His first reaction to his discovery that Marx was a moralist rather than a scientist, was that he could improve on Marx, and make socialism a scientific preoccupation divorced from all judgments of good and evil. He stated in a letter to Hyndman, the head of the Marxist Social Democratic Federation, that in contra-
distinction to Marx, he was a natural history student who felt no more indignation against Rockefeller and Cecil Rhodes, than against a dog chasing a fox. He thought he was remaining morally aloof by calling capitalists poor devils rather than sinners.

Shaw was able to stay unemotional in his politics, but that was quite different from preaching socialism without value judgments. Even though he did not call for revenge on capitalists out of indignation at the conditions they had wrought among the masses, as Marx did, Shaw grew to recognize the moral basis of his political stand. When social conditions did not change immediately upon receiving the truth from the Fabian society, Shaw took another profounder look at human nature. Furthermore, he grew to view with horror the nihilism inherent in the kind of materialistic universe which Darwin had posited, and enlightened thinkers hailed with joy.

Shaw was not a Christian. He was convinced that Christianity was a false theology, but he recognized the existence of religious truth. When the Darwinians hailed the freedom of an atheistic universe, Shaw felt that they had been released from more than superstitious enslavement; they had abolished moral criteria as well. Shaw's moral philosophy is an attempt to re-establish the existence of valid moral criteria for mankind.

Without a code of moral absolutes, man has no springs to action, for no reform can be justified, no retrogression scored; no political ideal established. Without moral absolutes, there is no justification in holding Socrates any better than the idlest member of the British aristocracy. All qualities are neutral, equally valueless. Socialism can have no moral advantage over capitalism. Where right and wrong are not clearly established, all political
systems are equal.

Militism, therefore, is poor metaphysical equipment for anyone who wants to be a critic of institutions. Criticism implies a standard of established values, necessary to taking a political or moral stand in society.

Shaw was a political and social reformer. He recognized the value of skepticism as a tool of criticism, and used it readily to deflate illusions and outworn concepts, but his skepticism was grounded in a set of values he believed to be universal.

Shaw’s moral philosophy is implicit in all of his early political writing, because socialism is moralism. His later plays, however, are the vehicle for most of his explicit moral ideas. He made his famous attack on the social and moral side of Darwinism in his play, “Back to Methuselah”, which was written in Shaw’s period of deepest disillusionment with constitutionalism, after the lost peace of 1919.

The doctrine of God and the universe which Shaw offers to replace both outworn Christianity and unworkable nihilism, is basic to all of Shaw’s political writing. His belief in the Life Force is the essence of his idea of political leadership. Shaw’s morality is a political morality, of and in this world.

Shaw was highly critical of the Darwinians who had enthusiastically accepted the creed of scientific materialism believing that casting away religion was synonymous with progress. He sympathized with their intention, but he points out that the alternative which they joyfully accepted as the new freedom, was a mindless, soulless universe of blind will, which could account for progress
only as the accidental result of biological mutation, for moral values, only as baseless illusions.

The nature of the Darwinian universe was not immediately apparent to his joyful followers because they believed that Darwin had unearthed an automatic law of progress, working in the universe; those best adapted to their environment survive the struggle for existence, and those not so well adapted die out. This point, along with Darwin's evidence that the higher species evolved out of the lower, seemed proof enough that there is a steady march of progress in the world.

Shaw points out that Darwin was no philosopher, that he drew no moral conclusions from his biological theories, and that he was not even aware that he had a quarrel with Christianity. He was unaware of the moral nihilism intrinsic to a world where there could be no free will, no self-control, only blind strife; that such a world could contain no moral significance; that good and evil could be nothing more than illusory appearances in the constant struggle of bare survival.

Although the Neo-Darwinians chose to ignore these implications of Scientific Materialism, and to concentrate instead, on the comfortable idea of automatic progress; Shaw saw them hovering over a bottomless pit. Furthermore, he felt that they were accepting a gross over-simplification of the nature of the universe. He pointed out that a mechanical interpretation of evolution cannot account for the survival of anything except by its superiority in terms of brute force, that it denied the validity of facts as obvious as the intelligence of animals.
Finally, he appealed to the spiritual instincts of the humanitarians and intellectuals who were grinding their axes on Scientific Materialism, along with militarists, individualists, and anarchists, in pointing out to them that if Darwinian evolution were all there is to the process of the universe, then:

The stars of heaven, the showers and dew, the winter and summer, the fire and heat, the mountains and hills, may no longer be called to exalt the Lord with us by praise; their work is to modify all things by blindly starving and murdering everything that is not lucky enough to survive in the universal struggle for hogwash.

Shaw felt that the very fact that other values beside brute force figure in the universe was a refutation of Darwin.

The first World War shattered the general belief in automatic progress. The holocaust accentuated instead the nihilistic burden of Darwinism by seeming to prove that brute force is the only quality likely to survive in the struggle for existence. The bottomless pit over which Shaw declared that the Darwinian philosophy hovered, suddenly frightened everybody. Because Shaw saw that all ethics based on Darwinism were equally illusory, he foresaw a failure of nerve, a rush for values, when materialists discovered that they were unwittingly committed to nihilism, not progress. Shaw offered them a way back. He did not claim that Darwin's theory could be refuted. He asserted instead, that accounting for the manifold wonders of the universe, and the evidences of mind and planning manifest in the universe, Darwinism left more to coincidence than a rational mind should accept. He attacked the blind coarseness, the
shallow logic, and the inhumanity of Darwinism.

To correct the shallow logic, blind coarseness, and inhumanity, Shaw offered a spiritual dimension to the evolutionary process, and claimed that he was offering a new religion, for the twentieth century. He accepted the theory of Lamarck, which Darwin had for all biological purposes discredited: that evolutionary changes were effected by functional adaptation, in which the will played an active part; that if the celebrated giraffe needed a long neck to get food from tree tops, he stretched, and consciously developed his neck; that man abandoned his monkey tail because he stopped living in trees.

Samuel Butler had supported Lamarck against Darwin, not from biological interest, but because he argued that mind could not be banished from the universe, and Lamarck's way could save it. Evolution was all right as long as the species improved their form by striving to better themselves.

The German Philosophers ignored the biological controversy, and concerned themselves with the world as an idea, the universe as will. The will was the driving force in the universe. If evolution was its method, so much the better, but it was not terribly relevant.

Shaw combined the attitude of Butler, and the general principles of Schopenhauer in his philosophy of Creative Evolution! There is a conscious will in the evolutionary process; and the will is the creative force in the universe. The will, or the Life Force, as Shaw calls it, directs evolution to its own purposes. The Life Force is the creative impulse in the universe.
It is progress at work. It is the driving power behind genius. Whatever is good or great in society is the work of the Life Force. The Life Force works by the trial and error method, and some of its experiments are failures. It is in essence, raw, and undisciplined, and it achieves order and logic by entering into the human brain. The Life Force manifests itself in a chosen few human beings, a natural elite, a born aristocracy of leaders. Their purposes and careers are directed by the Life Force to its own ends, and through them, the Life Force realizes its plans for civilization.

According to Shaw, the existence of the Life Force is self-evident. A live body and a dead body are physically and chemically identical, and the difference between them can be accounted for only by a vital force. He finds it equally apparent that some people are more alive than others, that some men strive to create new wonders, and dream about worlds of which the average mind is hardly aware, that one group of men live for artistic and intellectual achievement, but that most people, even though they have the same physical endowments, remain a race apart, mere clods. The difference between the two groups is the Life Force at work, in the former. Only a small part of mankind is so endowed. Shaw sometimes speaks of a superior five percent. Although the Life Force animates all men to some degree, it chooses only a race of Gods to do its work. Progress does not concern itself with plow men. For them the geniuses will offer new and better ways of Life. They are the receivers, not the creators of the benefits of progress.
Shaw sketched this concept of society, in the Perfect Wagnerite in which he delineated three classes of men: the giants, dull, hard working, respectful, these are the workers; the gods who are the natural rulers of society, the dreamers who create the art, the religion, and the great thoughts of society; they are the elect whose hopes and dreams make life worth living; finally, there are the dwarves who connive to steal the product of the dull, honest giants and to live without working; they are the capitalists and the idle class created by capitalism. He pictures the ideal society where the giants and the gods cooperate to overthrow the dwarves, and together, create a paradise which gives material abundance to the giants and the chance for unlimited self realization to the able.

In his recognition of the scarcity and value of genius, Shaw did not lose sight of either the place or of the rights of the average man in society. What the genius creates, his self-realization has a social dimension. His achievement has merit in that it has value for society. What the Life Force is creating, is essentially good in the world.

This Life Force is Shaw's answer to nihilism, to blind materialism. It is Shaw's conception of how order, planning, and purpose, function in the universe, and how man shares in this universal consciousness. The Life Force expresses itself by means of the human brain, thus man's purpose is integrated with divine purpose.

To explain the Life Force in terms of Christianity, Shaw equates it with the Holy Ghost, which is not itself God, but is
a manifestation of God. The Life Force is not God, but it is not explicable as unconnected outcroppings of genius. It is a concerted drive toward God, forcing those in whom it works, to give up part of their own will to do its will.

The Life Force is not content with the present race of men. It is intent on breeding a race of supermen, eliminating all clods, through evolution. Shaw explains genius as a higher level of evolution. Thus the Life Force expresses itself in the sexual drive, forcing together superior men and women, sometimes against their own wills, to breed the children it wants.

Not all of the Life Force's attempts are successful. The Life Force is omnipotent only in the sense that there is no limit to its final achievement. The world is full of its unsuccessful experiments, because it is always struggling with matter and circumstances. Its accidents, therefore, have no moral significance. Everything which is part of nature is part of its purpose, but it moves like a pendulum, and the purpose is not steadily apparent.

The concept of the Life Force is important to Shaw's political philosophy because he believes that it is the driving force in politics as well as in nature. It is frustrated to a degree by the evil dwarves of capitalism, but it is the force on which all hope for political change can be based. Furthermore, the Life Force working through the elect minority, dictates a principle of political lead-
ership: only those motivated by the Life Force, doing the work of progress, are fit to be political leaders. This fact leaves the political problem one of discover-
ing who belongs to this elite, which is no respector of family, wealth or social position, and making them avail-
able for posts of leadership, and making these posts available to them.

Shaw considered the ethical problem, why is it better to be a philosopher, a tool of the Life Force, full of its turbulence and struggle, than to be a peace-
ful plowman, who lives as long, and without the same misgivings? His answer is that life's highest good is not placid happiness, but creativeness, in the service of mankind. The philosopher decides the course of events. He can never be bored, or die of discouragement, like ordinary men. He never wants to die because he is always learning, always creating things or wisdom. For the philosopher, there is always some new wonder, or some new hope; something to live for.  

Shaw's concept of the superman differs from that of Nietzsche, in his interpretation of the relationship of the genius and society. Where Nietzsche emphasized the freedom of the superman from obligations toward society, in his drive toward self realization, Shaw conceives the genius in terms of society. Genius is merely a higher stage of evolution, a precursor of what society will raise
itself to. It is the duty of genius to raise civilization by clarifying the advanced theories or dreams which motivate him.

In *Man and Superman*, which Shaw wrote in 1903, the first exposition of his philosophy of Creative Evolution, the whole ideal of perfection in human greatness is set forth by Don Juan in his discourse with the devil. Don Juan exemplifies the superman. He is completely rational. He has no illusions about himself or about the world. He is capable of neither sentimentality nor malice. He has no fear, in the ordinary sense, because he has done with pleasure, with seeking for happiness, with unreality, with playing, and pretending; and therefore he has none of the concerns of the average man whose fears are shadow fears.

His purpose is so consuming, so direct, that the conventional person mistakes for selfish egotism. He has no need to persuade himself that what is done can be undone by repentance, that what is true can be annihilated by a general agreement to call it alie because he deals only in reality. He is preoccupied with two ends, the contemplation of the ultimate meanings of life, and helping life in its struggle upwards.

Shaw never sees morality as the withdrawal to a realm of pure contemplation. The moral giant is always part of the world, and the importance of his work lies always in its application to the world. Shaw had no heaven or after-life
in his religion, thus, all the good that was to be done, would have to be done in this world. Even in his literary conception of an after-life, Shaw cannot quite see the value to pure contemplation without any worldly object. The realm of pure contemplation which is heaven, is never quite convincing, as paradise.

Shaw describes God, through the speeches of Don Juan, as a "Mind's eye, which sees not only the physical world, but the purpose of life." It is hard to distinguish between this conception of God, and that of the perfected individual whom Don Juan describes as "Omnipotent, omniscient, and infallible, a God". He says that the raw force of life builds up higher and better individuals, while it works toward an ideal individual. He says at another point that the Life Force is working toward God. If there is a confusion in this metaphysics, it does not seriously worry Shaw. Shaw is not essentially a metaphysician, and he does not work out the fine points of the nature and purpose of his deity. Instead, he sets him up as a convenient anchor for the values in which he believes, and as a shield against moral relativism. It is important to him, only that values be fixed. He willingly leaves the proof of their order, and their logical reconciliation to metaphysicians. With the Life Force as a principle of progress, and the deity toward which it
strives, as a universal principle of order, Shaw was satisfied that he had offered a real alternative both to nihilistic materialism, and to pseudo-christianity, as he called all of modern Christianity.

Shaw felt that the need for a living religion was imperative, not only to make the universe logical, but because he believed that only religion could make men thirst after righteousness. He said in the preface to Back To Methuselah, which was a restatement of the metaphysical concepts in Man and Superman, that:

Moral indifference will not guide nations through civilization to the establishment of the perfect city of God... The revival of civilization after the war cannot be effected by artificial breathing; the driving force of an undeluded popular consent is indispensable, and will be impossible until the statesmen can appeal to the vital instincts of the people in terms of a common religion.

Politically, then, moral indifference is too dangerous to be tolerated. Shaw believed that the moral tone of politics and public life had declined since the principles of Christianity had lost their general persuasiveness. He states that the fear of God is useful in politics because "It makes it possible for statesmen to come to a general understanding as to what God disapproves of." Without God, Shaw observed, that public opinion lost its sanctity. And he feared that as a result, common irreligion will destroy civilization unless it is countered by common religion.
Shaw is not agreeing with Voltaire's famous pronouncement that if there were no God, it would be necessary to invent him. He is saying instead, that without a popular religion which demonstrates eternal moral truths, civilization falls apart. When Christianity no longer embodies those truths, a new religion is needed. He asserted that Creative Evolution is already a religion, unmistakably the religion of the twentieth century, because it embodies the truths of morality and the truths of science, at the same time. He said that all that it needs to become a popular religion is its store of miracles and legends.

Shaw's religion rebels against the lulling precepts of Christianity. Shaw had no personal consolation to offer except the intellectual assurance that the world is orderly. Christianity had developed into a justification for the status quo. Shaw stated in "The Economic Basis of Socialism," that:

It was pleasant to believe that all's love and all's law, like Browning's David, that the chances we were too lazy to take in this world would come back to us in another, that it was pleasant to believe that a benevolent hand was guiding the steps of society, overruling all evil appearances for good, making poverty here the basis for great blessedness hereafter. It was pleasant to lose the sense of worldly inequality in the contemplation of our equality before God.9

In contrast, Shaw's concept of morality made human action the necessary condition for the expression of divine purpose.
His philosophy was essentially optimistic about human nature. He held not only that it could be changed for the better, but that where there is a will there is a way. Christianity and political conservatism share a conception of human nature: that there is evil basic to man's nature, and that human nature cannot be changed. The political corollary flowing from this hypothesis is that social experimentation is dangerous because it is more likely to release the base nature in man than to effect any improvement.

C. F. M. Joad claims that Shaw's epistemology embodies the same optimism as his metaphysics. Shaw's view of truth, according to Joad, refutes the novel and widely quoted claim of G. K. Chesterton that Shaw is a lay mystic. Joad points out that for Shaw, the truth is something which is close, clear, definite, and stateable. It is not the untranslatable, ineffable experience the apprehension of which sets the possessor outside of common experience. Instead, Shaw sees truth as factual, within reach of everyone, provided that everyone is sufficiently educated, and that the truth is clearly presented. Truth can be communicated, while for the mystic it cannot, and the problem at hand concerns not the nature of truth but the distribution of it; the need to bring it to public attention by stating it frequently and brilliantly enough. Joad points out that people who take this view of
truth are generally optimists because such an epistemology clears the road for action. There are no political or moral questions which cannot be overcome by promulgation of the truth, or which cannot be apprehended when promulgated. 10

Shaw's approach to the moral problem of good and evil is basic to his political philosophy. He holds that human nature is not basically depraved, that the evil is mostly the result of good intentions gone wrong.

When men do choose evil over good, his choice is due to irresponsibility. His answer for moral irresponsibility is that if men could be made to live long enough to reap the consequences of the evil they create, they would come to choose good over evil as a matter of self-preservation. This answer which he offers in "Back to Methuselah" was a kind of deferred optimism with which he reacted to the world war. It was the answer of a thoroughly optimistic man who had been almost completely disillusioned by the stupidity and folly of the governments of Europe.
He advanced his idea that men need longer lives in order to lead moral lives, in the play, "Back to Methuselah". In the play, the Life Force has realized that man needs a longer lifetime to come to his full maturity, and has consequently, created a long-lived race. A young girl of that race, says to an elderly gentleman of the short-lived race which still survives as an anachronism, "What does it matter to you whether a thing is true or not? Your flesh is as grass: You come up like a flower, and wither in your second childhood. A lie will last your time: It will not last mine. If I knew that I had to die in twenty years, it would not be worth my while to educate myself. I should not bother about anything but having a little pleasure while it lasted. It is not the number of years we have behind us but the number of years we have before us that makes us careful and responsible, and determined to find out the truth about everything."

She accuses the short-lived race of living as children governed by children, who make so many mistakes, and are so naughty that there is continual rebellion against them. As they can never convince their subjects that they are right, they can govern only by beating, imprisoning, torturing, or even killing their subjects, if the subjects disobey them without being strong enough to kill or torture their leaders.11

Shaw judged three centuries to be the length of life needed
by men to reach maturity which would create a society of
honesty and peace. In "Back to Methuselah", the first
century of life was passed in the sensual life, the
second century devoted to learning the techniques of
statecraft and wisdom, and the third was devoted to
the practice of statecraft and to contemplation, the lot of
philosopher kings. The "Tertiaries" are in possession of
the philosopher's stone, wisdom.

The foregoing is Shaw's vision of the ultimate, in
Creative Evolution, a kind of parable for the popular
religion he was trying to establish. He hoped that better
parables would leave his crude attempts as far behind as the
religious pictures of the fifteenth century left behind the
first attempts of the early Christian religious art. Shaw
believed that legends are indispensable, because they communi-
cate the truths of religion to those who cannot grasp them
otherwise. Without fictions, he states in the play's preface,
religious truths would be incomprehensible to the multitudes,
indeed, to anyone who was not a speculative thinker.

The solution which Shaw offers in "Back to Methuselah", for
men's moral and political improvement, mirrors Shaw's growing
dissillusionment with the political condition of England, and
with the possibility for the rapid establishment of constitu-
tional socialism in England. He had lost his turning conviction
that Britain would legislate the good society into existence,
as soon as the way was clearly shown.

William Irvine says that Shaw had hoped that the World War would end:

In a prosaic success achieved by Fabian common sense. What occurred was a Greek tragedy enacted in a mad house. 12

Shaw's disappointment at the outcome of the war was extreme. He felt the war itself had been caused by capitalism, and lost by democracy. It is generally agreed that the post war period marks the beginning of Shaw's distrust of democratic processes. His belief in progressive evolution had been tied to his belief in democracy, in its insistence on freedom of will, in its vision of a humanitarian society, in his essential concern for the multitudes who must not be cheated out of their rightful earnings, or of their rightful religious heritage. He stated that the naive people of towns and villages were cheated of their sense of religious awe, and in a sense, of their divine spark, when they ceased to believe in anything because Darwin had disproved the religious fictions in which they had placed full credence. A belief in democracy, paradoxically enough, underlay Shaw's conception of the elite, the natural aristocracy. His opinion of the elite was continually modified by an understanding of the limits of natural eminence. He recognized that an artist is pre-eminent among men just in so far as he is an artist, and that in every other respect he was
undifferentiated from the masses, and deserves no special treatment. Shaw's point that extraordinary men are ordinary in ninety-nine percent of their capacities, is an excellent check on runaway egotism on the part of leaders, and on anti-democratic demands for centralization of power and influence in the hands of superior men. Furthermore, he never mentioned the natural aristocracy of leadership without noting how natural it was, being no respecter of position. This is part of the democratic tradition of leadership: that all should have equal opportunity to come to the top, the choice should be dictated by the natural endowments of the aspirants to leadership.

Shaw's moral and philosophical beliefs became more important in his scheme of life, as he judged the political condition of Europe more and more hopeless. He looked to biological methods, set forth in "Back to Methuselah", to improve man's good sense, by developing longevity and increased self-consciousness. This was, in a sense, giving up his belief in the effectiveness of the political measures he had advocated with fervor, for thirty years. He never regained the optimism with which he viewed political events before 1914.

He found more life in the totalitarian governments which prevailed in Italy and Germany, than in the half-hearted democracy of England and France. He was ready to give credit to any strong man who ruled without sentimental liberalism, who
stated his governmental aims realistically instead of as romantic lies. Thus Shaw found Mussolini a strong man and an admirable one.

In spite of this admiration for brute force in politics, Shaw was morally, a humanitarian, and a democrat. His Fabianism, the belief in gradual socialism, without violence or confiscation, but by constitutional methods, reinstated itself in his writing, as dictators did violence to all his moral ideals. He lost even his desire to give the devil his due, when dictators showed themselves as moral nihilists.

His support of dictatorships constitutes a moral lapse as well as a failure to realize the true nature of those dictatorships; rather than a change of moral philosophy.

Shaw's moral philosophy suffers, like his political philosophy, from Shaw's inveterate desire to shock, to galvanize his reader into thought by outrageous over-statement of basically moderate opinions. His plea for a new faith, an intelligent creed, to combat mechanistic fatalism, loses some of its very real strength and persuasiveness when it is coupled with extravagant statements about the extreme cruelty of Darwinian experiments, the sadism of vivisectionists.

Shaw compounded his moral philosophy in a historical period of tragic disappointment. The World War was a terrible shock to anyone who believed in moral principles of universal decency and purpose. Shaw's moral judgment was
rocked by the failure of democratic principles and the apparent victory of anti-democratic force, but his intellectual honesty, his willingness to reverse judgments arrived at and stated, and his intense humanitarianism and religious sense of righteousness led him to reaffirm the principles of democracy, and to stand up for them against totalitarianism.

It is difficult to isolate any part of Shaw's philosophy from the rest. As a moralist, he was a political polemicist, a biologist, an economist, and a dramatic artist, and he brought arguments from each of these fields to bear on his ethics. He tended to merge all of his arguments into a bewildering display of intellectual virtuosity. Beneath his archness, in spite of his exasperation with people and history for not living up to his expectations of them, and in spite of his iconoclasm, Shaw had a strong sense of morality. If all who shared his political views shared the morality which underlay and dictated them, Socialism would be a religious sect. His iconoclasm was, in a large sense, conservatism. Shaw wanted to save the spiritual values which were being threatened by a no-longer spiritual Christianity, and by materialistic nihilism, and he felt that he had to demolish those shaky structures in order to build a safe temple for morality.
Chapter II. Shaw’s Contribution to Fabianism

Shaw’s moral philosophy of creative evolution is directly reflected in evolutionary socialism, the doctrine of the Fabian Society, in which Shaw played a leading part.

The Fabian Society which made itself the intellectual fountainehead of the British Labour Movement, owed much of its own inspiration to Bernard Shaw. Shaw persuaded those who were to become the most distinguished Fabians to join its ranks. He was responsible for much of its theory, its wit and its notoriety. He gave it direction through its developmental years, and lustre in its maturity.

The Fabian Society developed evolitional socialism stressing in Sidney Webb’s terminology, the inevitability of gradualness. It developed a parliamentary program of legislative measures which were designed to establish socialism by establishing social justice. It succeeded so well in its aims, that its philosophy became the philosophy of the whole British Labor Movement. Fabianism appeared in England when social conditions had touched their lowest depths. Depression had brought trade to a standstill. The resulting unemployment had plunged the masses into starvation, misery and despair. The failure of capitalism was tragically apparent, and its destruction appeared imminent. All through England, socialist societies were organizing to replace the profit system with socialist utopias.
There were two significant strains in this socialist ferment. One represented the militancy of the proletariat, the other, the moral realization of the middle class. Karl Marx had given both movements inspiration by giving socialism which had felt itself to be a moral and romantic dream, a scientific basis. The Proletarian movement forgot its early utopian roots, and became enthusiastically and heedlessly Marxist. They were convinced of the inevitability of a revolution to destroy capitalism and were waiting for the moment to put it in motion.

The middle class movement which the Fabian society came to represent, stood in the tradition of John Stuart Mill, who, had turned from the Utilitarian belief in the efficacy of unregulated, unrestricted economic individualism, when he saw the social misery it created, and had almost unwillingly become a socialist. He had gradually accepted the need for wage and hours legislation, community ownership of public utilities, and even the nationalization of land. In Mill's Autobiography, written late in his life, he finally admitted that his political philosophy was socialist, that he advocated the establishment of socialism by constitutional methods. His socialism owed nothing to proletarian movements in the same direction. There was no hint of violence in any of his proposals. He was middle class, and intensely respectable. Mill never quite stopped considering himself an individualist.
No matter what revolution was implicit in his beliefs, they were grounded in and surrounded by an aura of Utilitarianism which was enlightened liberalism, familiar, English and respectable. England in the 1870's was full of societies founded on the ideas of Mill, dedicated to the discussion of some part of his philosophy.

Shaw came to socialism by the road of middle class Millite liberalism. He joined the Zetetical Society which was one of these. His reforming zeal was expressing itself in the debates of the Zetetical Society, whose members championed anything that smacked of skepticism and intellectual activity. Socialism was only one of many enthusiasms, along with evolution, universal adult suffrage, and the new woman.

Increasing interest in Socialism led a group to break away from the Zetetical society in 1884, to form the Fabian Society whose method of attack was implicit in its name. The Fabians had called themselves after Fabius Maximus, the Roman general who was celebrated for his strategic delays. Until Shaw and Sidney Webb joined the society, four months after its inception, a waiting game and a bias for socialism was all that it stood for. Shaw supplied the society with its economic arguments and Webb supplied it with its information. Shaw had been influenced by the ideas of Henry George, an American who held that all economic ills spring from the inequality of land values; that as land values rise, rents rise, and the
economic gulf yawns ever wider between the rich and poor. He set this doctrine out in *Progress and Poverty*, which was Shaw's introduction to the economic basis of social ills, and a lifetime influence on his ideas of economic rent. Sidney Webb said that the whole British Trade Union movement was similarly inspired by the ideas of Henry George: That his analysis of poverty in terms of economic rent was the greatest single influence in the development of aggressive trade union socialism.

*Das Kapital*, of Karl Marx, served to convince Shaw that Henry George did not go far enough in his analysis or in his cure for the prevalent economic misery. The class struggle, the inevitable revolution, the analysis of universal exploitation, under the Capitalistic system, found Shaw, a willing sympathizer. Nevertheless, Shaw could not go along with the emotional tenor of Marx. It was probably Shaw's unfailing wit which kept him from taking himself seriously enough to be an apocalyptic reformer. Instead, he joined the Fabian society, which although it was enthusiastic as a body, about Marx, contradicted Marx in both its spirit and its intent.

In an essay on "The Fabian Society, Its Early History", Shaw said that:

In joining, I was guided by no discoverable difference in programme or principles, but solely by an instinctive feeling that the Fabian Society and not the (Social Democratic) Federation would attract men of my own bias and intellectual habits.
Shaw shared the Fabian belief that the middle class, not the proletariat was destined to achieve the revolution, violating, from the outset, the common belief in the infallibility of Marx.

The Fabians were in the beginning, agreed that a class struggle existed and that a revolution was inevitable. Shaw reminisced in his preface to the thirtieth anniversary edition of the *Fabian Essays*, about his youthful certainty that the revolution would automatically produce the good society. He recalls that when he was asked on a lecture platform how long after the revolution it would take to get socialism going, he answered without hesitation, that it could be done in a fortnight. And he recalls with amusement that he was praised for being one of the more moderate socialists, on the strength of his answer. 2

The Fabians passed through their phase of revolutionary socialism swiftly, and set themselves a new goal, which was eminently suited to their intellectual temper and social make-up. They set out to make socialism respectable, because they believed that English socialism could only gain the strength of numbers if it were thoroughly bourgeois. Shaw said that it was the job of Fabianism to rescue socialism from communism, from barricades, from confusion with the traditional heterodoxies of anti-clericalism, from individualism, from anti-state republicanism, from anarchism, from middle class bohemianism, in short to make
it a constitutional movement in which the most respectable families and citizens could enlist without forfeiting the least part of their spiritual or social standing? The Fabians recognized that what socialism needed to make it a contender in English political life was a reputation for sanity, logic, and good manners.

With their end firmly in mind, the Fabians shunned the emotional revolutionary extremism of the Social Democratic Federation and the Socialist League. They discouraged working men from joining their organization which they wanted to keep small and thoroughly intellectual. They felt themselves to be a hand picked group of leaders, the prime movers of the mass movement.

The gulf which they created between themselves and the proletarian socialist groups was broadened by their abandonment of more and more of Marx's doctrine. Shaw debated the Marxian labor theory of value against Philip Wicksteed, a Unitarian minister who supported the theory of Stanley Jevons which posited a utilitarian theory of value. Shaw was completely won over by the Jevonian theory, decided that Marx's theory was a hopeless oversimplification of economic motivation. He remained a Jevonian all his life.

Shaw made himself the economic expert of the Fabian Society, and the others informally agreed to abide by his theories. Accordingly, the Jevonian theory became the Fabian theory of
value, though individual Fabians continued to subscribe to the Marxian analysis.

The Fabians made a great leap away from proletarian socialism and toward social acceptability when they lost their conviction that the revolution was inevitable. Shaw recalls a stock of aphorisms that the Fabians had developed to prove that the revolution was at hand: that gun powder had ended feudalism, and that dynamite would finish capitalism. The first British attempt to use dynamite to destroy capitalism, on "Bloody Sunday" November 3, 1887, convinced Shaw that although the depths of misery had been reached in the process of capitalist misera-
tion, the time for revolution was obviously not ripe, and that the whole theory was wrong. Forces of capitalism had formidable police protection as well as most of the economic and explosive weapons on their side. Hence, the whole theory of apocalyptic socialism was wrong.4

The poor showings of two candidates put up at the elections that same year in Hampstead and Kensington, by the Social Democratic Federation where one polled 32 votes and the other 27 votes, made Shaw aware that the exploited classes who should logically be socialist were not, that they needed a vast amount of education before they could be counted on in a revolution.

Shaw was convinced that education should be the policy of Fabians, and under his influence, the society turned away from the stream of the movement, standing aloof from the dock strike
of 1889, convinced that their job was to create socialists, not to use direct action against capitalism.

Alick West, in a critical account of Shaw's politics which he called *A Good Man Fallen Among Fabians*, reflects the resentment with which the working class organizations received the Fabian policy of *noblesse oblige*. He held that the Fabians had abandoned more than Marx, that they had put the poor out of mind, had forgotten the facts of capitalist exploitation, and had lost their dimension of morality and spirituality. He accused the Fabians of holding it virtuous to stifle passion rather than to stir it.

West's criticism is *valid* whether it is valid or not. Shaw admitted freely, in a "Report on Fabian Policy", that it was not the task of the Fabian society to stir people with a vision of communism, but to hold back the people from blindly following their passions and attempting a hopeless revolution.

He defended the Fabian policy of aloof tolerance toward proletarian socialism on the ground that Fabianism asked no one either to join it or to boycott other associations. Moreover, it pressed its members to join other organizations and to infuse them with constitutional socialism. He observed that "class distinctions may have prevented workingmen from joining the Fabian society, but they did not prevent any Fabian worth counting from joining working class organizations."
The Fabians saw further reasons for not forming a solid phalanx with the working class movement. Before 1900, there seemed to be little hope of establishing a powerful Labour Party, and the Fabians were reconciled to having to push their legislative measures as an adjunct of the Liberal Party. Fabian policy, as recounted by Shaw, was to take advantage of every legislative step toward collectivism, no matter what quarter it came from, nor how little its promoters dreamed that they were advocating an installment of socialism. With such a policy, they supported all socialist groups and with any other group in which they could implant their ideas, or further their legislative measures.

West called their policy a sell-out to capitalism. Shaw called it Machiavellian realism.

Defending the society against the criticism which West echoes that Fabianism was middle class messianism, Shaw argued that middle class socialism did have a peculiar contribution to make, that:

If socialism is not made respectable and formidable by the support of the middle class; if it be left entirely to the poor, then the proprietors will attempt to suppress it by such measures as have already been used in Austria and Ireland. Dynamite will follow. Terror will follow dynamite. Cruelty will follow terror. And more dynamite will follow cruelty. Both sides will thus drive each other from atrocity to atrocity. If on the other hand, the middle class will educate themselves to understand this question, they will be able to fortify whatever is just in socialism, and to crush whatever is dangerous in it.
Conscious of his mission, Shaw schooled himself in economics until he was expert. He made no independent contribution in the field, but he welded the theories of George, Marx, and Jevons into an economic argument which with a few exceptions became the standard Fabian position.

The first volume of *Fabian Essays*, contained a contribution, The Economic Basis of Socialism by Shaw, which Sidney Webb, in his preface to the 1919 edition, called the most creditable essay of the collection, and one which might stand true in spite of time or events.

In it, Shaw sets forth his conception of the basis of economic inequality; he calls the earth a great gaming table, and the people in it, gamblers, who lay claim to land, not knowing whether they will win diamonds or cabbages. His analysis of how land increases in value is that of Henry George; that the specialization of functions made possible increased individual productivity in a community, as opposed to the wilderness where an individual must be a jack of all trades to survive.

He goes on to state that there is not enough land for everyone to be an owner, and develops an analysis of how the *MAN* is exploited, and the proletarian for whom there is no land to rent, must sell his labor to live. He touches the moral problem of the idle class which is created by accident of having won highly profitable land in the big game, and he
questions their right to subsist on the labor of others, an issue Shaw was to concern himself with with great literary virtuosity all his life.

Shaw argued in this essay that control over the value of commodities inheres in the power to regulate the supply. Since the proletarians can't restrict the supply of their labor they cannot keep its value from descending to nothing, and Shaw points out that it is the Jevonian law of indifference, or in modern economic terminology, the law of diminishing marginal utility, at work when in depressed times, the unemployed can find no purchasers.

He attacks the common assumption that the idle rich are socially useful because their demands for luxuries give employment to a whole group of servants, jewellers, dressmakers, carriage makers and the like; along with the corollary assumption that England is a wealthy country because the rich live in great luxury and the shops are full. He points out that luxuries are not social wealth but that they are consuming productive facilities that ought to be used by the starving people whose rightful share they are, that when the poor are starving in the midst of a surfeit of luxuries, there is not plenty of food. "England", he states, "keeps its children half-starving in order to keep a carriage, and deal with a fashionable dressmaker". Effective demand, he points out, is not socially useful demand. Productive power increases, but
socially useless commodities prevent apparent wealth from becoming real. 8

Shaw concludes that capitalism is unjust from the beginning and is utterly impossible as a final solution to distribution. It creates rotten centers of vice and luxury, and he felt that English civilization was in an advanced state of rottenness.

This was to be the main argument of Shaw's socialism for sixty years. He used substantially the same analysis in The Intelligent Women's Guide to Socialism and Capitalism, thirty-five years later, and in Everybody's Political What's What twenty years after that. In his 1919 preface to the Fabian Essays, he stated that he felt no elation at the fact that the essays had achieved enough stature to warrant their republication. He said that the truths embodied in them should have been accepted not as advanced thought, by that time, but as commonplace reflected in the social machinery of the nation.

The Fabian Essays were the culmination of four years of Fabian activity, in which talented young men, many of whom were to earn reputations in other fields, devoted their time to addressing every audience they could find, even to the point of invading political lectures of other groups, and pressing their arguments through systematic heckling of the rightful speakers. They infiltrated newspapers, through the letters to the editors' columns, or used their remarkable literary talents to get jobs on newspapers, and then turned...
the columns they wrote into Fabian lectures.

Shaw was generally in the advance guard of these forays. He was the star speaker, the best heckler, and by far the ablest writer of the group. Furthermore, he was willing to devote prodigious amounts of time to Fabian activities, during the early years of the society. He turned himself from what Sidney Webb had termed an indifferently educated university graduate, into an expert in the social sciences, in order to develop Fabian doctrine. His studies on behalf of the Fabian movement paid great personal and artistic dividends to Shaw giving substance and intellectual merit to his plays but they were undertaken for the cause, nevertheless. And the Fabian movement is richer for having Shaw's sparkling essays.

The Fabians educated each other as well as the general public. They held private meetings in which individual members reported. The tone of these meetings, according to William Irvine, was that of a seminar without a professor.

Shaw's lecture on "The Transition to Social Democracy" was drafted as one of these informal lectures, then delivered later to the Economic Section of the British Association. In it, Shaw traces the economic and philosophical roots of the doctrine of Laissez faire. He states that the middle ages were better organized socially, than modern times under laissez faire individualism, a point that he was to stress in
his later political writing. The guild system, developed in the middle ages, had great charms for Shaw, who shared a common enthusiasm with William Morris, for craftsmanship, and labor with the integrity of meaningful creativeness; they believed that the industrial revolution had robbed work of its integrity, by dividing it into simple, incomplete operations. Shaw was never one to let nostalgia get the better of him, and he is quick to point out that roundabout production increased individual productivity tremendously, and that the guild system was too primitive to be kept in a complex industrialized world of international trade.
The guild system hindered industrial growth with its restrictions. Shaw states:

Anarchy became the ideal of all progressive thinkers and practical men because every law ordering business either did not work at all or only as a monopoly directly injuring the general interest. Legislation and regulation were mischievous and corrupt. Idealists believed that a just social order was not an artificial and painfully maintained edifice, but the spontaneous outcome of the free play of the forces of nature.

Shaw pointed out that these idealists, men like David Hume and Adam Smith who considered economic freedom the way of progress, were optimistically ignorant of the condition of the masses, who were living in Manchester, under the noses of the Laissez faire Manchester School, in such misery that the death rate could be calculated as using up nine generations in one.
The system of private property has a great defect, according to Shaw, in that it leaves no room for newcomers. This was to be a recurring theme of Shaw's because economic opportunity narrowed considerably during his lifetime. The mathematical chance for a man to rise from rags to riches grew slimmer and slimmer, as business combines of the twentieth century replaced the individual enterprises of the nineteenth.

In this essay, Shaw set forth his idea of equality in substantially the form it was to keep, with a few minor deviations.

The only kind of equality that mattered for Shaw, was equality of opportunity, specifically economic equality, which presupposes socialism. He held that there is no other means of getting rid of the factor of economic rent, the inequality of natural resources, the bounty of nature which makes some land fruitful and other land barren, and gives some men diamonds and others cabbages.

Since nature has not regulated her bounty, man must, through a strict legal edifice of socialism.

Shaw, as was apparent in his moral philosophy which held that progress works through a chosen few, never held that all men were created equal and in this essay he points out again that there is a natural inequality of men, but that nature is no respecter of rank. Leaders are born into poverty, and never have a chance to develop or to exercise their talents.
Economic equality, however, would make it possible for them to assume their rightful places in society.

In later work, Shaw was to advance new schemes to achieve economic equality under socialism. During the period in which he wrote *The Intelligent Woman's Guide*, he advocated strict equality of income. This will be treated in another chapter, as will his final position on the problem of equality. It will be seen that his goal remained the same, to create economic equality so that the natural differences in human talents could bring the leaders to the top, allowing no group special advantage of education or leisure in the race.

Shaw had completely abandoned the concept of a catastrophic revolution, 1888, when he wrote this essay. He stated that if "The change to socialism could be made catastrophically, it would be well worth making." He had come to a new understanding of distribution, which led him to conclude that great alterations and readjustments would be required in productive industry, in order to meet a demand which would be created by the entirely new distribution of purchasing power. Gradualism, then, is Shaw's answer: the government should nationalize industry as soon as it is equipped to run it, and such equipment would consist of a bureaucracy of experts, which did not exist at the time Shaw wrote this. He maintained that if a government, or a political group without technical experience, were to take over industry, they
would starve the nation, disrupt production, and cause more misery by ineptitude and inexperience than the bloodiest revolution. Therefore, "Mobs and guillotines could no more establish socialism than police coercion can avert it."

The Fabian alternative which Shaw offered for revolutionary socialism involved an Hegelian ideal of a state. Like Hegel, the socialists wanted to improve the nature and quality of the state to make it capable of the responsibility which their scheme would lay on it. A standard argument against state control had been: look at the state in its present corruption and ineptitude. What kind of edifice is that to trust the public welfare and livelihood. The Fabians answered simply: make the state better first.

Because of their Hegelian belief that the general welfare can be improved by improving the state, the Fabians had no sympathy with anarchism, which proceeded on a similar analysis of conditions to the Fabian's own analysis, but concluded that since the state is the preserver of capitalism in all its wickedness; an individual in all righteousness, should dissociate himself from the state, by abstaining from voting, and make war on existing injustices instead of compromising with the Status Quo.

Shaw attacked this concept of communist anarchism as well as the anarchy implicit in laissez faire economics, in an essay "The Impossibility of Anarchism, Anarchists, and Socialists,"
which William Irvine called one of the most skillful arguments of the Fabian collection.

With great fairness of mind, Shaw analyzed the merits of the case for anarchic communism. Desmond MacCarthy recognized that Shaw was famous for his scrupulous division of brains on each side of any debate. He pointed out in this essay that all the evils which conventional thinkers attributed to anarchism, were implicit in the capitalist system: People might take their subsistence without working for it, and break down the whole productive system, as capitalists maintained, but only because the ideal of the capitalistic system under which they were trained, to live without working for one's subsistence. Shaw states that the practical question of anarchic communism is: what is the point at which men trained under the capitalistic system could be trusted to pay scrupulously for their food if they could take it for nothing? He holds that it is not impossible that society may reach the point, but only after a long transition to a new social morality which does not now exist. The alternative lies between external compulsion to labor or the new morality. Shaw points out that those who have exploited people in greed, under capitalism, would be guilty of the same practices, would take the same advantages of communist anarchism. Society would be exchanging one kind of anarchy for another, and anarchy is untenable under any conditions.
Shaw points out that what anarchists really want is socialism with freedom, and in this essay, he analyzes the human desire for freedom with clarity and understanding which he was never to surpass. Shaw lost his liberalism when he lost sight of the truths he enunciated in this essay, that socialism cannot be established by despotic coercion, any more than communism can grow out of anarchic free enterprise. He could never have supported Mussolini as he did in the 1920's, had he remembered the truth he stated here:

The deprivation of personal liberty, though it double the rations or halve the working hours, will cause men to conspire against it. We only disapprove of monopolists. We hate masters.13

Shaw points out that freedom is less natural than tyranny for humanity, that we are not born free, but under the tyranny of nature, which forces us to work to survive, to limit our activities to the capabilities of our own bodies. The majority tyrannizes over the minority because production is geared to the needs of the average, and the below average or above average individual finds himself in the minority with his needs or wants. Shaw concludes that the anarchist's dream of complete freedom is as illusory as his belief that men are good enough to live in an anarchic communist society. The majority cannot help its tyranny even if it would. He maintains that democracy is as good a system as anarchy at its ideal best, since democ
racy does not give majorities the power to coerce their minorities any more than that power is taken from them by anarchism. The tyranny of nature holds, under any system. Either the majority or the minority must be incommodeled. Democracy does not make majorities absolute, or reduce minorities to ciphers. The only way to neutralize the power of the majority, is to make men moral enough to refrain from abusing it. Shaw holds that social democracy works in the right direction by making equality a social reality as well as a political principle.

People who think they can be wholly free are idiots, and people who seek complete freedom by making others shoulder their productive duties create slavery. Honestly purchased leisure is the only real freedom, and since it can be purchased only by work, there can be no complete freedom.

Shaw's analysis of the nature of freedom accepted the existence of political freedom as a self-evident principle. He accepted its existence the way he accepted the abundance of oxygen, making very little issue of its virtue because it was self-evident. On the other hand, he emphasized the suppressed premise that there is no freedom for the exploited classes, even if their political liberties are guaranteed. He continued to emphasize the social dimension and to ignore the political dimension of freedom, in discussing totalitarian
nations where political freedom became a burning issue through its deprivation.

In the present essay, Shaw had not lost his balance yet, as he was to do in the 1920's, and his position was that of a convinced democrat. He rejects anarchism completely because of its impractical view of human freedom, stating that anarchists neglect doing the possible, because they are waiting for the impossible. Shaw held in this essay, that democracy must be relied upon for the maximum degree of freedom, that when it fails, there is no antidote for intolerance except in the spread of better sense. His own belief in democracy failed him later, but was revived by just such a spread of common sense.

Shaw pointed out to anarchists that the House of Commons was their best bet, a better tool for establishing the social order they were working for than no tool at all, that:

A House of Commons consisting of 660 gentlemen and 10 workmen will order soldiers to take money from people for the landlords. A House of Commons consisting of 660 workmen and 10 gentlemen will probably unless we are fools order the soldiers to take money from the landlords, for the people. With this hint, I leave the matter in the full conviction that the state in spite of (laissez faire) anarchists, will continue to be used against the people by the classes until it is used by the people against the classes with equal ability and equal resolution.14

Shaw advised anarchists of both varieties to become good Fabians instead of hopeless utopians along with revolutionary socialists.
When Shaw was out convincing the privileged classes to become Fabians, his wit and wisdom sparkled with even greater intensity than usual. His essay on "Socialism for Millionaires", in a delightfully paradoxical style points out that the rich are as much to be pitied as the poor. He says, "Pity the millionaire who is a victim of satiation; he can't enjoy himself with all his money any more than an ordinary rich man." He must despair that enjoyment of his wealth has reached the point of diminishing returns. He can only make parasites of his heirs, by making them independent of honest labor. He can indulge in charity, but he runs into a stone wall when he attempts to dispense charity in a socially valuable manner. Shaw's opinion of charity is essentially that charity is degrading, a point which he made with great perspicacity in dramas "Major Barbara", and "Pygmalion", more seriously in all of his later political writing, and a point which was funded into the philosophy of the New Deal, and the British welfare state which tried to replace Doles with public work projects for that reason.

In "Socialism for Millionaires", Shaw says, "Woe unto the man who takes from another what he can provide for himself, woe to the giver." He points out that when the philanthropist attempts to find the "deserving poor" for his largesses, he runs into a paradox: The deserving poor don't want alms. Those who stand ready to take advantage of charity, are the
worthless, lazy, idle good-for-nothings, not the sober, honest, respectable poor who deserve help. The almsgiver finds that it is economically impossible to be kind to beggars, because beggars are a bottomless pit of sloth, incapable of regeneration. Shaw holds that private benevolence should be abandoned as impractical, and the poor law should be humanized so that the deserving poor could get help without feeling degraded, and there would be no private sources of support on which the slothful could depend.

Shaw offers rules of charity, for the poor benighted millionaire who, he figures, must inevitably turn to philanthropy because he must necessarily come to the end of his material desires long before he comes to the end of his money and because he can buy moral credit by donations as wealthy men bought indulgences from the church in the Middle Ages. Since charity is inevitable, under the present system, it should be made as effective, and as harmless as possible. Shaw offers a rule to the philanthropist, to guide him in all his donations: Don't do anything for the public that the public will do for itself without the philanthropist's intervention. Therefore, don't endow hospitals, schools, orphanages, churches, art, and the like. These are the things society must do for itself, and the philanthropist impairs society's sense of responsibility, by relieving it of its normal functions.
Shaw advises millionaires to help society in the areas where it will not take the initiative; in fields of experiment, propaganda, exploration, discovery, political and industrial information. Make certain of a lively intellectual climate, and pictures, statues, churches, and hospitals, will take care of themselves.

Shaw's essay on "Socialism and Superior Brains" lies in the same vein of persuasion as "Socialism for Millionaires." It is another attempt to convince the privileged that their interests lay with socialism, and that they just don't realize the fact. Shaw maintains that all men are nine tenths socialist, that if they would repudiate the ideal that whenever a man discovers a means to increase general wealth and happiness, steps should be taken to reserve the increase to the discoverer alone, leaving the rest of the country as poor as if the discovery had never been made; there would be no controversy over socialism, but a general agreement instead. "Socialism and Superior Brains" was a reply by Shaw, under Fabian auspices, to an article by Mallock, a well-known Liberal, who held that exceptional personal ability is the main factor in the production of wealth. He presented the corollary that labor receives more than its due, because it deserves to receive only what it could produce if ability never existed.

Shaw pulverizes Mallock's arguments, with a delightful
apostrophe, "Why, Oh why can a man not write bad political economy without coupling it with an attack on the Fabian society. Retribution at Fabian hands is always swift and sure."16

He proceeds to point out Mallock's error stems from ignorance of all the inferior people who live on unearned increment they never created, invested, or even understood, they live solely by the grace of somebody else's labor, and never having given anything productive to society, in return for what they consumed, they inflict on society the same injury as a thief.

Shaw argues against Mallock's ideal, that the business of society is not basically to reward exceptional ability which generally finds its own rewards, but to get the use of ability as cheaply as possible for the benefit of society. The able man should be given just enough to keep his ability active and efficient, if it should really turn out, and Shaw doubts the possibility, that able men will act stupidly unless they are given extra pay. Socialism, he argues, would be a paradise of the able, because exceptional ability unlike mere brute capacity for drudgery of routine labor, is exercised for its own sake, and it makes its possessor miserable when he is condemned to inaction. Social democracy, he concludes, will have more trouble with the naturally idle than with the naturally able.
Shaw ends his argument with the Fabian program, constitutional socialism, which moves gradually to do away with unearned income, as the government becomes equipped to put the money it confiscates into circulation as social income. He repeats the Fabian doctrine which he did much to establish that any levelling that is done must be levelling upwards, raising the standards of popular welfare, by minimum wage and hours legislation, rather than by disrupting production, and starting a new society on ruins.

These essays were all written by Shaw in behalf of the Fabian Society. They are, however, records of Shaw's personal opinions, not dogmas of the Fabian Society. The society allowed and still allows for a remarkable latitude of opinion. Sidney Webb put it that the interest of Fabianism were the sum of the interests of all its members. Those ideas did not all have to be reconciled with each other. In some fields, Shaw's ideas differed from Webb's. Shaw was more revolutionary, more equalitarian than Webb. He urged the formation of a Labour Party and wrote a militant manifesto for it in 1892, when Webb was still willing to work as a pressure group within the Liberal Party. Nevertheless, these two leaders of the Fabian movement were able to work fruitfully together, convincing each other when possible, and when not possible, agreeing to disagree amicably. There was no ideological strain within Fabian ranks. There was basic
intellectual agreement as to the necessity of democratic, evolutionary socialism; among the remarkable group who formed the Fabian seminar. The different emphasis which individuals put on measures for its achievement never seriously divided them.

They had no hierarchy of political organization. Local societies were all autonomous, owing no allegiance to the founding group in London, and with no ties to it except those of personal respect and similar social aims.

This group had remarkable successes, and they left their stamp on local as well as national politics. Sidney Webb was the architect of the Fabian assault on municipal government. He became chairman of the Technical Board of the London County Council, shortly after he and five other Fabians were elected as members in 1892, after a barrage of lectures of Liberal and Radical workingmen's societies, in the way of a campaign. Webb was instrumental in the extending of secondary and university education to the working classes of London. His stamp is on the municipal reforms which mark that era.

Shaw cooperated in the municipal undertakings of the Fabians. He became a vestryman in St. Pancras Parish where he gathered experience of the municipal type of government which he was to advocate, along with the Webbs as a superior alternative to Parliamentary government, and party discipline.
Shaw wrote a tract on "The Commonsense of Municipal Trading", on behalf of municipal socialism. The Fabians concentrated so intensively on municipal socialism, that they earned the nicknames of "sewer" socialists, and "gas and water" socialists. Clearly municipalization appealed to them in their desire to see the gradual expropriation of production and services. The Fabians were practical, and they urged all socialists to be equally practical in their aims. Their concrete accomplishments in the field of municipal government, paid off in increased stature for the Fabians as well as the practical working of their ideas.

In this essay, Shaw argued that municipalities can succeed in business enterprise because they can get unlimited cheap capital, managerial talent at moderate salary because of advantages accruing to civil careers, and they do not have to show profits like private enterprise: they can supply goods and services to the community, cheaper than private interests can.

Cheap services have attracted many conservatives to municipal enterprise, with a view to reducing taxes. Shaw was not, however, primarily interested in reducing the taxes of the rich. He states that:

A municipality must have a different conception of economy from that of reducing every item of expenditure to its lowest possible figure. It must concern itself with the total social utility of its enterprise.
Shaw points out that this concept of social utility demands that a municipality employ contractors who pay living wages; that it do unprofitable jobs like razing slums, as well as profitable ones like supplying gas; that it supply services in areas which private enterprise won't touch because there is no profit, but where the need is greatest and the purchasing power is least. Profit is a sterile concept in municipal enterprise, in view of the social needs of the poor. Shaw sees municipal trading essentially as socialism on a municipal scale, not as state capitalism. It is a way of abolishing poverty by redistribution of income.

Fabians remained active in municipal administration, advocating the ideas of Webb and Shaw, long after Webb became an advisor to Prime Ministers and Shaw became too busy being the literary light of London to attend vestry meetings.

The Fabian society had remarkable success in everyone of its undertakings. Fabians succeeded in turning the whole British Labor Movement into constitutional channels. They developed a corps of leaders out of which two Prime Ministers and scores of Cabinet ministers were chosen. They further influenced the leadership of the labor movement by the intellectual institutions they established which served to educate greater members than the Fabian Society could accommodate.
The London School of Economics, the excellent journal, *The New Statesman and Nation*, were both Fabian enterprises. The Fabian summer schools served for models for the institutes of leadership developed by the Trade Unions Congress.

The peaceful legislation of socialism in Britain, according to the precepts laid down by the Fabians was realized after the second World War. No intellectual movement has had a clearer vindication of the practicability of its methods. The Fabians were prophets of a new order which came into being amazingly close to the lines they set out.

Shaw is responsible for the creation of the movement, and for its brilliance. He brought to Fabianism its most brilliant exponents. He developed much of its theory, most of its tone of literary elegance. Shaw's finest political writing went into Fabian documents. His later writing is mere elaboration on the points he set out in his Fabian essays.

Shaw retired from an active role in Fabian affairs, as early as 1912, but he continued to inspire the movement by his personal battles for socialism, his personal appearances at its summer schools, and the drafting of much of its literature. Every drama Shaw wrote gave fresh literary illustrations to Fabian doctrines. His later political tracts were adaptations of the doctrine he developed in the early Fabian days, application to latest events.
Shaw's early Fabian doctrines were the most basic to his social outlook; political disappointment and historical disillusionment caused him to forget and abandon his militant belief in constitutionalism and political freedom, but it was the Fabian beliefs which were his final and abiding beliefs.
Chapter III. Shaw's Later Socialism

The Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism and Capitalism is Shaw's major post-war exposition of socialism written after a Labor Government had already held office in Britain, it sounds a different emotional note from Shaw's early pamphleteering but it offers a similar program. Shaw's great optimism which had led him in the early days of the Fabian movement, to believe that clear logic, sparkling wit, and socialism dressed in constitutionalism would bring on the millennium. By 1928, Shaw had been chastened by many disappointments, in the leadership of the Labour Party, in the headlong madness of civilized Europe, fighting the World War, and then losing the peace through stupidity, callousness and greed. He saw the women's rights for which he had long hoped, and to whose cause he had lent his very considerable influence, turned into a mockery. It was a disappointment which Shaw could foresee but not quite fortify himself against to have the women whose vote was a new and cherished privilege, vote hysterically to hang the Kaiser. The Labour Party achieved an equally cherished hope when in 1923, Ramsay MacDonald was called to form a Cabinet with Labour ministers predominating. They had superceded the Liberals in Parliament as the second party and from then it was to be Conservative or Labor. Great bitterness was yet to
come for the Labour Party, but for Shaw it was less than glorious to find the Labour Party in office, unable to legislate socialism.

Shaw had a distinctly Fabian remedy for the disappointing showing that women made in the first election in which they participated. He set about to permeate the female sex with his brand of socialism by interpreting it in terms that women would instantly recognize and understand. The *Intelligent Woman's Guide* is a book on political economy without a single graph, and almost completely without figures. Shaw explains production in terms of mutton, rubber boots, and household linen; capital investment in terms of ovens in which bread is baked. Labor is discussed in terms of servants, teachers, housewives. All economic abstractions are discussed in terms relevant to women.

Shaw's purpose was to educate women to their responsibilities as voters. If they were to share the responsibility of choosing their government, then they needed facts. Shaw had always been a champion of women's rights, but never on sentimental grounds. He had no illusions about women's superiority, and had long predicted that from the time women got the franchise until they became educated to their responsibilities as citizens, women would drag the quality of government down instead of improving it.

Shaw does not always talk down to women in *The Intelligent*
Woman's Guide to Socialism and Capitalism. His discussion without figures is as much the result of his own remarkable stylistic clarity, a recognition that he could explain in words, ideas in which other less skillful writers would get bogged down immediately, and therefore, used mechanical and mathematical explanations instead, as it is a concession to women's natural timidity toward figures and graphs. The lack of scientific verbiage is a stylistic triumph.

In The Intelligent Woman's Guide, Shaw extends his demand for social equality, advanced in the Fabian essays to a demand for complete equality of income. Shaw believed that the best way to the good society, without envy, class resentment, disloyalty, or rebellion, was absolute equality of income, with no regard to personal qualities or abilities. He answers the hypothetical charge, that considering the difference in temperaments and abilities of people, there would be rich and poor again inside a year; with the observation that equal division of pay is not a utopian ideal, but a standard practice in every trade, a policy adhered to by trade unions. Postmen, he argues, are all paid the same, and there is no tendency among them to divide into paupers and millionaires. On the whole, most people would remain on the level they are put without any change. The change that Shaw advocates is that postmen should be paid as much as postmasters, and postmasters, no less than anyone else.
Shaw does not dodge the question of incentive which has disturbed socialists before him. He strikes at the problem with the weapon of paradox, holding that nothing hides the difference in the merit of individuals as much as difference of income. Equality of income would instead, have the tremendous advantage of offering promotion to the capable in a coin that the stupid son of a millionaire could not aspire to, namely, honor. Only where there is pecuniary equality, can the distinction of merit stand out. The merit system, he holds, has no value at the present time because honors and titles can be bought.

Shaw's next argument to support his proposal is that with financial equality, everybody would find his own natural level. There would be the great and the ordinary, because there is a natural inequality of human endowment, but under Shaw's proposed system, money would be nothing, character would be everything.

In regard to incentive, Shaw puts it that no one should be required to work harder than anyone else that it is desirable that the burden of national production should be shared equally by the workers. As for naturally ambitious people, they want to work harder. It is their natural temperament, but they should not pretend that this is a sacrifice. The lazy may not be allowed to take less than equal wages, and perform less work. They must be required to work, and to take
an equal share. It is Shaw's fervent belief that poverty is a
crime, that it has a degrading effect on the poor, and that
it has a degrading effect on the nation. "Decent nations",
he states "must insist that their citizens lead decent lives,
doing their full share of the nation's work, and taking their
full share of its income." 2

Shaw holds that money is not the only incentive for work,
that personal idiosyncracies dictate the desirability of jobs,
and that absolutely undesirable jobs can be made attractive
by increased leisure, that leisure is a stronger incentive than
money in unpleasant work.

Finally, Shaw says that the genius is not affected by any
incentive, and that equality of income would not suppress
genius, but merely make it possible for him to get along as well
as the average person. The genius generally fares worse
financially than anyone else because genius is always ahead
of its time, and is, therefore, not only not appreciated but
is persecuted or ignored. Even if genius were accorded financial
incentives in the present scheme of distribution Shaw argues
that equality would not stem genius. He puts the question; who
with the capacity to be Shakespeare, would refuse to be
Shakespeare because there was no financial gain involved?

To support his stand that complete equality of income is
the only fair way for a nation to divide up its production,
Shaw tests other ways in order to reject them. He examines the
possibility of giving each person that part of the national wealth which he creates by his labor. Shaw rejects that on the grounds that it is impossible to find out exactly how much an individual has produced. Furthermore, a great deal of the world's work is service rather than production and a comparison of the value of a surgeon, a ballet dancer, and a plumber is impossible. He rejects payment for work according to the time spent because the value of a worker's time, depends on the demand for his work and the supply available, and supply and demand has undesirable results. In the long run values independent to labor dictate supply and demand. In comparing the value of the work done by people of differing abilities, one is hard put to say how much more the clever worker deserves than the stupid one. When the problem becomes one of comparing the work value of a bricklayer against a teacher, the whole program of comparisons becomes manifestly impossible.

Shaw is convinced that a nation's income can be divided so as to give each one what he deserves, and he is not willing that it should be left to chance, letting each one have what he can grab, which is what happens in a free economy. To point up his argument he explores the possibility of creating an oligarchy of rich idlers, making one in ten idle, and forcing the other nine to live at subsistence level to support the rich idler. Shaw's point in this alternative, is to show up
distribution in England, where one tenth of the population owns nine-tenths of the property, and to illustrate the artificiality as well as the injustice of this state of affairs.

Shaw maintains that distribution of wealth is a problem which must be faced, that leaving things as they are is leaving them slide. He argues that the industrial revolution has forced a change upon the property system, creating a steady immiseration of a great majority of the people, and that letting things go means letting them get worse. Meanwhile, trade unions brew managerial revolutions, and misery brews political revolutions.

As a supporting argument to his plea for equality of income, Shaw develops his famous stand that poverty is a crime more sympathetically, and more concretely than in any of his early socialist writing. Chesterton said that Shaw's humanitarianism stemmed not from his love for the poor but from his distaste for them, just as his vegetarianism stemmed not from his love of live animals, as from his distaste for dead ones. Chesterton was right and Shaw was the first to admit it. He makes no plea for the abolition of poverty except that poverty is a nuisance and a danger to respectable life. Shaw was never sentimental about any of the things people ordinarily wax sentimental about, neither about babies nor death nor poverty. He observed that if poverty were a virtue, as Christianity claims, it would be a good reason to institutionalize it. His argument against
poverty is not that it makes people unhappy, but that it degrades them. Shaw was not out to make people happy. He believes that happiness is a personal matter not society's highest aspiration, but because degradation which poverty inflicts on the poor contaminates the neighborhood, the town, and finally the whole country, he holds that it is too expensive to tolerate. A drunken man may be happier than a sober man. A drug addict may be ecstatically happy, and uneasy lies the head that wears the crown perhaps but the unhappiness of the rich is irrelevant to the problem of poverty, and the happiness which many people find in degradation does not alter the fact that out of that degradation grows crime and violence, vice, and infectious disease.

Shaw's argument against poverty in terms of its disadvantages to the upper classes does not arise out of snobbery, but out of his humanitarian liberalism which is essentially the belief that human beings must be treated primarily ends in themselves rather than means to another goal. The essential fact in his demand for respectability for everyone is the fact that every life is valuable. Every individual counts. Life is a divine force, therefore, no one should be allowed to exist without living. The degradation of poverty is mere existence, mere vegetating. Pascal said in *Les Pensees*, that man is elevated only through self-consciousness. Only a man can know that he is miserable. A tree cannot know that it is
miserable. Self-consciousness is the quality which raises men over trees. Shaw shares Pascal's conception of human dignity, and his tart argument against poverty, is a plea in its behalf.

Shaw makes his argument concerning financial equality palatable to the women whose sympathy he cultivates carefully throughout the book, by explaining that the socialist ideal of equality does not involve the equal division of existing production, but the equal division of the optimum production of the nation. Equality of income is feasible only in an economy of abundance. He reassures his feminine readers, who if his psychological slant is indicative of the prejudices of his audience, are flighty, illogical, impulsive creatures with blank, receptive minds; that the levelling to be done is levelling upwards, not downwards; that he doesn't intend to rob nice women of their finery or innocent pleasures, but to make them available equally to everyone. The alternative, he says, to having a few women well-dressed, and most women dowdy, does not have to be all women dowdy. Instead, it is a sensible rule that no woman should have diamonds until all women have decent clothes.

If one loses patience with the tone of patient elementary teaching, in The Intelligent Woman's Guide, it is useful to remember that his is the prevailing tone taken by most anti-progressive propaganda, aimed at the same audience, making it easier
for beginners to read anti-socialism than socialism.

Shaw had associated with the most talented and able women of his generation. His friends, Mrs. Patrick Campbell and Ellen Terry, the brilliant actresses; Beatrice Webb, May Morris, Annie Besant, and his own wife were distinguished scholars. He was not undervaluing them as a breed, but recognizing that because they had never had political responsibility, they had allowed themselves the luxury of ignorance; and he felt that they could no longer be allowed that luxury. So Shaw turns *The Intelligent Woman's Guide* into a primer of political economy, treating the labor market, trade unionization its aims and drawbacks; banking and the money market, the national debt; war finance; the party system, and the relationship of socialism and liberty.

All of Shaw's previous political philosophy is given an airing in the book, frequently with fuller treatment than it had ever received before; except for illustrations and current observations there are no new political ideas.

In connection with his fundamental ideal of leadership, Shaw recognized the managerial function in production, the element which Schumpeter is credited as discovering as the fourth factor of production, along with rent, capital and labor. Shaw *discusses* the rent of ability in connection with his ideal of equality of income. He recognizes leadership in
business, the managerial function as the midwife in the birth of production which is the child of capital and labor. He recognized that both capital and labor are passive until the catalytic agent of leadership, or ability effects results. Shaw's interest in the fourth factor in production is not one of discovery, but as a self-evident fact of human nature. He does not consider its existence important in itself, but only as a factor which, without sufficient explaining, might put an obstacle in his program of financial equality. He comes to the decision that special talent and managerial ability are rare and valuable, and that they will always be able to command a premium in the labor market. Because of their rarity, however, they cannot effect much of an upheaval in the scheme of equality even if they are paid higher wages than workers without their endowments. As long as inheritances are not allowed, as long as there is no parasitical labor which he terms any labor which is not productive in itself, but is in paid service of wealthy people, doing their work for them; Shaw holds that the rent paid to ability is as harmless as it is unavoidable.

Shaw's understanding of the managerial function, which might, if it had engaged his interest for itself rather than as a demonstration of another principle in which he was interested, and had it been treated more rigorously, might have been developed, as a major contribution to the science of
economics. It was for Shaw, rather than an economic principle, a sidelight of human nature, consonant with his idea of leadership, the natural aristocracy of human beings. He translated his belief that five percent of men are leaders and ninety-five percent are followers who need direction, even coercion, into an economic principle. His wide acquaintanceship among people of all classes, and his powerful intuition made him distinguish between those who had money to invest, and those who have talent for business or any other enterprise.

Possibly the most important value of *The Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism and Capitalism*, aside from its primary purpose of permeating, educating and organizing the female sex, is its historical pinning down of Shaw. This work serves as proof that Shaw's liberalism was in 1924-1928, when he was writing it, still articulate, that his authoritarianism was an aberration rather than a genuine shift.

Shaw had suffered many disappointments with the world from which he expected better behavior. He had seen democracy say fine things and do evil, foolish things at the same time. He had seen humanity fight a useless war, and crown it with a stupid, meaningless, impermanent peace. He had seen all this in the ten years before 1924, and he was seeing as he wrote, the failure of democracy to take hold of the reins of government in all the new republics of Europe. Shaw had written some pretty bitter things about democracy, and
liberalism. At the very time he was compiling *The Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism and Capitalism*, he was writing articles to the Manchester *Guardian*, praising Mussolini and his Fascisti, for their terroristic coup d'état, agreeing with them that democracy was a "putrefying corpse", and ignoring the loss of democratic forms as irrelevant, if not desirable. Shaw's humanitarianism, as well as his devotion to democratic ideals seemed to have been lost completely. Nevertheless, he did write in *The Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism and Capitalism*, such testaments to democracy as "Socialists aim to make everything much cheaper except human life." This is the central ideal in the liberal tradition; that human life is the end to which all other ends are subordinate. In defense of parliamentary and constitutional government, Shaw says that:

In the long run (which nowadays is a very short run) you must have your parliament and your settled constitution back again; the mess may have to be cleared up by a dictatorship like that of Napoleon the third, King Alfonso, Cromwell, Napoleon, Mussolini or Lenin; but dictatorial strong men soon die or lose their strength, and kings, generals, and proletarian dictators alike find that they cannot carry on for long without councils or parliaments of some sort, and that these will not work unless they are in some way representative of the public, because unless the citizens cooperate with the police the strongest government breaks down, as the English government did in Ireland.

Such a point of view is neither Fascist, nor it is drunk with the love of Liberalism. Shaw could find plenty wrong with
democracy which he was not willing to condone because of vague liberal aspirations. He was convinced, nevertheless, that as in the final analysis as government must be parliamentary, so change must be parliamentary. Practical socialism must proceed by the government nationalizing our industries one at a time by a series of properly compensated expropriations, after an elaborate program of training civil servants to carry on the work.

While apparently Shaw condoned violence in Italy even while he was writing this book, his statements on the value of a proletarian revolution here, show that Shaw was not basically a lover of violence. He is not outraged at the thought of violent revolution because civilization has developed too highly to use violence. If he thought so once, world events had taught him that society must resign itself to epidemics, as he puts it, of human pugnacity and egotism just as it has to resign itself to epidemics of measles. He sees that violence is inevitable because we teach our children to glorify pugnacity, and to identify gentility and honor with keeping down the poor, producing the dangerous conditions basic to class war.

This statement is less the condoning of violence than the recognition of its existence, and an attempt to avert it by educating citizens to its danger. Shaw holds that though dictatorship may come because nobody else mans the machinery
of government, that although violence may occur because the men in power allow unsanitary conditions of public morals to breed epidemics, violence is wrong. It can sweep away old evil, but it cannot create the conditions proper for socialism. Although dictators come to power because someone must govern, there must finally be some Parliament to carry on the nation's business.

Although this may not be a passionate plea for freedom, it indicates that Shaw was still a Fabian. Shaw always advocated gradualism because he recognized the creative effort that had to go into nationalization. He knew that business of production and distribution had to go on without interruption or people would starve. He saw revolution essentially as the interruption of production and the disruption of distribution, thus he was well aware that when the shouting dies, things would be just where they had been left. Shaw said in the "Economic Basis of Socialism", that a nation may nationalize its railways overnight, but it takes considerably longer to change first class coaches and third class coaches into second class coaches. Socialism means not merely the redistribution of existing wealth, but the production of the proper kind of wealth, as well. The proper kind of wealth is socially useful wealth; second class railway coaches as opposed to luxury yachts.4

The casualness which Shaw showed to the violence of the
Fascists did not come from belief in the usefulness of violence itself, but from Shaw's belief that sooner or later any regime must come around to democracy. Shaw's attitude toward dictatorship will be treated more fully in a chapter on Shaw's approach to foreign affairs. It has been brought in here because *The Intelligent Woman's Guide* is an attempt to inject strength into democracy by educating its women to their responsibilities as citizens, so that they could meet the challenge which authoritarianism posed to democracy.

*The Intelligent Woman's Guide* contains one of the fairest and sincerest of Shaw's many analyses of the problems of democracy. Even though he had been instrumental in the creation of the Labour Party, on the eve of its majority, he was disturbed by its future. Since the Labour Party represented the interests of an overwhelming majority of the British people, he was convinced that it would take complete possession of the House of Commons. In wiping out outside opposition, it would destroy its own unity. Shaw saw the possibility of the Labour Party falling into splinter groups, making parliamentary government impossible, with a final result of dictatorship.

Shaw saw that, in spite of forty years of Fabian preaching, most of those who call themselves socialists don't know what socialism is and subordinate its programs to the fads and follies in which they believe. They are unwilling to subordinate their traditional beliefs to it. When the Labour Party did come into
power in 1929, it was abundantly clear that Shaw was right, that those who called themselves socialists were not always socialists, nor were they eager to subordinate either their traditions or their ambitions to socialism. Ramsay MacDonald, lost his Fabian socialism and his party loyalty, both, under the pressure of political power and showed himself to be an aristocrat. Such political fiascos as the disintegration of the Labour Party in 1931, that disturbed Shaw into his raven-like attitude toward democracy and parliamentary socialism.

Shaw never, on the other hand, went conservative. He stated, along with his condemnation of unconventional people who call themselves socialists, that conservative people are mostly timid and stupid, that you cannot vote for stupidity (conservatism) on the grounds that unconventional people quarrel among themselves and don't accomplish what they set out to do. The conservatives quarrel even more irreconcilably within the limits of their conservatism because they are more unreasonable than clever people.

The answer to the dilemma Shaw outlines, lies, he believes, in a different kind of party system and a different kind of parliament. He offers an alternative system, the municipal system of government, for which he had gained great admiration when he served as vestryman in St. Pancras Parish. Shaw was never alone in advocating this proposal. Many Fabians had gained similar interest in municipal style of government through
working on municipal boards. Beatrice and Sidney Webb had published in 1920, *A Constitution for the Socialist Commonwealth of Great Britain*. It proposes that Britain should have two parliaments, a political one maintaining the cabinet system, and an industrial one, molded after the government of municipalities. Both Webb and Shaw, as has been noted, worked in municipal government, and found it a paradise of freedom and consistency in comparison with the party discipline of the Parliamentary system. In the municipal system, every member can vote on every issue as he thinks best, without endangering his party's power, or bringing on a general election. Instead business is carried on by committees. Committees form resolutions of policy, and in meetings of the whole council these resolutions are confirmed or rejected by a general vote. If it is defeated, nobody resigns. If it is carried, nobody's position is changed. Shaw crowns his case with the observation that municipalities are generally governed with efficiency which puts the House of Commons to shame.

Shaw has further criticisms to level against contemporary democracy. He sees as much danger as virtue in universal suffrage, because education does not keep up with responsibility. Extended suffrage, therefore, puts the country more in dangerous tyranny of demagogues. Shaw's fear of demagoguery did not express itself in conservatism, but in the insistence that democracy be awake to the dangers which menace it, and act
instead of talk. He had, in his later pessimistic years, all
the reservations about humanity common to the political conserva-
tive, and at the same time, he had the liberal's faith in
education and planning.

Shaw did not despair of England in spite of the legion
of shortcomings he saw and discussed at length. Even as he
criticized, he offered a blue-print for a socialist society
on terms which he was confident would succeed. Along with
equalization of incomes, there would have to be a complete
elimination of strikes, lockouts, doles, subsidies, and
unnecessary competition.

Even though British Socialism had advanced on the back
of the trade union movement, Shaw had never been confident
that trade unionists and socialists had identical aims.

He stated that:

It is fundamental in socialism that idleness shall not
be tolerated on any terms. And it is fundamental in
Trade Unionism that the worker shall have the right
at any moment to lay down tools and refuse to do
another stroke of work until his demands are satisfied.
It is impossible to imagine a flatter contradiction.

He called trade unions defensive conspiracies, and questioned
whether it was not likely that in a showdown, they would join
with big business against government regulation, than with the
government against the profit system.

Although his opinion on trade unionism was a departure
from the Fabian mood, the planned economy Shaw outlines is the old
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Fabian ideal, with constitutional socialism eliminating the profit system, placing prices below the maximum cost of production, equalizing the return from naturally rich and sub-marginal areas and industries.

Shaw's wavering belief in democracy is reflected in the play "The Apple Cart", which he wrote in the same year during which The Intelligent Woman's Guide was published. There is no doubt but that Shaw's attitude toward democracy was ambivalent, alternating between disgust to the point of rejection and critical affirmation of the necessity of democratic forms. Shaw had an unabashed admiration for the strong men of history. Aside from the flattering portraits he created of Caesar and Napoleon, he peppered his prefaces, his plays, and his political writings with admiring references to authoritarian rulers like Cromwell, Queen Elizabeth, Mussolini, Lenin, to any individual whom he judged to have shown the quality of leadership. His metaphysics puts leadership high in the list of human goods, superceding happiness by far.

The "Apple Cart", is a testament to the power and virtue of a great man whose wisdom carried when his ministers were a pack of fools. King Magnus is a constitutional monarch in a country which is ruled by big business, in spite of its socialist government. Magnus's ministers demand his abdication because he has been able to direct the government into channels of constructive policy, in spite of the garrulosity and the
stupidity of his ministers. Magnus is a philosopher king, and his ministers are a gang of demagogues. The king outwits them by agreeing to abdicate, and announcing that he plans to lead a rival party in the House of Commons.

The play records the triumph of an authoritarian, whose hereditary power is augmented by his personal prestige with the people and social prestige with the aristocrats. Furthermore, because Magnus is wise and selfless, capable and experienced, he stands high above his democratically chosen ministers. He recognizes the dangers of dictatorship and big business while they do not. The implicit question in the play is, who should govern, the fit man or the democratically elected ones? Shaw's answer is that democracy is a fraud, but that it must be made a reality.

In the preface to the "Apple Cart", Shaw says that democracy is strangled by irresponsible private enterprise, that:

Painfully evolved machinery of parliament and party system and cabinet is so effective in obstruction that we take thirty years by constitutional methods to do thirty minutes work, and shall presently be forced to clear up thirty years arrears in thirty minutes by unconstitutional ones unless we pass a Reform Bill that will make a complete revolution in our political machinery and procedure.

Shaw defended himself in this preface against charges of being anti-democratic with a quotation from a radio speech he had made to the effect that those who could see the faults of
democracy were its best friends, not those to whom democracy appears as an infinitely beneficent principle in which we must trust though it slay us. He likened democracy to the sea, defending his stern tactics on the ground that if he, Shaw were to say that the sea is sometimes furiously violent and always uncertain, that those who are most familiar with it trust it least, his audience would not brand him as an enemy of the sea, or accuse him of wanting to abolish the sea. He asked his audience to be equally objective about democracy, not to get hysterical when he subjects it to analysis, nor to denounce him as either a Tory, a Fascist, or a medieval monarchist, who wants to rescind the franchise, free speech or the right to trial by jury. His own attitude, he believed, was objective; democracy exists, and we must reckon with it. He stated that: "Our business is not to deny the perils of democracy, but to provide against them as far as we can, and then consider whether the risks we cannot provide against are worth taking."

The validity of Shaw's defence depends on whether democracy is an incontroversible fact like the sea or whether it is a less abiding essence. Shaw himself never doubted the need for and worth of the sea, as he did democracy for a period. His ingenious metaphor is, therefore, not completely apt.

The risks of democracy lie in its leadership. Government by the people is impossible, according to Shaw although govern-
ment for the people is highly desirable, and government of the people is an absolute necessity. Government by the people is a cry for demagogues; he believed government was too complicated a business to be undertaken by an ill-assorted mob and he held that the people could no more make their own laws than they can write their own plays. Government, then, should be left to those with a talent for government, and the people's concern is to choose capable leaders, and to keep themselves from being at the mercy of them by checks on power. Shaw stated the dilemma that faces democracy in this way: we cannot govern ourselves, yet no man is good enough to be another man's master. We must be governed and yet control our masters. In the final analysis, civilization will still depend on the consciences of the governors and the governed. So, in order to safeguard democracy, citizens must teach their children to be better citizens than they are, and devise tests to ascertain the quality of leadership, in terms of measurement. Shaw was convinced by the strides being made in anthropology, psychology, and biology, that it would not be long before science devised anthropometric tests for leadership. If these tests were adopted as part of the election procedure in democratic nations, there would be genuine meaning in elections. Every candidate on the ballot would have proved his fitness for governing mechanically, and automatically, by succeeding in the battery of prescribed
tests. Shaw held that a choice between an honest stupid man and a thorough incompetent, was no choice at all, and that this was the type of choice which presumably democratic ballots offered every day. Scientifically selected candidates would do away with such unsatisfactory alternatives.

The usefulness of mental tests would not be limited to election panels, although they would be invaluable in creating governments. There would be graded panels of capable persons for all employments, public and private. Such grading would guarantee fitness for employment as well as employment for recognized talents.

Until such tests are devised, Shaw advocated the same measures he advocated in The Intelligent Woman's Guide, the scrapping of a parliament that does nothing but debate, and the substitution of several additional legislatures, working on the municipal system. Shaw had said in the course of many arguments that the party system was anomalous; that opposition for the sake of opposition is not fruitful even when it is called performance and criticism instead of government and opposition. When one party stands ready to repeal the legislation put through by the other party, the result is obstruction in the short run, and stalemate in the long run. Shaw stated in this preface, that since democracy was weak and stood ever in danger that the obstructive function of the present political machinery must be scrapped, and a new positive approach to government cultivated, on the model of the Webb's constitution for the socialist commonwealth of
Britain.

The "Apple Cart" is concerned with socialism as well as democracy. In a sense, the play is a demonstration of the main preachments of *The Intelligent Woman's Guide*. It even maintains the gallant attitude toward women which was not always quite typical of Shaw. Capitalism is represented in the play as the giant trust "Breakages Limited", which controls the country. Breakages Ltd. is interested solely in high profits, wholly indifferent to disease, economic waste or social utility. The overall result is one of shameful social inefficiency and corruption according to Shaw, so that:

The armament firms thrive on war; the glaziers gain by broken windows; the distillers and brewers build cathedrals to sanctify the profits of drunkenness, and the prosperity of Dives costs the privation of a hundred Lazarees.

Shaw never lost his faith in Socialism as the most intelligent form of distribution. The portrait of capitalism in the play reflects that his sense of morality as well as his consciousness of social necessity was outraged by the results of irresponsible private enterprise. His belief in democracy wavered often, but, in the long run, his criticism of democratic institutions was always calculated, not to destroy representative government, but to rationalize and insure it by remodeling its institutions.
This is the obvious conclusion to be drawn from Shaw's arguments in the "Apple Cart", and The Intelligent Woman's Guide. Shaw's reputation as an authoritarian springs from other writings of his than these. It is useful to examine those works which earned him that reputation from a vantage point of thirty years, and to interpret them in the light of hindsight.
Chapter IV. Shaw's Foreign Policy

Shaw's opinions on foreign policy, and on world affairs were highly unconventional. They shocked and disappointed his followers who wanted to believe their idol stood for every manifestation of Liberalism, and couldn't when they heard him state that there was no purpose to the war which was to make the world safe to democracy; that liquidation of those who resist the government is a defensible practice; that Mussolini was a good thing for Italy; and that Hitler would have been fine if he had kept to his original pattern of leadership and not turned into a megalomaniac.

Shaw's ideas on foreign policy were not typical of the Fabians except for the manifesto: "Fabianism and the Empire" which was chiefly Shaw's work. Fabianism never developed a coherent foreign policy for itself. Socialists were completely absorbed in their domestic tasks of analysing and repairing the damage of capitalism to concern themselves with foreign affairs. The Fabians, like all British Socialists tended to over-simplify problems of foreign affairs, by assuming that the interests of the workers were identical, the world over; and that international struggles for power were the results of capitalism and to the mutual advantages of capitalists. The economic conception of warfare as a profitable business for munitions makers and
general business prosperity, was so convincing, that Socialists accepted it uncritically, not stopping to consider that the economic concept of war might be true as far as it went, but that other international tensions existed along with the economic, posing dangers even for a socialist commonwealth. The importance of foreign affairs was ignored, because the complexity of foreign affairs was underestimated.

Most socialists tend to be optimistic about human nature, and to underestimate the dangers inherent in man's will to power, and his natural pride. They believe that human ills are due more to blindness and stupidity, than to natural sinfulness; and hence, that education can remedy human ills, by attacking ignorance and blindness. To the degree that one accepts or rejects this hypothesis, one becomes politically liberal or conservative. The conservatives mistrust progress as they mistrust man's nature. It was this optimism which led the British Socialist to ignore the irrational elements of international relations, the problems of nationalism, of nationalistic aggression and cravings for power, in an unseeing pacifism.

Shaw shared the progressive belief that education could move mountains, but he never believed in man's unalloyed natural goodness. He was convinced that man is as naturally pugnacious as he is naturally good, and that human pugnacity in the aggregate is aggressive nationalism. He deplored this tendency,
but he never lost sight of it even when England's patriots would have preferred to call their emotional state by another name.

Shaw's opinions on world affairs, made him at times, according to William Irvine, the most unpopular man in England. Shaw was an Irishman by birth and an Englishman only by adoption. As such he was immune from the kind of patriotism which he called: "A conviction that a particular country is the best in the world because you were born in it." Moreover, his rationalism and realism would never let him hold to uncritical pacifism.

His first pronouncement on world affairs was his pamphlet on Fabianism and the Empire. It was not a purely private effort. The pamphlet was a statement of the Fabian views of the Boer War which was being waged, in the face of a great national ideological split. The Fabian society was split among the Marxists and the pacifists who actively disapproved of the war, and those who like Shaw and Sidney Webb who wanted to ignore it because it had nothing to do with the business at hand, of developing constitutional socialism. The society decided that Fabianism had to take a stand on The Empire, and they delegated to Shaw the task of drawing up a manifesto embodying that stand. Their position which was too imperialistic for the pacifist socialist, and too moderate for the imperial jingoists, was one of moderate, unre-
manticized, unsentimental imperialism. It held that ideally, there should be global government, but that lacking that, a few great nations will inevitably hold sway over the world with its trade and resources. Until world federalism is achieved, an arrangement like the British Empire, a federation of powers is a good substitute. The manifesto stated the principle that international anarchy is no more possible than national anarchy, and there must be order in the world. The Fabians held that if Britain wanted to claim moral superiority of its civilization as a justification for its imperialist activities, it must revamp its imperial administration, by liberalizing, expanding its services, hiring technical experts. Its policies should be democratized, offering self-government to parts of the empire as soon as they are ready for it. The manifesto advised more self-government for India, as well as self-government for the Boers. It treated the war as a terrible mistake, but held that the settlement of it should do justice to the problem involved. The gold fields and diamond mines should not be left to the Boers merely because England was fighting a senseless war. Instead, they should be internationalized or made imperial property.

The future of the empire according to Shaw and the Fabians, depends on its democratization. Britain can never hope to hold it together by force, and must do it by loyalty instead. Britain must give political liberty to its dominions, freely, and create
an Imperial Council which will rule in the interest of the world. The Empire would become a bastion of freedom which small nations would clamor to join.

Along with its rationalization of imperialism and its stating of ideal according to which the Empire must act to survive, the pamphlet contains an attack on militarism; Shaw stated as he was to state many times again that war is a costly and intolerable imposition, and that the army was a brutal and inefficient organization in which a little humanization of conditions would be more effective than maintenance of military discipline. In "Arms and The Man", Shaw had pointed out the visceral aspects of army life, had de glamorized the institution of the brave fighting man, by having the hero admit that he carried chocolate instead of bullets in his rifle, that most soldiers are cowards, and that those who aren't, aren't normal.

These observations which were amusing enough in peace-time to be adapted into a musical comedy version of the play, became intensely unpopular in wartime.

The tract "Fabianism and The Empire" stressed finally, that foreign policy would succeed only by raising the level of civilization, and that this could be done only by increased efficiency of production and social justice. The Fabians saw foreign policy essentially as an enlargement of domestic policy.

Shaw's discussion of imperialism does not seem to be any-
thing but a rational outline of what the empire must evolve into if it expects to continue. It is interesting therefore, to see how his words hit the young people who grew up with imperialism. C.E.M. Joad records that Shaw's words struck the chains off his "Public School Victorian-ridden youth", that for his class, the empire, under the influence of Kipling, became a cult, and empire loyalty a mystique. Young people so influenced, clamoured to be allowed to assume the "White Man's Burden", of the British Empire, that "monument to disinterested self-sacrifice, a witness to racial superiority, which, conscious of itself, willingly accepted the burdens which its superiority imposed." He recalls that in a passage from "Fabianism and the Empire," stating that:

One can see... that our present system of imperial aggression, in which under pretext of exploration and colonization, the flag follows the filibuster and trade follows the flag, with the missionary bringing up the rear, must collapse when the control of our military forces passes from the capitalist classes to the people.

This statement, which is now, hardly a radical vision, had a generally electrifying effect on the generation schooled in empire idolatry like Joad. He states that on its account, a whole house of cards came fluttering about his ears. 3

The pamphlet on the empire recognized that Germany was England's most formidable rival, with a civilization as great as England's to implant abroad. Shaw had always been an admirer
of German culture. His wide musical knowledge made him recognize the contribution to civilization of Germany's composers, and his personal moral philosophy bears on it the stamp of the German idealists. He had been the greatest champion of Richard Wagner in England. He saw a growing threat in the economic and nationalistic rivalry between Germany and Britain. In 1913, when relations between the two countries were deteriorating, he was asked by the German government to draw up a manifesto of Anglo-German friendship, which he did willingly. Shaw relates, in What I Really Wrote About The War, that aside from the pious generalities with which the manifesto was filled, he put one test sentence, concerning Britain's willingness to have the German fleet expanded. He was well aware that the growing German Navy was the controversial point in Anglo-German relations. He held that Germany had as much right as England to a large Navy. No Englishman would sign until the test sentence was deleted, at which point everyone willingly signed the manifesto except Shaw, who stated that his refusal was meant to underline the existing conflict.

When the war started, Shaw published his pamphlet, "Common Sense About the War", in which he refused to be self-righteous, or to accuse Germany of any of the excesses which warring nations accuse their opponents of to stir up patriotism. His cool impar-
tially outraged the nation. He was called slanderous as well as frivolous when he stated that there was no moral principle being fought over in the war, and that it was rather like an encounter between two pirate ships, that it was immaterial to the onlooker, unless he happened like Shaw to be with his wife, children and property, on board one of the ships. Other than that, he stated that he could have no ethical respect for capitalism and its wars whether it was of the British, French, or German Variety.

Shaw pointed out that a moral fervor was hard to work up over a cause when both the British and the Germans were allied with the most despically despotic nations. The participation of Russia and Turkey belied the claims of either side to democratic intentions. He castigated the British statesmen, Lord Grey, Bonar Law, and Lord Lansdowne at a time when they were sacred in the eyes of the British public. He stated that the efforts of these men had not been to avert the war, but to insure victory, the war being taken as inevitable. He stated that the secret of British foreign policy was that there was no foreign policy, just blunders. When the hysteria of war abated, military and government experts were to agree with his judgments about Britain's foreign policy and its inept exponents, but when Britain was fighting and sacrificing an entire generation of young men in the war, it could not bear to hear that there was no sense in their fight, and no moral
justification in the destruction they were wreaking, no divine beauty in their sacrifice.

Psychologically, the war was no time for an attack on militarism which is just what "Common Sense About the War", was. Shaw stated that war doesn't make sense, that everyone is a coward, and if the men on both sides had any sense, they would shoot their officers and go home. In the same Puckish tone, which makes such good reading in peacetime, but was so insupportable to a nation under pressure, Shaw stated that international warfare is a nuisance, that it disrupted too many worthwhile activities for civilized nations to stand for it. (He had said the same thing about revolution and had been roundly applauded for his sentiments). He stated that war may be a tonic, as militarists say, and that it might stimulate trade, and if so, a good civil war would turn the trick without ruining civilization. He proposed that all those who were enthusiastic about war for its own sake should repair to Salisbury Plain, choose up sides, don uniforms, and begin shooting at each other, and leave the rest of the world to attend to business.

Because Shaw felt it was a moral necessity that soldiers should not die deluded, even though their government might force them to die, he pointed out that the justness of the quarrel had nothing to do with the hostilities, that both sides would be glad to restore the Status Quo Ante with
apologies, if it could be done, but that it could not possibly be done. If the Germans tried, the British would call their move propaganda, and could not countenance such defeatism on their own side.

He said that war was morally indefensible, and that the churches would do better to shut up shop until hostilities ceased, rather than continue to justify the particular brand of immorality on which their lives depended. They would be in a more respectable position if they admitted that the sword is never right, that the war was a horrible mistake.

As the war dragged on, Shaw continued these attacks on the concept of a righteous war, and he began to outline what the aims of the allies ought to be in victory. He admitted that Germany should be beaten, not for any of the reasons which had forced the war, but because Germany was the chief exponent of militarism in the twentieth century, and aggressive militarism could not be allowed to exist. He argued that England had isolated Germany economically, that the personal virtue England was claiming was rather a sated imperial ambition. He did not excuse Germany but accused England. England's great lack had been the absence of foreign policy, a dependence on treaties and secret agreements as an avoidance of constructive thinking. England had been more quarrelsome than Germany, and the first to start talking about war.
Shaw iterated and reiterated that England should assume no moral attitude of superiority in peace negotiations. He argued that militarism as a disease was not peculiar to Prussia, that England had its Junker class. He argued that atrocity stories should not color the attitude of the peacemakers, that they were morally irrelevant, indeed that they were natural to war. It wasn't the atrocities, but war itself which created moral degradation. He observed that; "You can't have glorious wars and glorious cathedrals", and that humanity had to make up its mind as to which institution it would preserve.  

Shaw argued that the Allies should recognize a limited objective in the war, that it was not necessary to crush Germany but only to score a decisive victory. Then, the Allies ought to settle for a Roman peace, without rancor.

He toured the battlefront under government auspices, and was invited to publish a fact finding report. He wrote of gruesome details of gas, wounds and death as it became fashionable to write only in the post-war disillusionment. Nevertheless, Shaw was probably the loneliest man in England during the war when the man in the street spurned him as a moral monster who wanted Britain to lose the war, many of his friends no longer knew him, and he was dropped from the Dramatist's Club. He was attacked unashamedly by the newspapers. Nevertheless, Shaw was on a crusade, as he said in
What I Really Wrote About the War, to make sure that the diplomats and militarists who brought about the war should not get credit for having saved the world from the peril which they had in fact created.

Shaw's moral philosophy had prepared him for the position of loneliness in which he found himself. He argued in "Candida", in "Man and Superman" and in every statement of his theory of creative evolution, that genius is the highest good like has to offer; and that the genius who is on a different evolutionary plane from the average man, is necessarily lonely, misunderstood, unpopular, and reviled for his ideas. The genius is compensated for his inevitable maladjustment to society by his ability to see beyond the horizon of other men, his unique conception of truth. Shaw was certain that he was right about the war, and that if he were alone in his point of view, it was merely proof of the limited minds of his contemporaries. History has vindicated both his judgment and the stand he took. His supreme rationalism made him almost a breed apart. It seems odd, in the wisdom of hindsight, that Shaw's sanity could have been discounted and reviled. The worst judgment that can be levelled against Common Sense About the War, is that it was tactless, that its wit, inoffensive in itself, was ill-timed. War is so illogical, its needs run counter to the normal instincts of humanity, that a nation at
war cannot face a cold, logical summation of its position. Shaw was not so much a prophet or seer, as a cosmopolitan, who did not share the nationalism or the emotionalism of either side, who alone kept his head. And the sane man among idiots is as isolated as the lone idiot among the sane men.

In Peace Conference Hints, he continued to accuse England and Germany of equal blame for the war, to point out the Junkerism on both sides, to heap abuse on both nations for having the stupidity to fight because he wanted to see magnanimity on the part of the victors at the peace table and he was afraid that self-righteousness and vengeance would thwart justice, instead. He continued to harp on the nature of war and the senseless destruction, to the end that the victors should establish a lasting peace. Shaw pleaded for the establishment of a league of nations, stating that the only constructive result that the war might have would be to have given the coup de grâce to medieval diplomacy which had failed to avert the disaster, and had proved its worthlessness for all times. His hints for the peace embodied a program which William Irvine states had great influence on Woodrow Wilson. He advocated freedom of the seas, open diplomatic agreements, freedom for Poland, the self-determination of peoples, and a league of nations with a view to ultimate supra-national government. His idea was not for world government, but for a world of superstates, which would guarantee peace
because none of them would have anything to gain from war. He was enthusiastic about Wilson, whom he marked as the only statesman capable of establishing a just peace. The failure of Wilson, along with the greed of England and revengeful spirit of France, disappointed Shaw profoundly, even though he had tried to prepare himself for just such a fiasco. He could not have been surprised either at the failure of idealism or at the injustice of the terms of Versailles. He had predicted them, and warned against them. Nevertheless, Shaw had hoped that common sense would prevail, and that the disaster of the war would be mitigated by the lesson it taught.

Shaw's bitterness and scorn for the workings of democracy stem from his disappointment in the peace settlement. He saw capitalism as the prime evil because it had caused the war, and democracy as a dupe because it had lost the peace. He concluded that capitalism renders democracy impotent and turned away from both to look for a universally valid morality which would teach the world that war is a universal wrong, that a military cross for bombing someone else's babies could only be a glorious exploit from a militarist, nationalist, or selfishly patriotic point of view, and that any of these points of view was necessarily immoral. It was immediately after the war that Shaw intensified his meta-biological arguments, in an effort to save the world
by religion as long as it was not susceptible to political salvation. His search for religion was, in part, a search for new weapons with which to damn capitalism, and to set free democracy, to make humanity take stock of its moral heritage in order to avert the catastrophes which its political ineptitude was laying up for it.

From this period, Shaw's tone was not consistent. In his post-war political writing he alternated between optimism and bleak despair. He alternately accused democracy of failing to live up to its responsibilities, and of being incapable of handling its responsibilities. He admired the accomplishments of dictatorship pointing out the virtue of strong leadership, on one hand, and on the other hand, he argued that democracy was the only stable form of government. He was in the throes of an ideological struggle. And at times, he lost perspective of the historical struggle he was witnessing. He lived long enough to regain the perspective which he lost in the depths of his despair, to affirm that dictatorship runs greater risks than democracy at its indecisive worst.

Shaw's disappointment in the peace lay deeper than annoyance in the fact that the Allies had fallen into pitfalls which he had foreseen and warned against. In spite of his rationalism, he had shared an illusion about the war with all liberals, that out of the abyss of capitalistic
destruction, a new world would shape itself because the old had destroyed itself. And they assumed that it would be a better world. Logically, he was convinced that war could have no constructive consequences, but psychologically, he was unprepared for defeat.

Shaw's defense of Mussolini reflected a genuine wavering of principles. For a while he really lost sight of the meaning of freedom, of the need for constitutional safeguards. Only dictatorship in its extreme form awakened him to the danger of dictatorship in any form. During the interim between the two world wars, Shaw defended authoritarianism in Italy, Germany, Portugal, and Russia, and agreed with and pointed up authoritarian attacks concerning the decadence of the democracies.

After Mussolini assumed power in Italy, by a coup d'etat, liberals were shocked at the violence and terror with which he ruled. Shaw made himself unpopular a second time, after he had been forgiven for his wartime unorthodoxy, by praising Mussolini and apologizing for his methods. Observing Italy from a luxury hotel in Stresa, Shaw sent enthusiastic letters to the Manchester Guardian. He described Mussolini as a latter day Caesar, who was effectively administering Italy where democrats and socialists had failed. Britain had been outraged by Mussolini's illegal accession to power. Shaw pointed out that calling Mussolini's power an evil coup
does not dispose of Mussolini; there have been many valuable rulers who took their power in just such a way. He pointed to Caesar Augustus, to Cromwell, and to Napoleon as examples, and announced that the English were ridiculous in crying that they would not submit to such outrage. He argued that the question was not how the Duke had come to power, but was he doing his job well?

Shaw maintained that he was doing splendidly. He argued that Mussolini's Fascism was more socialist than the British Labour Party, that it had swept the last vestiges of rotten capitalism out of Italy. More than brutal egotism was going on in Italy. Instead, there was a socialist revolution, and its conflict with capitalism was all to the good. To those who looked nostalgically back to the status quo ante, and hoped to see it reestablished, Shaw stated that the old regime had been thoroughly corrupt, that Mussolini had achieved a positive good, by purging the country of its nineteenth century liberals who mouthed phrases about political liberty, while political liberty was a mockery to starving people. That kind of idealism, Shaw stated, is dead as a door nail. Liberty has no meaning to the exploited, but only to the exploiters.

He dwelled on the esprit de corps, that Mussolini had injected into the whole Italian nation, and discounted the reign of terror, the brutality of the regime, as the inevit-
able excesses of a change of power interests. Political assassinations are disgusting, he asserted, but not peculiar to Fascism. Mussolini does not dictate these excesses any more than Caesar commanded the assassination of Pompey. They came from the overzealousness of his followers who were less capable of commanding power with generosity than Mussolini himself. Shaw judged Mussolini to be great because he had made the nation carry on, he had stepped into a vacuum of leadership because someone had to govern. Mussolini fitted Shaw's concept of greatness, because he had risen to leadership, totally by his own talents, from obscurity, poverty, and political persecution.

Shaw's eulogies of Mussolini drew answering fire from Salvemini, Italy's leading Social Democrat who had fled to England for political asylum. Salvemini accused Shaw of defending Mussolini not on the basis of facts but out of a poetic desire to see Julius Caesar take command of Rome. To Shaw's observance that personal liberty has no meaning to starving people, Salvemini pointed out that Italy in 1922 was an expanding economy, not a starving nation, and that Mussolini didn't bring plenty, but that instead, he had cut the bread ration and increased the work day from eight hours to nine hours. He pointed out that liberty does not mean the right to stand for Parliament, as Shaw seemed to think, but the right to read what one pleases, the right to free assembly,
the right to express an opinion without fear of punishment. His eloquent defense of political liberty pointed up a genuine lack of insight in Shaw. Salvemini observed that Shaw would not take political freedom so lightly if he had ever been deprived of it. Indeed Shaw generally discounted the importance of freedom by equating it with economic laissez faire or with idleness, reducing it to a meaningless concept in order to reject it.

Salvemini called Shaw to account on his frivolous approach to Mussolini's reign of terror. Shaw had said in effect, that Mussolini's enemies had deserved the treatment they had received because they proved themselves incompetent. Mussolini had tortured his enemies with castor oil, and the fact had had wide coverage in the press. Shaw seized on this point, as an example of moderation in Mussolini's reprisals, stating with great glee that most men would prefer to be dosed with castor oil than with whips. Salvemini listed the less frivolous punishments which were present in abundance. He refuted Shaw's surmise that Mussolini was not personally responsible for the blood-letting with documentary proof of Mussolini's personal command of the murder of Matteotti, the socialist leader of Italy.

Shaw came out decidedly the worse in the journalistic battle with Salvemini. Salvemini was right that Shaw's knowledge of Italy and of Fascism was superficial, that his
judgments issued more often from what he would like to have seen developing in Italy than from what was really occurring. Salvemini stated that Shaw was no liberal. William Irvine holds that Shaw cheered Mussolini on as a socialist who wanted to see democracy put on its mettle, rather than as a Fascist. Both are probably right. Shaw vacillated between a Fabian instinct for reform and a hearty disgust with the indecision and slowness of democratic processes. At the same time, he was cheering Mussolini on and yelling for democracy to meet the challenge he presented.

Shaw was peculiarly short-sighted about the danger which Fascism presented to world peace. Its militarism was readily apparent to most observers and Mussolini's promises of military glory to his people carried an obvious threat to the security of weaker nations around him, but Shaw failed to see it carried away by the role he had created for Mussolini to play; the great man of affairs in the twentieth century, the leader whose conceptions were so broad that he could not be limited by the passions of ordinary men, or his actions judged by their standards.

Shaw made somewhat the same mistake about Hitler in the early days of Nazism. He failed to recognize that the unity of the German nation which Hitler undoubtedly achieved, was purchased at the high price of liberty, decency, and peace.

Shaw's attitude toward Hitler is easier to reconcile with
his integrity, than was his approval of Mussolini. He had great sympathy with the problems of post-war Germany. No one had been less satisfied with peace terms than he. He had foreseen the tensions building up in Germany on account of the moral drubbing the Germans received at Versailles, in the reparations settlement, in the post-war blockade. He believed that the victors richly deserved a Germany led by Hitler to teach them a lesson. Shaw never went as far romanticizing the personality of Hitler as he had Mussolini in the early days of Fascism. It was immediately obvious that Hitler might be a brilliant leader, but he was not the great-minded natural aristocrat, which Shaw had seen in Mussolini. By 1938, when Shaw wrote "Geneva", a play of the moment, the scales were off his eyes concerning the virtue of German, Italian, and Spanish dictatorships, but his annoyance with the futile way of democracy had not abated. His attitude in the play is one of a curse on both your houses. He finds capitalist democracy, religious evangelism, and totalitarian dictatorship equally meaningless at the end of the world.

Desmond MacCarthy reviewed the play in a spirit of sad disillusionment that Shaw who had once stood for justice, mercy, and humanity, had had his human sympathies blunted by political disappointment and senility, so that he could look at the sad state of the world in a spirit of indifference when
he had once embodied the spirit of reform. MacCarthy's unwilling judgment that Shaw had grown indifferent through senility was to be disproved by the appearance of Everybody's Political What's What, which appeared in Shaw's eighty-eighth year reasserting the old optimism of Shaw's Fabian days, offering elaborate plans for a world of promise.

Nevertheless, Shaw's human sympathy was blunted. From the time when he laughed off Mussolini's novel means of torture, through the peroration of The Intelligent Woman's Guide in which he said:

Therefore, do not be oppressed by the frightful sum of human suffering; there is no sum; two lean women are not twice as lean as one nor two fat women twice as fat as one. Poverty and pain are not cumulative; you must not let your spirit be crushed by the fancy that it is.

to the point in "Geneva" where a bruised and beaten political prisoner reports his maltreatment and the dictator replies, "I am sorry, but I cannot be everywhere, and my agents are not angels."

The lack of human sympathy is apparent in Shaw's early writing as well as in the late political plays which Desmond MacCarthy deprecates. His letter of condolence to Mrs. Patrick Campbell when her son was killed in the first war is full of annoyance at the stupidity of war without any understanding of a bereaved mother.

He displayed the same detachment toward the sufferings of human beings in his wholehearted acceptance of the Russian
revolution. He found nothing to criticize in their methods except that they were not quite Fabian enough, by which he meant that the Soviet government nationalized industries which they were not equipped to run. Shaw took a trip to Russia in 1927, and returned calling Lenin and Stalin, "Fabians". For Soviet Russia, like for Fascist Italy, his argument stemmed not so much from what he had seen as from what he had wanted to believe.

In spite of Shaw's condemning of totalitarian methods in Soviet Russia, his attitude was not considered indefensible as was his espousal of Mussolini's cause. He did not arouse the protests of those had felt Shaw to be on their side. The Russian revolution had ended what Shaw had called in Common Sense About The War, the foulest despotism in Europe. Furthermore, it had set up a political system in which Shaw devoutly believed, one whose professed principles were identical with his: nationalization of property, equal distribution of wealth, and world peace. The Russians set up a dictatorship as complete as that of Italy or Germany, but it held the proviso that it was a dictatorship of the proletariat, and that it would be dispensed with when the new nation emerged from its emergency period.

It was belief, not lack of it, sympathy, not indifference which made Shaw a champion of the Russian Revolution, and his experience was parallel to that of many liberals and socialists who refused to think ill of a movement which embodied their
principles, which promised a millenium, and was merely taking the short cut, in eliminating its enemies, to secure it. Sidney and Beatrice Webb whose democratic liberalism never wavered as Shaw's admittedly did, were as enthusiastic as Shaw about the Russian experiment.

The fact that Shaw wavered in his devotion to democratic ideals is not so significant as the fact that he moved back to a reaffirmation of them. Even in "Geneva" where his answers to moral problems of dictatorship were far from adequate, totalitarianism no longer held charms for him. He believed that democracy had failed in its responsibilities, but he realized that the dictatorships had failed worse. The pirate ships of England and Germany were no longer equally immoral as they had seemed to him in the first World War.

In his flirtation with totalitarianism, Shaw consistently underestimated the danger of the aggressive nationalism which was steadily being aroused in both Germany and Italy. The dictators were depending on military preparations and conquests to balance the economic lacks and ideological needs of their people. He had refused to consider the part played by militant German nationalism in causing the first world war, writing to Chesterton that stupid statesmen, not national characters start wars.

In his dispassionate discussions of the relative advantages of dictatorship and democracy, he failed to discuss the issue
of world peace, and to recognize that while dictatorships were exploiting militant nationalism, the chief advantage of democracy lay in its tendency to delay, check, and disperse any headlong enthusiasms. Shaw was eager to give the devil his due, to show Mussolini in the best possible light, and that light did not illumine the whole picture. Shaw's view on the necessity of world peace, on the moral nature of war, would never have let him condone Fascism in its military expression. Shaw looked at political systems in terms of his own aims: how well did they expedite the achievement of socialism.

Unquestionably, Shaw was attracted by the efficiency of dictatorship. Nevertheless, when he realized the aims and principles of Mussolini and Hitler, he withdrew his approval. It was never as an extremist that he had supported them, but as an idealist who was disillusioned with democracy's methods.

Even in an old age, Shaw's mind remained flexible, capable of reversing itself, and such a reversal is evident in the shift of opinion from "The Apple Cart", written in 1928, to "Geneva" written in 1938. King Magnus, in the former, represents a romantic ideal of dictatorship, the leader who stands beyond public caprice, free to act for the public good, without the hindrance of the ignorant mob. "Geneva" shows dictators as bombastic demagogues, more dangerous to civilization than democrats at their ineffective worst.
Shaw had overstated his approval of dictatorship in the first place, to shock the self-sure democracies into parallel action. His withdrawal of approval was consonant with his underlying Fabian liberalism which he had never really abandoned.

He returned to his original contention that political freedom is a necessity which cannot be abandoned even temporarily, for the sake of efficiency, that you cannot depend on the end to justify the means.
Chapter V. Everybody's Political What's What, Shaw's Final Terms with Democracy

Everybody's Political What's What, which Shaw wrote in 1944, is the final statement of Shaw's political theory. It maintains the constant belief in socialism, and completes the shift back to liberalism which was evident in Shaw's late political plays. Shaw came full circle, back to the Fabian liberalism he had advocated sixty years before.

Shaw advanced no new ideas in this book. He brought his old ideas up to date, illustrating them in terms of contemporary political movements. In 1944, it took considerable faith to reaffirm the old socialist belief in the goodness of mankind. The human destruction which Shaw had witnessed in his inordinately long life, had not intimidated him. His schemes for reforming Britain were as energetic and as revolutionary as ever. His early optimism which was doused by the first war, was jauntier than it had been for twenty-five years.

Shaw had good reason to be optimistic in 1944. England had moved steadily in Shaw's direction, establishing many of the constitutional measures the Fabians had advocated, cradle to the grave social security, wages and hours legislation, wide areas of municipalization of services, all of which had been out of reach when Shaw had first suggested their possibility. It was apparent that the next general election might well see a Labour majority which would legislate socialism.
Everybody's What's What is a final attempt to knock some sense into "Everyman's" head, to direct his view away from what has been accomplished to what needs to be done.

Shaw's old yardstick of values remains intact: Idleness and poverty must be abolished; all classes must be equal in the sense that they can marry freely; political freedom must be grounded in economic security; economic freedom is anarchy, and must be replaced by nationalization of industry and planned production.

This reaffirmation of socialist aims is grounded in Shaw's reaffirmation of the socialist view of mankind, which holds that man is not incurably depraved, that this is not the best of all possible worlds. Man and society are both capable of vast improvement and the proper spirit for reform is optimism. He states that pessimism and cynicism are delusions which are caused, "not only by ignorance of contemporary facts, but by drawing wrong conclusions from them."

The conclusions which Shaw terms right involve an economic view of politics and a political view of economics with a unified scientific outlook. No one could oversimplify any human problem into progressivism or conservatism, into absolute good or evil, or take refuge in despair. Shaw points out that the hell of capitalism is not the result of man's evil nature, but the result of his good intentions, the dreams of visionaries which got out of control. With such human material as the
creative builders of capitalism, Shaw says that, "We can build a dozen new worlds when we learn both the facts and the lesson in political science the facts teach." ¹

With a unified view of civilization, Shaw examines his favorite issues, the land question, the British party system, economic equality, education, and finance. He hits on biology, theology, and anthropology, all of which become political issues when the state becomes the tool for rational living which Shaw demands.

While his analyses are not essentially different from those he had given the same problems, in previous works, Shaw is more preoccupied with historical parallels, than he had ever been.

Shaw's tremendous command of historical facts adds value to his keen analytical powers. He handles the land question flexibly restating his original analysis of "The Economic Basis of Socialism" pointing out that the goal of equality can be achieved as well by taxation as by collectivization. He had watched the Russian experiment in collectivization of land with keen interest, and had recognized that beneath the Kulak problem ran a universal human passion to own land.

As a rationalist, Shaw has little patience with passion especially when it obstructs reform, but as a political realist he offered alternatives and suggested the way of least resistance.

His goal of equality shows similar modification over the
intransigent stand he took in *The Intelligent Woman's Guide* where he demanded equality of income. In this issue again, he had a historical parallel to draw upon. Russia had tried to divide its production according to the concept, from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs and had abandoned it form one of compensation to work done. Shaw revised his program accordingly. He requires the maintenance of a decent minimum standard of living, below which no one is allowed to fall. He states that:

> When democratic socialism has achieved sufficiency of means, equality of opportunity, and national intermarriageability for everybody, with production kept in its natural order from necessities to luxuries, and the courts of justice unbiased by mercenary barristers, its work will be done; for these, and not a mathematical abstraction like equality of income are its real goal.²

He argues as he always did for equal distribution of labor and of labor, irrespective of wages. Shaw had always maintained that freedom is leisure, and that unfair distribution of leisure is slavery.

Shaw's return to political liberalism is not manifested in an uncritical acceptance of British political institutions because German and Italian ones proved corrupt. Instead, Shaw stressed the need for new institutions to safeguard and extend democracy. He had once believed that democracy was the logical form of government into which all governments must evolve. Whether they begin with dictatorship, monarchy,
or constitutional assemblies. In *The Intelligent Woman's Guide*, he had suggested democracy might profit by a short term suspension of democratic delays. The irrational behavior of Hitler had showed him that the progress of governments is not necessarily logical, and that it is folly ever to suspend democratic processes, or to make power irrevocable.

He rejected dictatorship completely when he said:

We must reject the Hitler plan because though it works in the army successfully, it gives one man more authority and responsibility than one man can bear. If he is weak, he is corrupted by his power; if he is strong, he is demented by it, and, like Alexander, Hitler, and Napoleon, tries to add the world to his dominions, thus becoming a scourge and a tyrant. New brooms sweep clean when they are new but when they are spoiled or worn out, the place becomes an Augean stable.

Shaw's rejection of the desirability of dictatorship did not lead him to revise his opinion of mobocracy. He remained mistrustful of the ability of the man in the street to govern, or even to choose leaders wisely. He never had any use for Rousseau's concept of the general will's infallibility. He stated in his final summation of political realities that: "Until popular choice is constitutionally guided and limited, political ignorance and idolatry will produce not only Hitleresque dictatorships but stampedes led by liars or lunatics." Shaw was still terrified at the prospect of a government which could like
the first French Republic cut off LaVoisier's head, saying that the republic has no need for chemists. He combined this judgment of the natural incapacity of men to govern themselves with an appeal for panels of persons who have passed the most stringent tests proving their qualities of leadership. The anthropometric tests he hoped for in The Intelligent Woman's Guide, had become a reality, and Shaw was enthusiastic at the prospect for putting them to use in the cause of inspired government.

For the man in the street, Shaw saw a vital but non-legislative function. They would be in control of the House of Commons which would be redefined as a place for the ventilation of grievances, for questioning and criticizing ministers, for suggesting new methods and remedies; the moving of resolutions; and for votes of confidence or non-confidence, "for keeping the government in touch with the people, a representative popular parliament of men and women in equal numbers." Without such checks, and provisions for government with the consent of the governed, the common people become seditious.

Shaw continued to hold as he had held in The Intelligent Woman's Guide Parliament must be scrapped, and the party system along with it, that one was a hopeless abstraction, and the other a meaningless convention. He still clung to the constitution the Webbs had written for a socialist commonwealth which put the municipal system of government by standing committees on
a national basis. It had never been accepted by the Labour Party, but Shaw believed that the social and economic parliaments which it sketched to replace the jack of all trades existing one, were necessary for the establishment of working democracy. Until parliaments could handle national business efficiently, representative government would not exist. He argued that Britain has many judicial and administrative boards which do in fact legislate, but that they have assumed their powers casually and without plan. They are accountable to no one because their function is not clearly defined, thus completely responsible government is impossible under the present system. In a municipal system, where government, is carried on by specialized committees, these boards would assume a responsible function.

Furthermore, private organizations such as manufacturers, associations, medical associations, trade unions, legal associations and the like, which are all monopolistic enterprises, holding powers of life and death over the community, are themselves organs of government, and tend to become conspiracies against the public, with the power they hold. Shaw argues that these organizations should be controlled by the state, and that until they are, democracy, and Shaw defines it not as self-government but as responsible government, is impossible.
Shaw's political reforms do not stop with Parliament, he would alter all democratic institutions to broaden and preserve democracy. His reforms don't even stop with political institutions. He would rationalize religion, language, science and art, as well. He would make education the prime purpose of the state, for his Fabian belief that education was the tool of progress, never died. Everybody's Political What's What, is an energetic attempt to further the work of Fabianism, to show the practical way to Utopia, by making progress out as a set of reforms rather than a vague, emotional ideal.

Politically, Shaw was reconciled with the principles of humanitarian liberalism. His critical faculties were not, however, blunted into passive acceptance of traditional institutions. Shaw's intellectual curiosity never deserted him. Even at an age when most minds cease to dwell in the present and concern themselves with the past, Shaw continued to think of the future with unabated interest, and with great hope for mankind.
Conclusion

This study has traced the way in which Shaw's political ideas changed, from the tenets of liberalism to disillusioned doubt of them, from acceptance of democracy a temporary abandonment of democratic aims; with a final reaffirmation of democratic beliefs. It has been shown that there two major strains in Shaw's political thought, socialism and liberalism, and that they were not always intertwined. Shaw's belief in socialism remained constant and unchanging, while his beliefs in liberalism wavered and shifted.

This study has examined Shaw's major works on socialism, pointing out the similarity of the programs which he advocated through sixty years. Shaw's ideas on socialism never grew timid. It can be seen in Everybody's Political What's What, that he was as revolutionary in 1944, as he had been in 1888, when he wrote his first Fabian essays. His enthusiasm for experiment and reform never dimmed.

Shaw's contribution to British social thought lay chiefly in his contribution to the Fabian society. It has been shown that he was responsible for many of its doctrines, much of its literary brilliance and intellectual vigor. And it has been shown that the Fabian society permeated the whole British labor movement with its ideas, winning it from a philosophy of revolutionary, direct action, to the Fabian concept of constitutional socialism, achieved through evolution.

Because Shaw's ideas of socialism remained the same throughout his life, his later socialism suffered from having nothing
new to say. At the same time, his ideas on foreign policy were so controversial, that his socialism was ignored in the furor he aroused. His opinions concerning the first World War, his defense of the totalitarian regimes in Italy, Russia, and Germany, coupled with bitter attacks on the stupidity of democracy, were unpopular with the liberal elements on which Shaw's socialism had had the greatest influence. Shaw's lack of personal influence on practical politics can be traced to his controversial ideas on foreign policy, which were consistently unpopular even when justified.

Shaw was not an original political thinker. His philosophy was eclectic, containing elements of Millite socialism which were supplemented with ideas of Henry George, Karl Marx, Stanley Jevons, Nietzsche, Samuel Butler. Out of these separate strains, he developed a unified view of the world, an organized approach to political economy which emphasized the moral aspect of economics and the economic aspect of morality. Shaw made the moral basis of socialism clear by pointing it out in every context possible. In every analysis of production, he considered wealth in terms of social benefit as opposed to unearned increment; he argued the problem of distribution in terms of human needs. For Shaw, war, peace, poverty, idleness, religion and power, education, and science were all political issues; and he discussed them in terms of human values. He never abstracted a political problem from its moral consequences. He believed devoutly in eternal truths, although he rejected traditional theologies. He never shrank
from value judgments. His judgments were frequently unpopular, sometimes wrong in the light of historical fact, but they were always the result of seeing society steadily and whole.

Shaw's approbation of totalitarian regimes was considered a moral lapse. It has been shown in this study that it was more an emotional and intellectual lapse. Once Shaw was aware of the facts of modern dictatorship, he disabused himself of his admiration for strong men in government, and his basic liberalism which held that men are ends in themselves not to be subordinated to the ends of the state, reasserted itself. Although he finally rejected dictatorship completely, Shaw never accepted democracy uncritically. His middle class socialism was grounded in distrust for mob sentiment, and in the same way, his belief in democratic ideals was always tempered by his fear of mob-rule.

Shaw laid claim to about fifteen distinct reputations. At present, his dramatic reputation is in the ascendancy, and his political reputation is being ignored. Nevertheless, it is Shaw's political thought which gives his plays much of their substance, and his moral integrity which contributes much to their merit. It has been shown in this study that Shaw's moral thoughts and his political theories were never abstracted from each other, but were interdependent. They differ in emphasis rather than in essence. If his political and moral philosophy are to find their most lasting expression in his plays, it is fortunate that the plays make no intellectual compromise. It has been shown that "Man And Superman" and "Back To Methuselah" are the chief expositions of Shaw's moral beliefs, and that Shaw's political shifts are
reflected in "Geneva" and "The Apple Cart". With their prefaces, these plays leave no doubt about Shaw's politics.

Although Shaw has been called a clown, a crank, and an extremist, he was a serious political thinker. His wit and his penchant for exaggerating his case for effect, tend to detract from the seriousness of his ideas. His mistaken judgments must be considered along with his prophetic ones, but it must always be recognised that his arguments are logical, his facts are pertinent, and that many of his programs proved not only possible, but highly successful.
Shaw, George Bernard
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Abstract Of thesis

Hypothesis: Shaw's influence was greatest in his contribution to Fabianism, and least in his pronouncements on foreign affairs. Shaw's ideas on foreign policy were grounded in his socialism, and his sympathy for totalitarian movements which diminished his influence on liberals, was dictated by belief that dictatorship was a short-cut to socialism.

Chapter I  A moral philosophy is basic to Shaw's political theories. His social creed of evolutionary socialism developed into a religion of creative evolution. Shaw rejected Christian theology as outworn. He rejected the current scientific materialism of the followers of Darwin, because it posits a meaningless universe, without free will or virtue. Shaw's own metaphysics put purpose back into evolution by positing a life force, a creative impulse which works through man toward perfection. The life force works only through a born elect of genius, the creators and leaders of civilization. Shaw posits free will and a Godhead, the essence in which all values inhere. He considers the problem of good and evil in "Back To Methuselah", which is the main exposition of his moral philosophy. He argues that man does evil through irresponsibility rather than through desire, and if he lived long enough to reap the consequences of his deeds, he would refrain from evil for self-preservation. Human nature is not naturally evil. It is capable of improvement, through education. Education, therefore, is the chief tool of progress. Truth is of such a nature that it can be communicated by clear and distinct explanation. This view of truth is basic to a reforming critic of institutions.
which Shaw was. Shaw's iconoclasm was an attempt to conserve values by rescuing them from no longer spiritual Christianity and from scientific nihilism.

Chapter II shaw's contribution To Fabianism

The Fabian society represented middle class, evolutionary socialism, in the end of the 19th century. Its goal was to embody socialism in a set of constitutional measures, to make it thoroughly respectable. Shaw contributed much of the Fabian doctrine. He was the economic expert, the chief lecturer and heckler for the society. His Fabian essays contain all the essential elements of the socialist doctrine he advocated for sixty years. He showed the influence of Henry George in his analysis of the land question in, "The Economic Basis Of Socialism"; evolutionary tactics were considered in, "The Transition To Social Democracy"; the desirability of socialism over communist anarchism and over laissez-faire economic anarchy in "The Impossibility Of Anarchism"; the undesirability of great wealth and the intelligent disposition of it through charity in, "Socialism For Millionaire"; "and the position of the able man in society, in, "Socialism And Superior Brains". The Fabians advocated municipal socialism and many of them distinguished themselves in municipal administration. Shaw served five years as a vestryman in St. Pancras Parish. His essay, "The Commonsense Of Municipal Trading", advocates the municipalization of industry, since government can not only operate more cheaply than private enterprise, but they are not required to show profits, and can think in terms of social usefulness instead.

The Fabian Society had great national influence; its philosophy
became the philosophy of the Labour Party, and many of its members became leaders in the Labour governments. Shaw was responsible for many of the doctrines which were to become the law of the land.

**Chapter III** Shaw's Later Socialism

Shaw's later socialism was expressed in *The Intelligent Woman's Guide To Socialism And Capitalism*. It reflects the disillusionment Shaw felt because of the first World War and the Allied mishandling of the peace. He had advocated Women's suffrage, but the hysterical voting of women to hang the Kaiser, in the first election in which they participated, convinced Shaw that women had to be educated politically. This is his attempt at their education. He elaborated on his Fabian theories, advancing the idea of complete equality. His discussion of democracy reflects the shift of opinion he underwent in that period, during which he supported totalitarian movements in several European countries. *The Intelligent Woman's Guide* maintains that all governments must eventually come to some force of representation and that their beginnings, therefore, are not of great importance.

"The Apple Cart", a political play written in the same period, points out the desirability of a ruler who is above the caprice of public opinion, free to legislate according to his superior wisdom. "The Apple Cart", maintains Shaw's belief that socialism is basic to any good government.

**Chapter IV** Shaw's Foreign Policy

Shaw's ideas on foreign policy were first expressed in a Fabian manifesto concerning the Boer War, "Fabianism And The Empire", in which he debunked the mystical cult of empire, but maintained that the empire was a valuable structure which could be modified into...
a democratic organ of international government. In it, Shaw warns against the dangers of militarism and the moral horror of war.

During the World War, Shaw was highly critical of British foreign policy and of the statesman who had not averted it. He did not excuse Germany from guilt, but he equated England's guilt with Germany's. He advocated magnanimity at the peace table when it became apparent that the Allies were winning. He supported a peace program similar to that of Woodrow Wilson's. The failure of Wilson's idealistic plan at Versailles, made Shaw bitter toward democracy and he retreated from politics into metaphysics and morals in his search for plans to reform society. He watched the rise of anti-democratic powers in Europe with a wry satisfaction. The failure of dictators to create socialism in the nations they ruled as well as the menace they proved to be to world peace, drove Shaw back to liberalism. The shift is apparent in his play, "Geneva", as opposed to the earlier, "The Apple Cart".

Chapter V Shaw's Final Terms With Democracy

Shaw's final statement of political theory, in Everybody's Political What's What, restates his Fabianism in terms of issues current in 1944. He maintains the same goals he posited in 1886, but he offers new alternatives, in the light of socialism's historical experience, to achieve them. His final rejection of dictatorship does not carry with it an uncritical acceptance of democracy. Shaw continued to hold that Parliament, and the party system as well as political popularity contests must be scrapped.

Conclusion Shaw's socialism remained constant even when his liberalism wavered. In spite of his criticism of democracy, and his admiration for strong leadership, Shaw's Fabianism was essential to his thought, and his return to liberalism was inevitable.