Chapter Three

Power-relations in Woman's Role

I. Economical Independence

In this chapter, I examine the development of the women's economy in relation to the freedom and independence that their economic situation affords. However, according to Frank Harris, a woman "who has earned her economic independence and managed to keep free of emotional enslavement to any one man" has never got rid of her mother's influence (Harris 189). Throughout the history, most parents have raised their daughters for marriage rather than promote and advance their individuality. Women themselves also notice the advantage of marriage that they often hope for it, and as a result, they often acquired less special training to make a living independently. In this way, women in society stay in "the lower levels, to be inferior; and the vicious circle is formed: this professional inferiority reinforces her desires to find a husband" (De Beauvoir 137). Only a liberated woman is "productive, active. She can accept her transcendence to project her status as subject in connection with the aims she pursues with the money she earns, and the rights she attains (Ibid 680). As a woman with greater self-awareness, she can free herself from marriage through a job. Thus she no longer accepts "domestic subjection with docility" (Ibid 137). Therefore, in the social context, women's work-force participation, comes from an understanding of the economic situation within which women live their lives.

In terms of economic activity, many changes are made by women from their shifts in economic status to their stops being simple bystanders to economic activity. However, women still have to put up with some domestic details, so their material progress is limited, and their civic autonomy weakened by their lack of access to money. Money was to a considerable extent a repressed subject in Victorian

England. Among Shaw's three plays, in *Major Barbara*, money matters, because The Army can not work properly without it. In *Pygmalion*, money means survival. Both Barbara and Eliza are capable of achieving their ends of economic independence by understanding and work. On the other hand, in *Saint Joan*, Joan successfully performs her mission through her own inspiration, also military and financial support.

In *Major Barbara*, Undershaft, the munitions manufacturer, as the embodiment of the capitalist system, is in a great contrast to the values of the spirit personified by his daughter, Barbara. Barbara, working in the Salvation Army, does her best to save the poor and abject people of the souls. However, without money, she must seek support from the rich and powerful people. With economic restrictions, Barbara must rethink her ways of raising money first. In essence, it is an issue about money and its impact.

At the moment when the Army shelter had not enough money to keep it open, Lord Saxmundham, a distiller of whisky offers £5,000 and Undershaft, Barbara's father, a munitions manufacturer presents another £5,000 to the Salvation Army. Barbara decides to leave the Army, because she realizes that without money, she can not save people by religion and morality alone.

Barbara, at first, firmly believes that only with religious aid can she convert and save souls, as she later tells Cusins: "I was happy in the Salvation Army for a moment", but she also realizes the impact of money (151). "I escaped from the world into a paradise of enthusiasm and prayer and soul saving; but the moment our money ran short, it all came back to Bodger: it was he who saved our people: he, and the Prince of Darkness, my papa" (151).

Actually, without adequate financial support, she can not lead the Salvation Army efficiently. In comparison, Perivale St Andrews, the world of Undershaft's

cannon works and factory town, represent a place, different from the poor, miserable, hungry people in the Salvation Army, but living in this place, people are well-fed, well-clothed, well-housed and well-behaved, and there is no secret that the source of the money is from the "factory of death," Undershaft's munitions works. It dawns on Barbara:

> when we feed a starving fellow creature; it is with their bread, because there is no other bread; when we tend the sick, it is in the hospitals they endow; if we turn from the churches they build, we must kneel on the stones of the streets they pave. As long as that lasts, there is no getting away from them. Turning our backs on Bodger and Undershaft is turning our backs on life. (151)

Because "there is no wicked side" of life; "life is all one" (151). Independently, economically, and spiritually, Barbara, "through the raising of hell to heaven and of man to God, through the unveiling of an eternal light in the Valley of The Shadow," rediscovers her transcendence (152).

Furthermore, money, in *Pygmalion*, means survival. In a word, money even can change attitude, behavior and language. Without money and knowledge, one can not survive or have independence. In this play, Shaw aims to illustrate the relationship between money, survival and independence. De Beauvoir, the feminist, explores not only the humanity of the female but also the male under a patriarchy. *The Second Sex* is her works of theory, analysis and interpretation, and its purpose intends to present answers "in the form of response to particular events or injustices" (Winegarten 84). The first volume of *The Second Sex* focuses on the fate, history and myth of woman. Woman has been regarded as the instrument of production because of her biological fate, and her responsibility is to do repetitive work. In

patriarchal times, women had been ruled by her father or her husband, and her statue was very low. Woman herself constitutes a part of the patrimony of a man: “first of her father, then of her husband” (82-83). In the second volume, De Beauvoir ‘s work discusses the true experience of woman from her childhood to an old age. The fate of woman is doomed to do the repeated housework. However, the endurance of woman is against her will, and she surrenders to man unwillingly. Therefore, in the patriarchal regime, she is “the property of her father, who marries her off to suit himself” (84). It is easy to succumb to slavery rather than to fight for her independency and equality.

In spite of this view, a woman is surrounded by money, which is tightly coupled with independence. Hence, in *Pygmalion*, money is in the top of Eliza’s mind. At first, being a poor flower girl, Eliza only has about £60 a day to afford her living (30). She lives in her tiny room, which is decorated with “very old wall paper hanging loose in the damp places. A broken pane is only mended with paper… a draped packing case with a basin and jug on it and a little looking glass over it, a chair and table, the refuse of some suburban kitchen” (23). At times, Eliza removes her skirt and shoes and climbs into bed to keep warm. These shabby lodging represents Eliza’s strained financial situation.

On the other hand Higgins, an expert in phonetic, lives comfortably by his lucrative profession because he can teach speech. Later, and he boasts to his friend, Pickering that he can teach this working-class girl better English and perhaps she can have a better-paying job, in the future. He takes an interest in a poor girl, Eliza.

Higgins tells her: “If youre good and do whatever youre told, you shall sleep in a proper bedroom, and have lots to eat, and money to buy chocolates and take rides in taxis” (36). After Eliza moves in with Higgins and Pickering, she takes a hot bath.

She sees an unrecognizable self in the mirror for the first time. She begins to prepare for new station in life.

After Eliza lives in Wimpole Street for six months, she learns how to speak correct English like a lady. Under the command of Higgins, Eliza just like a baby obeys Higgins orders to the letter in order to learn, as De Beauvoir states in *The Second Sex*, "Servitude is often before Liberation, and one of women distinguishing traits is resignation" (601). The position of man is superior than that of woman in a patriarchal society, and in fact, a woman is inhibited to have her rights. At first, Eliza does not agree with Higgins's dogmatism, because she is not allowed to have her value, her wisdom, even her taste for her costume. On the other hand, Eliza is willingly controlled by Higgins because she wisely accepts his superiority and his value judgments, and also lets him feel that he is valued, conversely, if Eliza never allows him to do so, and his value judgments will become useless.

Higgins has a passion for phonetics and worships his mother's finesse, but Eliza is way out of his league. After learning sane phonation, she begins to think about her future, she complains to Higgins: "I sold flowers. I didn't sell myself. Now you've made a lady of me I'm not fit to sell anything else" (82-83). To get a better job, she wishes to have speech lessons from Higgins. Now, she becomes aware of her personal meaning of life through economic independence.

There is an evolution in Eliza's character from passive receiver of control to positive agent of control. Through the mobility from one social class to another, Higgins offers the connections of money and better job to Eliza. Before Eliza submits to Higgins's lessons, she has already demonstrated her independence as a flower girl. Yet, in the midst of her studies, she displays her dependence on Higgins because she wants to learn the phonetic enough to enlarge her future picture in order

to stand independently in the society as a lady. Only through education and social acceptance, women can have better economic participation. For Eliza, the ability to earn more money promises to give her more independence.

At the end of *Pygmalion*, capable of earning more money than before, Eliza becomes both emotional and financial independent of Higgins. As Higgins says: "you were like a millstone round my neck. Now you're a tower of strength: a consort battleship" (109). Again, we see the transcendence in her.

II. Male and Female Relationship

Shaw's female characters "usually prove more interesting and more vital than his male characters" (Weintraub 8). His strict observance of "the traditional man-woman/mind-body dichotomy is itself an inversion, since that dichotomy assumes the passivity of women and their corresponding domination by men" (Vogt 53). Therefore, in many of Shaw's plays, woman is active; man is passive. In *Pygmalion*, the cockney flower girl is a young woman, smart enough to support her activity. In *Major Barbara*, Barbara, a salvation leader, transforms her original inferiority successfully to perform her will power of mission. In *Saint Joan*, Joan leads an army "not because she is a woman, or even in spite of that womanhood, but because she has the instincts and the capacity for leadership" (Weintraub 8-9). The three female characters show their aggressive, positive and energetic attitudes to encounter with the facts of life.

I have made a careful study of the female characters and men positioned in relation to the women. I explore Shaw's three plays representation of the power relations between men and women according to Michel Foucault's microphysics of power. The study includes the following women characters: Eliza in *Pygmalion*, Barbara in *Major Barbara*, and Joan in *Saint Joan*. And I analyze the negative as

well as the positive power relations between men and women in these three plays. I attempt to read Shaw from a power perspective. And Foucault's theory of micro power will be applied to the analysis of the characters in this essay, including men's power over women in *Pygmalion*, *Major Barbara* and *Saint Joan*; conversely, how women exert their power over men. And this study consists both of the repressive and the productive sides of the power relations between them. Hopefully the study can demonstrate a new way of reading Shaw's plays.

Michel Foucault's theory of power relations provides a good perspective to interpret and analyze the power relations in *Major Barbara*, *Pygmalion* and *Saint Joan*. According to the theory of Foucault, power is "a relationship between two individuals, a relationship which is such that one can direct the behavior of another, or determine the behavior of another" (Lotringer: 410). Foucault also says: "power strategy refers to the totality of the means put into operation to implement power effectively or to maintain it" (Dreyfus and Rabinow 225). For instance, "every time one side does something, the other one responds by deploying a conduct, a behavior that counter-invests it, tries to escape it, diverts it, turns the attack against itself, etc. Thus nothing is ever stable in theses relations of power" (Dreyfus and Rabinow 144). In other words, when one person may try to escape or resist such command or attempt to control the actions of others in turn, thus making a sophisticated network of interpersonal power relations, which is different traditional notions about power Traditional conceptions of power focus on the macro power relations between whole groups or classes, while Foucault foregrounds the micro power relations between individuals.

Apart from this, traditional conceptions regard power as repressive, while Foucault thinks the nature of power can be productive, not always repressive

(Lotringer: 411). So, Foucault's theory is an useful framework for analyzing the power relations between women and men, such as the ones represented in Bernard Shaw's plays here concerned. In this way, Foucault's theory of micro power is applied to analyze the power the male characters exert on the female characters. The repressive power relations between them as well as the productive power relations between male and female will be examined. In general, male and female relationships involve several kinds of power relations. Often they mix with each other and complicate each other.

But Foucault observes, "we must distinguish between power relations understood as strategic games between liberties---in which some try to control the conduct of others, who in turn try to avoid to allowing their conduct to be controlled or try to conduct the conduct of others---and the states of domination that people ordinarily call 'power'" (Foucault qtd. in Rabinow x vii). Foucault further illustrates, "One impoverishes the question of power if one poses it solely in terms of legislation and constitution, in terms solely of the state and the state apparatus. Power is quite different form and more complicated, dense and pervasive than a set of laws or a state apparatus" (Foucault b: 158). Obviously he means that it is not enough evidence to analyze macro power, so we should pay more attention to micro power.

Gary Wickham further clearly clarifies about Foucault's distinguish between micro and macro powers. He says:

> There is no one unified site or sites of power relations such as the social or the state and all such categories must be defined as specific groupings of practices which are repeated or represented in specific sites; strategies, tactics, techniques and technologies of power relations do not exist in or operate as meta-sites of power, incorporating smaller sites---they repeat the

> smaller sites within their boundaries and the smaller sites repeat them, or aspects of them, within them. (Wickham 174).

That is the thinking behind an elaborate power relationship, which each aspect of micro power can be discussed independently, though they are also linked with each other.

Within feminist thought, there is a long tradition between the practice of love and the reconstruction of patriarchal power. Some feminists argue that the "blind, passionate, seductive and conflictual nature of romantic love undermined women's interests" (Langford 5). In *The Second Sex*, first published in 1949, Simone de Beauvoir developed a Hegelian analysis of patriarchy. According to her, "the key dynamic is a fundamental tendency of human consciousness, hence it becomes aware of itself as a subject, and in turns becomes aware of the existence of other subjects, to see them as objects, as 'others', and as inferior, as a defense against its own fear of their subjectivity" (Langford 5). The tendency combines with the various living conditions of different groups, will lead, for sure, to relations of domination and subordination. The idea of De Beauvoir is in complete accord with what Foucault calls a traditional "male ethics〔 … 〕in which women figured only as objects or, at most, as partners that one had best train, educate, and watch over when one had them under one's power" (Foucault d: 22). Members of dominant groups become the "Ones", who "reduce the existential threat of the 'Others' by objectifying them" (Langford 5). This is the basic phenomenon that has formed relations between men and women for a long time. Women, defined as the "Others", are directed towards a life of "independence, vulnerability and self-sacrifice" (Langford 5). Men are defined as the "Ones" who are capable of "transcendence" (Langford 5). These notions are in accordance with De Beauvoir's words about a woman:

> She chooses to desire her enslavement so ardently that it will seem to her the expression of her liberty; she will try to rise above her situation as inessential object by fully accepting it; through her flesh, her feelings, her behavior, she will enthrone him as supreme value and reality: she will humble herself to nothingness before him. Love becomes for her a religion. (De Beauvoir 653)

That explains why male has always regarded himself as superior to female. In *Pygmalion*, Henry Higgins, who accepts this task is an overbearing bully, undertakes the task of changing a woman from one kind of person to another. He bullies Eliza almost over everything, ordering her about in a very cruel manner without any concern for her feelings. In the Act II, when Eliza, at first, comes to ask about taking elocution lessons from Higgins, he asks Pickering "shall we ask the baggage to sit down or shall we throw her out of the window? " (28) His treatment of her is full of masculine impoliteness and offensiveness. When she interrupts his phonetic lessons about the price, he barks out, "Hold your tongue," and when as a consequence of those speculations and of his rudeness, she begins to cry, he threatens, "Somebody is going to touch you, with a broomstick, if you don't stop sniveling" (30).

Accordingly, Higgins adds that Pickering should understand from his military experience that there is no use trying to explain matters to Eliza, who is too ignorant to understand any such explanation, and that therefore the proper treatment of her is simply to "give her her orders: that's enough for her" (36). Furthermore, in Act 5 Higgins calls Eliza, without using respect language, as one of the "squashed cabbage leaves of Covent Garden" and a "damned impudent slut," and instead of inviting her to come back to Wimpole Street, he orders her to do so: "Get up and come home; and don't be a fool" (96-97). Thus he explains that his brutal treatment of her has not

changed in the course of the play, though she has successfully changed into a totally different person from what she was at the beginning of the play.

Hence, at the first time Higgins met Eliza, he began to control Eliza. For some reason, he opposed the likes and dislikes Eliza had. In a word, he tried to improve Eliza to his taste. Obviously, Higgins is an erudite but also arrogant man. Once, in Mrs. Higgins's at-home party, he ordered Eliza to behave well just like a doll; it is apparent that he treated Eliza as an object belonged to him. This process of subjection is essentially objectifying. And when his housekeeper, Mrs. Pearce mentioned that he should not dominate Eliza, Higgins refused directly, because he thought it was natural for a girl to have discipline. Consciously, Higgins wanted Eliza to obey him without objection.

Consciously or unconsciously, Eliza accepts to be treated as an object by Higgins, because she realizes that her future is depended on Higgins. As a traditional woman, she has no ability to realize her dream by herself. Power and resistance in the male and female relationship is obvious in the power relationship. According to Foucault, "if there were no possibility of resistance〔…〕there would be no power relations at all" (Lotringer 441). In order to pursue this route to salvation, a woman must believe in the possibility of: "liberation through servitude" (Langford 6). As long as Higgins attempts to dominate Eliza, sooner or later she will resort to resistance. Facing such a man, it is natural for Eliza to resist. First, a domineering like Higgins does not give Eliza the proper respect she should have. He reasons arrogantly that women are "all idiots" because "some habits lie too deep to be changed" (58). So he begins to train Eliza according to his taste. By preventing Eliza from doing what she likes, instead doing what he thinks she should do. Higgins exercises his power in order to change Eliza into a lady.

When in the American Embassy, after the interpreter, Nepommuck, mistakenly judges Eliza to be a Hungarian Princess with royal blood. Professor Higgins has won the bet that in six months he could tutor her language and "make a duchess of this draggletailed guttersnipe" (31). Lisa says defiantly:

> Oh, when I think of myself crawling under your feet and being trampled on and called names, when all the time I had only to lift up my finger to be as good as you, I could just kick myself. (108)

The reference to her former "crawling" under his feet and "being trampled on" even seems to be as a token of her submission to him. Certainly, here at the end of *Pygmalion*, there is a deliberate repudiation of the idea of male domination over the female. In the Act II, Liza's father wants to sell Liza for a five-pound note. Also Liza wants to pay Higgins a shilling to have lessons, but he thought it as a percentage of this girl's income. After Eliza wins the bet for Higgins, she feels and talks more confidently by saying that "she'll teach anybody to be a duchess just the same in six months for a thousand guineas" (108). And after Eliza has declared her independence of Higgins, he says:

> You damned impudent slut, you! But it's better than sniveling; better than fetching slippers and finding spectacles, isn't it?... By George, Eliza, I said I'd make a woman of you; and I have. I like you like this. (104-5)

Apparently, Eliza is not a child any more, she begins to learn how to be treated by others if she wants to have her right.

While, in *Major Barbara*, women and men embrace their appropriate roles within an utopian patriarchal order. In *Shaw's Daughters*, J. Ellen Gainor explains the gendered import of this father-daughter relationship: "For Shaw, teaching is a masculine profession, and the lessons of the father always overpower those of the

mother…resulting in paternal identification by the child…. This identification takes on gender attributes, as the father brings up and forms the daughter in his own image, essentially imbuing her with his recognizably masculine traits" (Gainor 163). Undershaft represents the very masculine qualities of reason, vitality, and power, so that Barbara's union with him can offer her the potential of access to patriarchal power.

When Barbara accepts the role that Undershaft dictates to her, she is obedience to patriarchal dominance. Freed from purified spirit and thought, Barbara can escape Undershaft's power. Instead, the final contest between father and daughter takes place at the cannon works where he is not just Mr. Undershaft, Barbara's father, but Andrew Undershaft, Father Colossus, Mammoth Millionaire, the man who forcefully wields the power of life and death, whose intellect and will give him a profound philosophical understanding of moral evolution; He is the whole one, the entirely authoritarian patriarch of Perivale St. Andrews. Whether he is right or wrong, he is, of no use, clearly masterful, making it quite comprehensible that Barbara, who should embrace her father's vision of her future unless she wants to dedicate to God. Embracing Undershaft, it is all the riches of life that she can possess.

What she embraces, as Gainor points out, is not an active role in the sphere of public power that Undershaft represents---the domain belongs to exclusively to men---but a passive one, as a domesticated shadow of her former self. It illustrates Barbara as essentially an object in the mutual exchange of power between Undershaft and Cusins (soon to be Undershaft himself), Gainor cites a 1979 article by Thomas Noel, which argues that Barbara's destiny will be reduced to her biology: "In keeping with Shaw's general male-female principles, Barbara is biological vitality, relentless producer of the next generation of life, but dependent on the male principle to make a

better life for the next generation" (Gainor 223). Gainor paraphrases the conclusion of the play confirms Noel's analysis:

> Barbara, who starts the play as an independent working woman, during the course of the drama gives up her external employment and agree to marry. Her closing lines in the play reflect her new domestic focus; she asks her mother to help her choose a house in the village to live in with her husband…. There is nothing concrete in the drama to suggest a specific, active professional function for Barbara once she marries, unlike her husband-to-be, who will report to the office promptly at six the next morning. (Gainor 223)

In spite of Undershaft's former declaration "I shall hand on my torch to my daughter. She shall make my converts and preach my gospel" (96), he hands his "torch"---guns, cannon, money, even his very identity---to Cusins, leaving Barbara outside alone. Barbara concerns only about finding a house in the company town that belongs to her father now and will belong to her husband later. It is the interference of Undershaft and particularly, Barbara, however, even if she can subjectively go through unfamiliar experiences, she is objectively implied in his domain. No matter how completely Barbara may have aligned herself with the masculine power that her father represents, it does not ultimately give her direct access to the public power of commerce and government---or even gospel and salvation. What Barbara fears or desires is always an embodiment of her own existence. Instead, dragging her mother's skirts, she begs Mamma for help to find "a house in the village to live in with Dolly" (153). While God may ultimately owe a debt of gratitude to Major Barbara, Major Barbara herself is indebted to her more earthly master, the husband who has "found〔 Barbara her 〕place and〔 her 〕work" (153).

It is noteworthy that, in Barbara particularly, she feels herself to be possessed by Undershaft. Moreover, the movement of the domestic context subjugating Barbara to the insignificant margin, tucked away from the world where men's substantial power prevails.

The extent to Barbara's reconciliation with her father weakens her possible access to power, as Gainor suggests, a triumph of the male-ordered society that prefers its women at home, "keeping at bay the threat of woman's assumption of paternal ability and power" (Gainor 224). However, where *Major Barbara* clearly sets men in charge of public power and confines the women to the private sphere of the home. It manifests woman aspires to make spirit triumph over life, while man aspires action over passivity in that man's will shape woman. Accordingly, a man disciplines his children, a man whose concept of "patriarchal authority" has changed into a brutal mania for control over his wife and children (Gainor 224). Hence, Barbara, initially, aligns to submit her strength to the greater power and authority of the Father. Conversely, the relationship between Undershaft and Cusins is concrete that Undershaft bestowing his power to Cusins, keeps money and power firmly in the hands of men. The deal that Cusins negotiates with Undershaft--- without involving Barbara---mainly transfers the source of her wealth to him. As subjects, Undershaft and Cusins pose the world, and remaining outside, they make themselves rulers of it. Hence, Cusins will build the cannon shell and so, can keep her well. For Foucault's view about domination, which refers to "a situation in which the subject is unable to overturn or reverse the domination relation---a situation where resistance is impossible" (Hekman 170). For men, they exercise the domination not the power on woman, they hope to control over woman's spirit and thought. Instead, in *Major Barbara*, Barbara cleverly wields power, which is "flexible, mutable, and even

reversible," to extend her original domain and unite with Undershaft and Cusins's power together (Hekman 170).

In *Saint Joan*, Joan herself faces the top form of totalitarian domination, she struggles against the form of power, namely, subjection, Warwick and de Stogumber, the representatives of English feudal aristocracy and nationalism respectively, and Cauchon and the Inquisitor, Lamaitre, symbols of Church authority. For Joan, she, basically, is a woman. There are feminine behavior ties to Joan that, however, Shaw opens his play with a problem: there's no milk and the chickens won't lay. When Joan is giving her way, the eggs come. Although she is unconscious of this, this first scene ties her to the domestic sphere. She is also molded to be a polite young woman than a soldier. In the first scene, she "curtsies" and sits "down on the stool," like an obedient schoolgirl" (66). Her humble request for men's clothing is also almost begged for: "And the dress? I may have a solder's dress, maynt I, squire?" (69). Although she has greatly matures throughout the course of the play, we still can detect the sense of her childishness and pureness: "She squats down on the flags with crossed ankles, pouting" (115). Shaw's Joan indeed shows innocence in the face of her accusations: "What I have done is according to God. They could not burn a woman for speaking the truth" (118).

Furthermore, France wins the battle not because the strategy of the war or she is a saint but she is considered a woman, a devil witch or heretic. Indeed, to be a woman in a patriarchal world has been historically to fit a role of harlot, lunatic, or witch. Shaw has practically said as much himself: "The sum of the matter is that unless Woman repudiates her womanliness, her duty to her husband, to society, to the law, and to everyone but to herself, she can not emancipate herself…. Therefore woman has to repudiate duty together" (Lorichs 31). Importantly, for Joan, duty to

the Lord is duty to her self.

It is not fair for Joan. When Charles first meets Joan: “Can you do any cures? Can you turn lead into gold, or anything of that sort?” (85), he seems to be asking about her ability for miracles, wise women who made cures were often regarded as witches. In the English camp, the Chaplain and Bishop Cauchon dispute grew more violent about the source of the powers that result in her stunning victories. Cauchon believes that the dark and magical power stands on her side: “she is inspired, but diabolically inspired” (100). Her enemies, however, are not all in believing her as a witch, although they are not villains but rather as judical and pious murderers. They attempt to subvert and define Joan’s inferiority. The power of Joan is becoming more and more important, even though the struggles against established forms of domination.

Indeed, she proposes a subversive image. Furthermore, “the reversing power positions without altering relations of power is rarely liberating” (Hekman 171). Cauchon inclines to the view that she is not a witch, but a heretic. Warwick, the nobleman, protects Joan against the danger, a Catholic crime when he does not believe she stands for Catholicism: “It is the protest of the individual soul against the interference of priest or peer between the private man and his God. I should call it Protestantism if I had to find a name for it” (106). Of course, Warwick makes this argument in a time before Protestantism existed in England. These problems of definition do not allow the Bishop’s to alleviate harsh condemnation of Joan: “Call this side of her heresy Nationalism if you will: I can find you no better name for it. I can only tell that it is essentially anti-Catholic and anti-Christian; for the Catholic Church knows only one realm, and that is the realm of Christ’s kingdom” (107). Her own conduct is her condemnation.

Shaw admires Joan's loyalty to the country of her birth, although she feels no such pride. The English troops groundlessly assume Joan a witch simply because she makes them encounter a complete defeat: "We are not fairly beaten, my lord. No Englishman is ever fairly beaten" (97). The trial scene is inclusive of a brief exchange in which the English offer as evidence of diabolism that Joan's voices speaking to her in French (119). Evidently, this is heresy enough to the English. Although Joan's nationalism, nationality, and religiosity deeply trouble those men who attempt to save or burn her. There is a strained relationship between them. To be sure, power operates negatively to impose limits, restrictions, and prohibitions. To define the Catholic and Feudal power as "an inherently separable phenomenon from male force and domination", as Foucault would have us do, is to "disregard the ways in which this power is frequently transformed into violence" (Hekman 225). Or, rather, power exerts and articulates its control through the relationship between man and woman. Joan living in an abusive and autocratic relationship feels its possible power to overturn the existed system. Throughout *Saint Joan*, Joan categorically denies her femininity in every way possible: "〔matter-of-fact〕I will never take a husband. A man in Toul took an action against me for breach of promise; but I never promised him. I am a soldier: I do not want to be thought of as a woman. I will not dress as a woman. I do not care for the things women care for. They dream of lovers, and of money. I dream of leading a charge, and of placing the big guns. You soldiers do not know how to use the big guns: you think you can win battles with a great noise and smoke" (91).

Inherent in this speech are the many ways in which Joan goes beyond the sex-gender system of her time: as Shaw reminds us, "she refused to accept the specific woman's lot, and dressed and fought and lived as men did" (1). Joan not

only declines to submit herself to a husband, but the very fact that indicates her repudiation of her role as wife. Shaw's picture of Joan resembles in many ways Marina Warner's positive depiction but not in historical description. They both believe "she is anomalous in our culture, a woman renowned for doing something on her own, not by birthright" (Warner 9). Warner refers, however, that Shaw makes Joan a much more intelligent than she was. It is with a sense of regret that Marina Warner clearly indicates the dissimilarities between the historical Joan and Shaw's character: "Shaw made Joan's defiance of the ordinary procedure of a trial the mark of her individualism and disdain for institutions' coercion. His image of the young, plainspoken peasant taking on the mighty pillars of the Church and sundering them like Samson has an eloquence that has made it stick in the minds of many as the true Saint Joan. But it is an anachronism; Joan was not against compromise for purposes of modern self-determinism" (Warner 173).

Joan's transvestism is Shaw's important point different from Warner's version. Also, Warner reminds us that it is what Shaw peruses: "neither at this point in the trial nor at any other time, until the very end, did she specifically give a practical reason 〔for cross-dressing〕. She never said she had done it to live with greater safety among soldiers, to preserve her chastity, or to ride a horse" (Warner 144). It is just Shaw has her say: "what can be plainer commonsense? I was a soldier living among soldiers. I am a prisoner guarded by soldiers. If I were to dress as a woman they would think of me as a woman; and then what would become of me? If I dress as a soldier they think of me as a soldier, and I can live with them as I do at home with my brothers. That is why St Catherine tells me I must not dress as a woman until she gives me leave" (138). In this speech and dress, Shaw's Joan is a creature of our era, an inspiration for women who wish to transcend society's sex-gender system. As a

woman, moreover, she is driven by a maternal instinct to help others and she is a rational creature with common-sense, political understanding and the indispensible practical ability. But she is also equipped with a creative imagination which enables her to apprehend new and divinely inspired truths.

Shaw's holds that "She was the pioneer of rational dressing for women" (1). The Archbishop is seen as prejudiced against her because of her dress as he warns Charles about her: "This creature is not a saint. She is not even a respectable woman. She does not wear women's clothes. She is dressed like a soldier, and rides round the country with soldiers" (75). The dangers Joan's transvestism posed are explained by the Inquisitor, Brother Lematre: "Mark what I say: the woman who quarrels with her clothes, and puts on the dress of a man, is like the man who throws off his fur gown and dresses like John the Baptist: they are followed, as surely as the night follows the day, by bands of wild women and men who refuse to wear any clothes at all" (128-29). Shaw notes that only those women who are "in a position to defy public opinion" may escape being labeled ignoble for their "rational dressing" (18). Hence, Joan is depicted as a subject in the model of transgression, and she realizes and bores the responsibility for her acts. It is suggests that what one wears will influence what one does, so that a woman who dresses like a man will start to act like a man as well (Sullivan 50). Joan manifests all the boldness and prowess at arms usually seen as distinctive to men. She dominates men, indeed, six thousand men, and not only ordinary men but princes, barons, and other nobles. Instead of submitting to men, as women are supposed to do, she makes them, however numerous and highly ranked, submit to her. Joan successfully transforms the unequal situation, by making the man serve the woman, the nobleman serve the peasant, and the higher serve the lower.

In addition, Shaw has often held the opposite opinion, unlike any traditional notions about the superiority of man over woman. As a follower of John Stuart Mills and Mary Wollstonecraft, he most likely assumed, as they did, that "Whether through inherent nature…or through centuries of suffering, women are constructed, in and through their bodies, as being in the thralls of passion and unreason and hence morally more adept than men" (Laqueur 203), which would have appealed to his love of reason. Namely, in body, Shaw believes women are hardier than men. His answer to critics who thought of women as inferior in nature: "Of course, it's usually pointed out that women are not fit for political power, and ought not to be trusted with a vote because they are political ignorant, socially prejudiced, narrow-minded, and selfish. True enough, but precisely the same is true of man" (Braby 240). Unlike conventional concepts, Shaw believes women should not be weak; conversely, they are supposed to be strong; just as men do. Joan is the capable incarnation: strong-willed, inspired, clever, determined, and innovative.

Therefore, Shaw did not agree with the most of the men of his time, who tried to divide the world into separate sphere (Laqueur 194). Shaw was not concerned about the issue of sex, he believed only the intellect is the power. For Eliza, Barbara and Joan distance them from the patriarchal feudal system, reforming female inferior power.

III. Philosophical Attitude in Difficult Situation

Shaw declares his disagreement with Darwinian evolution which represents survival and progressive development. In fact, Shaw is antipathetic to some of the ideals that Darwin expressed. Instead he leans toward Lamarck's Creative Evolution, a theory debunked by the discoveries of Darwin but attractive for Shaw, because of its support of "the potential of the individual will" (Shaw f: xiii). In Lamarckian

biology a species survives and develops because of “the impulse itself.” To choose an absurd example, the giraffe develops its long neck to reach the best food (Shaw f xiii). Shaw combines the two theories and changes them into a reformer’s signal, “not the survival of the fittest, but the survival of those who will to be fit” (Shaw f xiii).

Therefore, the impact of Creative Evolution becomes the main metaphor in the Shavian dramatic action. The theory of Creative Evolution, at least in part, centers on the idea of “a universal will, responsible for both creation and progress” (Smith 33). With regards to Creative Evolution’s impact on men, “the will that drives them is not always their own, for they are in the grip of a mysterious power” and its “relentless programs for spiritual self-help” which Shaw calls the Life Force (Kaufmann 12). Rather, what Shaw calls the Life Force “has got into the minds of men as what they call their will,” and through their will, humanity bears the responsibility for evolution: “The power that produced Man when the monkey up to the mark, can produce a higher creature than Man if Man does not come up to the mark. What it means is that if Man is to be saved, Man must save himself” (Smith 33). To the extent that a character exercises his own will, he has the “potential to help the progress of the Life Force, without respect to sex” (lzabrouski 83). Simpler men might call it God, but the Shavian phrase emphasizes “his concern with life rather than death, with action rather than apathy” (Shaw f xiii).

Major Barbara together with *Saint Joan* and *Pygmalion*, which represent the zenith of Shaw’s playwritings, create a sunny metaphor and parable of creative evolution and represent various attitudes toward life. Barbara and Joan believe in the existence of a divine power that appears in dreams and visions when they live, work and even die, they do not easily submit to its “Absolute” in the face of human

strength (Weintraub 182). In fact, their attitude and dependence to their God is self-assured. As Barbara proudly asserts, "Let God's work be done for its own sake: the work he had to create us to do because it cannot be done except by living men and women. When I die, let him be in my debt, not I in his; and let me forgive him as becomes a woman of my rank" (152). Conversely, in *Pygmalion*, the play displays different definitions and paths of success. The life force, the God, that drives Eliza is Henry Higgins; "What is life," he cries, "but a series of inspired follies? The difficulty is to find them to do. Never lose a chance: it doesn't come every day" (31). Under Higgins's urgent and impatient patience, Eliza finds her life force as she grows her metaphorical neck.

Pygmalion, as its title implies, is concerned with the creation of a human being, which portends Shaw's notion that basic human nature and human relationships are especially vital. Initially and importantly, Liza Doolittle is transformed from a subhuman flower into a true human being because she covers up her fears, develops a will of her own, and is able to regard Higgins as an equal in the pressure of wills which is the human condition. Eliza starts as a stereotype, one of the flower girls of Tottenham Court Road, but by the end of the third act, she has been transformed anew into an educated lady and charming duchess. However, this is only a change from one stereotype to another. By rising into the higher class, at times she has become a lost soul for she understands she can not go back her reformer world. She is captured in a new and sophisticated world where she belongs to nobody, since Higgins is not the suitable marrying kind. The evolution, once started, continues; the life force will not be stopped. In the final scene Eliza becomes an individual, responsible to and for herself.

Contrast her fate with her father's. Doolittle begins as a free man, uncontrolled

by morality, marriage, or responsibility. But under the middle-class conscience, he becomes a slave to money. His has a fate worse than mere death, as Eliza's is better than mere life.

HIGGINS. Goodbye, mother. 〔He is about to kiss her, when he recollects something〕. Oh, by the way, Eliza, order a ham and a Stilton cheese, will you? And buy me a pair of reindeer gloves, number eight, and a tie to match that new suit of mine. You can choose the color. 〔His cheerful, careless, vigorous voice shews that he is incorrigible〕.

LIZA〔disdainfully〕Number eights are too small for you if you want them lined with limb's wool. You have three new ties that you have forgotten in the drawer of your washstand. Colonel Pickering prefers double Gloucester to Stilton; and you don't notice the difference. I telephoned Mrs Pearce this morning not to forget the ham. What you are to do without me I cannot imagine. 〔She sweeps out〕.

MRS HIGGINS. I'm afraid you've spoilt that girl, Henry. I should be uneasy about you and her if she were less fond of Colonel Pickering.

HIGGINS. Pickering! Nonsense: she's going to marry Freddy. Ha ha! Freddy! (109-10)

With her well-considered decision, Eliza would not really marry Higgins if he asked her. Much as everyone has a blueprint for his life, Higgins hopes to include Eliza in his, and hopes to give her a perfect future. Eliza's decision will rely a good deal on whether she is really unrestrained to choose; and that, again, will depend on her age and income. If she achieves little at the end of her youth, and has no reliable livelihood, she might marry Higgins because she must marry somebody who will

provide for her. Eliza's youthful age and attractive appearance bring her powerful energy and hopeful possibilities for her future: she feels free to pick and choose. Therefore, Eliza's intuition tells her not to marry Higgins, but does not tell her to give him up. Namely, Eliza leads a different life from others, and she persues what she wants and desires.

Unlike Eliza in *Pygmalion*, Joan in *Saint Joan* is visionary and her visions have a meaning for the future. She is a revolutionary, whose very aim is to "clear away conventional modes of life to establish her new standards" (Weintraub 177). For Shaw, the revelations are "products of the prophetic imagination" (Weintraub 177). Shaw's geniuses call it "divine" because the workings of that Life Force are immanent in all living things. In the same way, God is absolute transcendence, perfect in Himself, "independent of man and independent of development and growth in time" (Weintraub 180).

Joan shows her progressive willfulness, a will that is almost exclusively in contrast with her best interest. As a result, she refuses to compromise even for the sake of her own life. Shaw discusses the nature of Joan's sacrifice in the play's preface:

> When Joan maintained her own ways she claimed, like Job, that there was not only God and the Church to be considered, but the Word made Flesh: that is, the unaveraged individual, representing life possibly at its highest actual human evolution and possibly at its lowest, but never at its merely mathematical average. (35-36)

Joan's initial triumph is to defeat the English camp with Dunois (The Bastard of Orleans) with the help of wind. Joan projects herself as a servant of God, and a brave soldier, urging aggressive attacks ahead. After the siege of Orleans, she

conducts the march to Charles VII's coronation at Reims. Tragically, Joan does not live long enough to see the ultimate French victory. The Battle of Orleans, in scene three, is a turning point in the play. However, also her life has reached the zenith of the glory for she has completed her mission. In scene VI, her situation has a sudden change for the worse; she has faced the severe trials of life. The Inquisition has decided that Joan's is not "a prisoner of war" but "the gravest cases of heresy" (123). The Earl of Warwick makes it clear that Joan's death is "a political necessity," but Cauchon affirms "the Church is not subject to political necessity" (124). The Inquisitor knows that Joan has been doing much to condemn herself, because she utters such blasphemies; therefore, she is going to be died for heresy.

To sum up, Creative Evolution accounts for the phenomenon of the Life Force, under which people are "carrying out a will not exclusively their own" (Shaw g 33). By calling on her "rationality and free will" in committing to die for "the cause of human improvement", Joan has, according to Shaw, in fact given up her life for the Life Force, even if, from her own medieval perspective, she does her best to serve the will of God (Lzabrouski 84). In this way, then, the force and will are possessed and dominated by Joan. As Shaw describes it in the preface, the continuous movement of Life Force is in union with her own will, which can provide the progress she craves for her country and her God. Her refusal to recant before the Inquisitor puts her in the position of one who acts only out of interest in "the greater good of progress and humanity," which is the work of the Life Force (Lzabrouski 84). Desiring her own death, which is more completely irrevocable than any other action, is evidence of Joan's total devotion to the Life Force (Lzabrouski 84).

It is obviously that Joan does not succumb to attack presents a clear threat to the long established order of the world. By being put to death, Joan creates controversy

and challenges an order from the Church, which she believes is in accordance with the will of God. If Joan hangs on, she'll succeed in the end, even though the work is very hard. It is possible that the Church acts out of concert with God, and Joan trusts her instincts and opposes the very idea of a hierarchical Church acting up to the God's will, doubting the establishment of her society. It marks Joan as a progressive leader, simply, without suspicion. After the death of Joan, in other words, Joan is seen as progressive. Bishop Cauchon laments this trend to fear and destroy the very individuals from whom one would learn how to become better, asking "Must then a Christ perish in torment in every age to save those that have no imagination?" (160) In focusing on the miserable repetition of this behavior, Cauchon indicates a shame that extends to all humanity, dying in the springtime of life, over many ages, like Shaw himself states in *The Intelligent Woman's Guide to Capitalism and Socialism*:

> Considering that we poisoned Socrates, crucified Christ, and burnt Joan of Arc amid popular applause, because, after a trial by responsible lawyers and Churchmen, we decided that they were too wicked to be allowed to live, we can hardly set up to be judges of goodness or to have any sincere liking for it. (Shaw g 54)

It is clear that while Shaw, with personal power, celebrated the Life Force in his play, Joan believed in God that was naturally unlike his own. Shaw holds up Joan, of course, as a triumph of faith, but he questions one of the most basic assumptions of her sainthood miracles. Joan never performs a miracle in his play:

> a fact which points up a fundamental difference between her conception of the God she is serving and that of her creator. God, as Shaw conceived him, is not a transcendent Being, capable of interfering in the orderly processes of nature…. 'It is not an omnipotent power that can do things

> without us,' Shaw remarked of the Life Force in 1912; 'it has created us in order that we might do its work. In fact, that is the way it does it work---through us.' (Searle 101)

Despite, in vivid description, Shaw's little explanation of many of Joan's miracles, he still must argue against the voices that lead her into battle. Shaw wields the subject early in the play, when Robert faces Joan in her first meetings with Charles:

> JOAN. I hear the voices telling me what to do. They come from God.
>
> ROBERT. They come from your imagination.
>
> JOAN. Of course. This is how the messages of God come to us. (66)

It is natural, too, that the divine power became a mysterious worship from Joan herself. This exchange is representative of Shaw's beliefs about how God operates in our world.

In *Major Barbara*, therefore, even the acquisitive Undershaft is an agent of the Life Force. Like Cusins and Barbara, Undershaft conforms to the philosophic idea of "contemplating the will of the world, trying to discover how to fulfill it, and then doing it. But the union of Cusins and Barbara promises to supersede him in greater understanding" (Weintraub 48). It points out that Barbara embodies the Life Force. Their union is hopeful because the embodiment of the Life Force weds the explicator of it.

Shaw writes in his preface of *Major Barbara* that Undershaft has a "constant sense that he is only the instrument of a Will or Life Force which uses him for purposes wider than his own" (22). In the play, he unveils it. Accused by Cusins that Undershaft has no power, he replies not that Cusins is right**,** but says "none of my own, certainly," which is different (139). The power that drives the armaments

factory is “A will of which I am a part” (139). In other words, he is an instrument of the Life Force, which he understands to be greater than his own. While Cusins expels the statement as metaphysics, proclaiming instead that he is enslaved by “the most rascally part of society,” Undershaft’s answer is, in some ways, neither assent nor dissent but “Not necessarily” (139). Undershaft confronts Cusins to leave off “preaching and shirking” in favor of “fighting the rascals”, but he cannot force Cusins or any good person to do so (139). He states, “I can make cannons: I cannot make courage and conviction” and Barbara refers to Undershaft as being “in the power of God” (139-40).

Although Undershaft is, by no means, a conscious agent of the Life Force, he, once a millionaire and a charming man, does not represent the ultimate in social or spiritual organization. To Shaw, no one really acts. Money and gunpowder, says Undershaft, are required for salvation; no one says they are adequate for it. When he tells his wife that Stephen does not interest him, she responds that he is their son. His comment, “I see nothing of myself in him, and less of you,” illustrates that his son, Stephen, is not apt to inherit the Undershaft tradition (118). Furthermore, Undershaft is a capitalist, however benevolent or farsighted, and represents “the final word in social evolution” (Weintraub 54).

These comments on Undershaft’s shortcomings should not reduce his value in connection with the Life Force. Obviously, Undershaft wants someone who will go further than he and since in Act III Cusins and Barbara alternate as Undershaft’s antagonist this is suggestive that they at long last become a single entity, when they surpass Undershaft (Weintraub 55). They join in marriage as well. Symbolic of the Life Force’s combination of religion and sex is the Salvation Army’s conversion to the West Ham Salvation March. The combination of Barbara and Cusins represent

social advance. Cusins's desire to marry Barbara, who offers no resistance, reflects this energy. Cusins has thought that this union transcends the personal and links to godhead: "Dionysos and all the others are in herself. I adored what was divine in her, and was therefore a true worshipper" (134).

Although Undershaft disdains such love, neither Cusins nor Barbara can changes his mind. By comparison, Cusins recognizes it and moves further. For him, all do not have the right to fight and he intends to judge who does have. By small but important changes, Shaw clarifies Cusins's principles:

> As a teacher of Greek I gave the intellectual man weapons against the common man. I now want to give the common man weapons against the intellectual man. I love the common people. I want to arm them against the lawyers, the doctors, the priests, the literary men, the professors, the artists, and the politicians, who, once in authority, are more disastrous and tyrannical than all the fools, rascals, and imposters. I want a power simple enough for common men to use, yet strong enough to force the intellectual oligarchy to use its genius for the general good. (150)

The last sentence is particularly important. Cusins tries to use his genius for that good. In a Fabian fashion, he aims to broaden his base of power, to build upon Undershaft's social advance (Weintraub 58). Although the play's final line is Undershaft's command, "Six o'clock tomorrow morning, Euripides," its final sentence implies that the Professor of Greek will take over the factory, too, with the possible triumphant of Undershaft (153).

It is possible that Barbara learns and understands Undershaft's words, "All religious organizations exist by selling themselves to the rich" (98). "There is no wicked side," Barbara says**,** "life is all one" (151). Also, "There are no scoundrels"

(35). It is unimportant to call Undershaft wicked or a scoundrel. For Shaw, the Salvation Army's military form of organization is apt: "Does it not suggest that the Salvationists must actually fight the devil instead of merely praying at him? At present, it is true, they have not quite ascertained his correct address" (28). However, Barbara finds it. In changing her locus of operations, she becomes, like Cusins, an agent of the Life Force.

Like Cusins, Barbara, who is willing to overcome individual differences, accepts the power Undershaft offers, and like him she aims to use it for her own purposes, and learns to accept each other. Barbara more than loves the common people, because she is one of them. Early in the play her mother complains that she discharged her maid and lives on a pound a week. Later in the play Barbara asserts, "I have no class, Dolly: I come straight out of the heart of the whole people" (151). She adds that Undershaft's workers think Undershaft "ought to be greatly obliged to them for making so much money for him---and so he ought" (152). What the workers are to her biological father, she---a worker for God---is to her heavenly father: "Let God's work be done for its own sake: the work he had to create us to do because it cannot be done except by living men and women" (152). Barbara's union with Cusins creates simultaneous social and spiritual redemption. And happily, there is progress on all three. Undershaft says that he, Cusins, and Barbara---all Life Force figures---are made.

Work is play and play is life: three in one and one in three. In following with this idea, Barbara makes his vision concrete. Undershaft has used his power to discard poverty. In addition, his daughter works toward salvation and his intellectual fiancé, his adoptive son, aims to give power to the people. In the world they want men and women will do God's work for its own sake and serve for human life which

will become divine. The three do deeply affect each other so as to symbolically become one. Undershaft hands his torch of reality and power to his daughter and to his adoptive son. Through blood and spirit, Undershaft concerns about people's bodies, Cusins their minds and social needs, and Barbara their soul. Only together can they become useful and powerful; they make a trinity of body, mind, and soul necessary for economic and spiritual salvation.

In fact, Barbara, as the daughter of a manufacturer of arms, concerns herself with the salvation of souls. For despite of Barbara's apparent change of will in leaving the Salvation Army to join her father in supplying armies with weapons, Barbara, of course, actually remains changeless in her goals, just adopting a new, more effective way to achieve her goal. While Barbara has already dedicated her life to the service and saving of souls, this dedication has been met with attacks from all sides. Her mother and siblings think she is ridiculous and lament that she has given up the trappings of her class by "discharging her maid and living on a pound a week" (54). Barbara has, furthermore, chosen a profession that pays nothing. Her purpose is to give people hope and light. Still, even her religion, the Salvation Army, is controversial and removed from the Established Church. Later, after leaving the badge of the Army and becoming merely Barbara, she makes a controversial decision. She throws off the chains of social and moral taboos by embracing the chosen profession of her fiancé. Instead of only saving the souls of the poor, abject people in the Army, she now wants to save those full-fed, uppish creatures in the company as well. The transformation of her outlook is momentous.

However, Barbara and Undershaft have engaged in a war of conversion, each battle for the soul of the other. In act 1 the major and her millionaire father assert their different values of the soul and the pound sterling. Undershaft hates poverty is

genuine, and he says to Barbara: “I hate poverty and slavery worse than any other crimes whatsoever. And let me tell you this. Poverty and slavery have stood up for centuries to your sermons and leading articles: they will not stand up to my machine guns. Don’t preach at them: don’t reason with them. Kill them” and he also says that is “the only lever strong enough to overturn a social system” (143). With constant financial difficulty, she becomes hopeless with the Salvation Army. At the play’s end, Barbara understands only when people have enough material comforts, they can pay attention to this spiritual needs. Paradoxically, it is not fit to her original ideal notion; namely, she only uses religion and morality to save people’s souls.

Cusins loves, even idolizes Barbara and Barbara’s mother has “a very strong suspicion that he went to the Salvation Army to worship Barbara and nothing else” (73). However, he inclines to put aside those feelings in pursuit of progress not only for himself but also for what he imagines as the improvement of the society at large. Barbara’s eagerness is to support and accept her father’s idea that “the history of the world is the history of the men” (144). It drives her to achieve her goal of saving souls, demonstrating both insight and creativity on her part.

In a large scope, Barbara’s conversion from a major in the Salvation Army to a facilitator of the armies of destruction comes as an important change in her life, but the essence of her Life Force remains unchanged. With the best ways to complete her goals for human salvation and this business of motive development, she not only improves but also reinvents herself, but she retains the basic principle of human progress. As a major, Barbara is concerned with the spiritual mission of saving souls, but she feels depleted by the constant pressure of the material needs of the poor. As her father says, “It is cheap work converting starving men with a Bible in one hand

and a slice of bread in the other" (142), implying that their conversions are transient. Barbara nevertheless persists steadfastly in what she has been doing her whole life: the progressive work of the Life Force.