

ABSTRACT

The research talks about the Anti-Romantic view of war in 'Arms and the Man' and how war considered as a weapon invented by the capitalistic civilization to spoil human life, and destroy the humanity as a concept.

In war, decoration is only for leaders while blood, death and destruction is for innocent soldiers.

Bernard Shaw point of view on war was negative because he considered war as something that brings ignorance to the nations and people will on suffering for years after war. Bernard Shaw considered Bluntschli as a fact he represents the realism in the whole play while Sergius presents heroism, he was only a hero in appearance. In this research, there is a contrast between realism and idealism, presented by the contrast between the characters of Bluntschli and Sergius. In general, in this play Bernard Shaw wants to show us the real face of war rather than mask that every leader puts around the world.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

George Bernard Shaw: The Writer and the Man

George Bernard Shaw was born in Synge Street, Dublin in 1856 to George Carr Shaw (1814-1885) whose father was Bernard Shaw, an unsuccessful grain merchant and sometime civil servant, and Lucinda Shaw, born Gurly (1830-1913), a professional singer.

He had two sisters, Lucinda Frances (1853-1920), a singer of musical comedy and a light opera, and Elinor Agnes (1854-1876). George attended a number of school and one assume did not enjoy his time in any of them. In fact, he harbored a lifelong animosity toward schools and teachers. He painstakingly detailed the reason for his aversion to formal education in his Treatise on parents and children. In brief, he considered the standardized curricula useless, deadening to the spirit and stifling the intellect. He particularly deplored the use of corporal punishment, which was prevalent in his time when his mother left home and followed her voice teacher, George Vandeleur Lee, to London; Shaw was almost sixteen years old.

His sisters accompanied their mother but Shaw remained in Dublin with his father, first as a reluctant pupil, then a clerk in an estate office. He worked efficiently, albeit discontentedly, for several years. ^[6]

In 1876, Shaw joined his mother's London household. He was provided with a pound a week while he frequented public libraries the British Museum reading room where he studied earnestly and begun writing novels. His novels were rejected however, so his literary earnings remained nest to nothing until 1885, where he became self-supporting as a critical of

the arts. Influenced by his wide readings, he became a dedicated socialist and a charter member of the Fabian Society, a middle-class organization established in 1884 to promote the gradual spread of socialism by peaceful means. Through this involvement, he met fellow Fabian Charlotte Payne – Townshend, an Irish heiress, and they married in 1898. In 1906, the Shaws moved into a house, now called Shaw's Corner, in Ayot St. Lawrence, a small village in Hertfordshire; it was to be their home for the remainder of their lives, although they also maintained a London home. Shaw's plays were first performed in the 1890's and by the end of the decade; he was an established playwright, writing 63 plays in all. He was also a novelist, critic, pamphleteer, essayist and private correspondent.

His output was prodigious; he is known to have written more than 250,000 letters. Along with Fabian Society members Sidney Webb, Beatrice Webb and Graham Wallis, Shaw founded the London School of Economics and Political Science in 1895 with funding provided by private philanthropy. One of the libraries at the LSE is named in Shaw's honor and holds collections of his papers.

Shaw wrote five unsuccessful novels at the start of his career: *Cashel Byron's Profession* (1886), *An Unsocial Socialist* (1887), *Love Among the Artists* (1914), *The Irrational Knot* (1905) and *Immaturity* (1931). The dates are those of publications, Shaw had written *Immaturity*, for example in 1879. A collection of Shaw's short stories, *The Black Girl in Search of God and Some Lesser Tales* was published in 1934. *The Black Girl*, an enthusiastic but misguided convert to Christianity, goes searching for God, whom she believes to be an actual person. Written as an allegory, somewhat

reminiscent of Bunyan's *The Pilgrims Progress*, Shaw uses her adventures to expose flaws and fallacies in the religions of the world. At the story's happy ending the Black Girl quits her searching in favor of rearing a family with the aid of a down – to earth red – haired Irish man.

However, it is for his plays that Shaw is best known. Shaw's plays like those of Oscar Wilde are full of cutting humor, which was exceptional among playwrights of the Victorian Era and both authors remembered for their comedy. However, Shaw's wittiness should not conceal the important role he played in revolutionizing British drama. In the Victorian Era, the London stage has been regarded as a place for frothy sentimental entertainment, Shaw made it a forum for considering moral, political and economic issues, possibly his most lasting and important contribution to dramatic art. In this, he considered himself indebted to Henrik Ibsen, who pioneered modern realistic drama, meaning drama designed to heighten awareness of some important social issue. Significantly, *Widower's Houses* – an example of the realistic genre – was completed after William Archer, Shaw's friend, had translated some of Ibsen's plays to English and Shaw had written his treatise *The Quintessence of Ibsenism*.

The play *Pygmalion*, for example was an expression of Shaw's furious objection to what he saw as the deterioration of English usage. Asked once why, if he felt so strongly about this particular issue he didn't just deliver a lecture on the subject, he replied tartly (as was his habit) that if he were to deliver a lecture on the subject very few seats in the hall would be occupied, whereas his play was drawing full houses night after night! [Shaw's published plays come with lengthy prefaces. These tend to be more

about Shaw's opinions on the issues addressed by the plays than about the plays themselves. Often his prefaces are longer than the plays they introduce. For example, the Penguin Books edition of his one-act *The Shewing-up of Blanco Posnet* (1909) has a 67-page preface for the 29-page play script!]

As Shaw's experience and popularity increased, his plays and prefaces became more voluble about reforms, he advocated without diminishing their success as entertainments such works, including *Caesar and Cleopatra* (1898), *Man and Superman* (1903), *Major Barbara* (1905) and *The Doctor's Dilemma* (1906) displays Shaw's matured views, for he was approaching 50 when he wrote them.

By the 1910's Shaw was well-established playwright. A musical adaptation of *Arms and the Man* was produced in 1908, titled *The Chocolate Soldier* and produced by Oscar Straus. It was very popular, but Straus. It was very popular, but Shaw detested it and, for the rest of his life, forbade musicalisation of his work.

One wonders how he would have reacted to *Pygmalion*; becoming the Broadway musical *My Fair Lady* (and later a Hollywood film), explosively no doubt. Shaw's outlook was changed by World War I, which he uncompromisingly opposed despite incurring outrage from the public as well as from many friends. His full-length piece, presented after the war but written mostly during it, was *Heartbreak House* (1919). Anew Shaw had emerged-the wit remained, but his faith in humanity had dwindled. In the preface to *Heartbreak House*, he said:

“It is said that every people has the Government it deserves. It is more to the point that every Government has the electorate it deserves; for the orators of the front bench can edify or debauch an ignorant electorate at will. Thus our democracy moves in a vicious circle of reciprocal worthiness and unworthiness”.

Shaw had previously supported gradual democratic change toward socialism, but now he saw more hope in government by benign strong men. This sometimes made him oblivious to the dangers of dictatorships. Near his life's end that hope failed him too. In the first act of *Buoyant Billions* (1946-1948), his last full-length play, his protagonist asks:

“Why appeal to the mob when ninety-five percent of them do not understand politics, and can do nothing but mischief without their leaders do they vote for? For Titus Oates and Lord George Gordon with their popish plots. For Hitler's who call on them to exterminate Jews, for Mussolini's who rally them to nationalist dreams of glory and empire in which all foreigners are enemies to be subjugated”

In 1921, Shaw completed *Back to Methuselah* his “Meta Biological Pentateuch”. The massive, five-play work starts in the Garden of Eden and ends thousands of years in the future. Shaw proclaimed the play a masterpiece, but many critics disagreed. *Methuselah* was followed by *Saint Joan* (1923), which is generally considered to be one of his better works.

The play was an international success, and is believed to have led to his 1925 Nobel Prize in Literature. (Shaw accepted the honor but declined to accept the money).

He wrote plays for the rest of his life, but very few of them are as notable as his early works. Shaw viewed writing as a way to further his humanitarian and political agendas. His crusading nature led him to adopt and tenaciously had a variety of causes, which he furthered with fierce intensity, heedless of opposition and ridicule. For example, *Common Sense about the war* (1914) lays out Shaw's strong objections at the onset of World War I. ^[38] His stance ran counter to public sentiment and cast him dearly at the box-office, but he never compromised. ^[39] In his old age, Shaw was a household name both in British and Ireland, and was famous throughout the world. His ironic wit endowed English with the adjective "Shavian", used to characterize observations such as "My way of joking is to tell the truth. It's the funniest joke in the world." During his final years, Shaw enjoyed attending to grounds at Shaw's Corner. In the small village of Ayot St. Lawrence, Hertfordshire. His home is now a National Trust Property, open to public. The Shaw Theatre, Euston Road, London, opened in 1971, was named in his honor. Near its entrance, opposite the new British Library, stands a contemporary statue of Saint Joan, commemorating the author of play by that name. George Bernard Shaw. His death at 94 from renal failure was the direct result of injuries he suffered when he fell while pruning a tree. His ashes, mixed with those of his wife, were scattered along footpath and around the statue of Saint Joan in their garden.

ARMS AND THE MAN: REVIEW

One late night at the end of the 19th century, Raina Petkoff, the daughter of Bulgarian Major Paul Petkoff, gets an unexpected visitor who climbs into her bedroom and present himself as Captain Bluntschli. He is a Swiss mercenary soldier fighting for the Serbian army, and now he seeks refuge from the Bulgarian troops. Despite the fact that Bluntschli fights for the enemy forces Raina feels sorry for him and helps him hide in her bedroom for a couple of hours before he is off again. Raina and Bluntschli meet again when the Bulgarian-Serbian war is over, and it turns out that Major Petkoff and Raina's fiancé Sergius Sarnoff have met and made friends with Captain Bluntschli during the war. It does not take long until it is obvious that Raina and Captain Bluntschli are in love with each other and that the feelings between Raina and Sergius have been built on hypocrisy and false ideals. A number of hilarious complication and vehement arguments follow, and eventually Bluntschli and Raina end up being betrothed to each other, whereas Sergius whose main goal in life has been always to reach the top of society, finally gives in to his feeling for the servant Loucka and asks her to be his wife.

MODERN AGES:

Modernism in its broadest definition is modern thought, character, or practice more specifically, the term describes the Modernist Movement, it is set of cultural tendencies and array of associated cultural movements,

originally arising from wide scale and far reaching to western society in the late 19th and early 20th centuries.

Modernist was a revolt against the conservative values of realism. ^[2] ^[3] ^[4] Arguably the most paradigmatic motive of modernism is the rejection of tradition and its reprise incorporation, rewriting, recapitulation revision and parody in new forms. ^[5] ^[6] ^[7] Modernism rejected the lingering certainty of the Enlightenment thinking and also rejected the existence of a compassionate all powerful Greater God. ^[8] ^[9] In general, the term modernism encompasses the activities and output of art, architecture, literature, religious faith social organization and daily life were becoming out dated in the new economic, social and political conditions of an emerging fully industrialized world. The poet Ezra Pound's 1934 injunction to make it new paradigmatic of the movement's approach toward the obsolete.

Another paradigmatic exhortation was articulated by philosopher and composer Theodor Adorno, who in the 1940's challenged conventional surface coherence and appearance of harmony typical of the rationality of Enlightenment thinking. ^[10] A silent characteristic of modernism is self-consciousness. This self-consciousness often lead to experiments with form and work that draws attention to the processes and materials used (and to the further tendency of abstraction) ^[11]. The modernist movement at the beginning of the 20th century marked the first time that the term "avant-garde" with which the movement was labeled until the word "modernism" prevailed was used the arts (rather than in it's original military and political context). ^[12]

Surrealism gained fame among the public as being the most extreme form of modernism or the “avant garde of modernism...”^[13]

Modernism as a literary movement reached its height in Europe between 1900 and mid-1920's, modernist addressed aesthetic problems similar to those examined in non-literary forms of contemporaneous modernist art, such as painting (en.wikipedia.org).

Gertrude Stein's abstract writings, for example, have often been compared to the fragmentary and multi-perspectival Cubism of her friend Pablo Picasso.

The general thematic concerns of modernist literature are well-summarized by the sociologist George Simmel, “The deepest problems of modern life derives from the claim of the individual to preserve autonomy and individuality of his existence in the face of overwhelming social forces, of historical heritage, of external culture and of the technique of life” (The Metropolis and Mental Life, 1903) (en.wikipedia.org).

The Modernist emphasis on radical individualism can be seen in the many literary manifestos issued by various groups within the movement. The concerns expressed by Simmel above are echoed in Richard Huelsenbeck's First German Dada Manifesto of 1918: “Art in its execution and direction is dependent on the time in which it lives, and artists are creatures of their epoch. The highest art will be that which in its conscious content presents the thousand fold problems of the day, the art which has been visibly shattered by the explosions of last week. The best most extraordinary artists will be those who every hour snatch the tatters of their bodies out of the frenzied cataract of life, who, with bleeding hands and

hearts, hold fast to the intelligence of their time.” The cultural history of humanity creates a unique common history that connects previous generation with the current generation of humans, and the Modernist re-contextualization of individual within the fabric of this received social heritage can be seen in the ‘mythic method’ which T.S. Eliot expounded in his discussion of James Joyce’s *Ulysses*: “In using the myth, in manipulating a continuous parallel between contemporaneity and antiquity, Mr. Joyce is pursuing a method which others must pursue after him... It is simply a way of controlling, of ordering, of giving a shape and a significance to the immense panorama of futility and anarchy which is contemporary history” (*Ulysses, Order and Myth*) (en.wikipedia.org).

Modernist literature involved such authors as Knut Hamsun (whose novel ‘*Hunger*’ (1890) is considered to be the first ‘modernist’ novel), Virginia Woolf, T.S. Eliot, Gertrude Stein, H.D. (Hilda Doolittle), Dylan Thomas, Paul Lawrence Dunbar, Ezra Pound, Mina Loy, James Joyce, Jean Toomer, Ernest Hemingway, Rainer Maria Rilke, Franz Kafka and others. Modernist literature attempted to move from the bonds of realist literature and to introduce concepts such as disjointed timelines.

CHAPTER TWO
ANTI-ROMANTIC VIEW OF WAR IN SHAW’S “ARMS
AND THE MAN”

Though we see difference in the definition of romanticism but there is like-mindedness about one thing, that romanticism is marked by emotional outburst. Shaw has tried to find his drama on what he regards as “genuinely scientific natural history” and since nothing can be more alien to scientific history than romantic, Shaw’s drama are completely bereft of sentiment. The alternative of illusion is of course reality, and Shaw is championing reality as the basis for social institution. Shaw’s main aim was to expose the society deliberately and powerfully. Shaw in his drama like Caesar and Cleopatra, Arms and the Man, and Man of Destiny create heroes who are naturally great, who can see things out of reach of ordinary man. He describes his heroes by putting them in amazing situation in which they act with self-control and with total freedom from conversation. His realism is that of society, he creates characters who are his mouthpiece expressing his views.

War is traditionally associated with glory and love is often colored with tings of romanticism. It is considered that war provides an opportunity for soldiers to show their heroism. Shaw rejects the idea to such heroes and succeeds in removing the illusion that surrounds love and marriage in popular imagination. In the play “Arms and the Man”, the hero Captain Bluntschli is a soldier with an incurably romantic disposition, but he never forgets that discretion is the better part of valor. His common sense is a refreshing contrast to the reckless heroism of Sergius. Shaw believes that a

soldier fights most heroically when he has the greatest reason to be afraid of his enemy. He is courageous only because he is 'coward on instinct'. The instinct of cowardice is a fundamental instinct, it tends to preserve life rather than destroy it. The attitude of Sergius and Raina to war is also idealistic; Sergius joins the army as a missionary, not as a mercenary like Captain Bluntschli. Sergius led a cavalry charge in battle at Stivnitza and heroically carried the day. Receiving this news, Raina and Catherine go ecstatic and embrace rapturously. Because war to them is an act of heroism, a deed of glory and patriotism in which the bravest of the brave risk their lives for the sake of their country, but more perhaps to win public applause. Raina considers Sergius as god and she is all set to worship him like a priestess. Bernard Shaw, however, very soon shattered the romantic notion about war. At this point in the play, realism enters in the shape of runaway Serb officer, Captain Bluntschli. Unlike the "tall and romantically hansom" Sergius, he is a man "of mildly stature and undistinguished appearance" with a hopelessly prosaic nose, Shaw purposely contrasts between simple and sharp, between Sergius and Bluntschli, in this comic drama, and it makes for what is called "good theatre" Bluntschli was being chased by Bulgarian soldiers so to save his life he climbs into Raina's room. Bluntschli represents the anti-romantic view of everything. He tells Raina that it is one's duty to live as long as he can. Bluntschli presents himself as hungry, frightened and unwilling to die. Raina resumes her illusions of war and disdainfully tells him:

Raina: Some soldiers, I know are afraid to die.

Bluntschli makes his answer very plainly: All of them, dear lady, all of them. It is our duty to live as long as we can.

These lines show Bluntschli's thinking about life. Bluntschli will fight whenever it is necessary or to save his life. War for him is a necessary and should be fought when imposed. Man should not fight to gain glory and honor, Shaw does not accept illusion about war. Man should not fight to live, soldier should try to save their lives. Bluntschli's thinking prepares the audience for further manifestation of romantic ideals, now he discloses his identity to Raina. He tells Raina that he fights for living, not because of patriotic motives:

“Don't hate me, dear young lady, I'm a Swiss, fighting merely as a professional soldier, I joined the Serbs because they came first on the road from Switzerland.”

Bluntschli is a professional soldier besides this he appears to be a man of extraordinary practical wisdom. Shaw introduced the character of Bluntschli in the play with a special purpose, to disillusion the romantic notions of love and war. He knows the reality and futility of war. Being a professional soldier, he will fight for any country if he gets payment. Like Sergius, he has no patriotic sentiments and no ambition to acquire glory on a battlefield. He would not use the arms to risk his life, in fact, he will use the arms as a means to earn livelihood. He considers it wise to flee from the field if it is not possible to face the enemy. What surprises us is that Bluntschli is not ashamed of his views, he follows the policy of “save your skin” since he has to earn his livelihood at his own he is always conscious of his physical health. Even in battlefield, he carries food with him to keep himself fit and active.

Bluntschli tells Raina:

“Bless you, dear lady! You can always tell an old soldier by the inside of his holsters and cartridges boxes. The young ones carry pistols and cartridges.”

He shows his presence of mind at many places in the play. He fully understands the delicacy of every situation and acts accordingly; when he was being chased by the Bulgarians, he takes all kinds of unfair steps to take shelter in Raina’s house. He snatched Rain’s cloak so that she may not leave the place to tell others or she may not allow others to enter the room. However, this deed of Bluntschli is unromantic but thoroughly practical. He never loses his patience, presence of mind, and sense of humoring in adverse circumstances.

Not only Bluntschli himself is unromantic and unheroic, he openly ridicule the romantic heroism of Sergius. The charge was folly not bravery; it succeeded because through a logistical blunder the other side had been supplied by wring ammunition. C.B. Purdom says:

“He goes on to describe the magnificent cavalry charge and how the officer at the head of it was carried away by his horse. Thus, Bluntschli attacks, unconsciously but devastatingly, the heroines cherished ideals”. (Purdom, Guide to Plays: 159).

Bluntschli is not a coward, though he likes to save his life as far as possible. When it becomes the question of his life, and he feels himself helpless, he determines to face it bravely. When he hears the sound of footsteps of Bulgarians, instead of being nervous his response to Raina is:

“The first man in war find out keep out of the way and don’t look. It will not last long, but it will not be nice. I promise you a fight: a devil of a fight.” (Shaw. Plays Pleasant Second Volume: 10)

Now Bluntschli impresses Raina, by his realistic views on war and she determined to save his life. Bluntschli in the first act had done enough to shatter Raina's illusions about war. Now the second act Sergius himself comes out fully disillusioned with war and the glory of the war.

“Soldiering, my dear madam, is the coward's way of attacking mercilessly when you are strong, and keeping out of harm's way when you are weak. This is the whole secret of successful fighting. Get your enemy at a disadvantage and never on any account fight him on equal terms.” (Shaw, Plays Pleasant Second Volume: 47).

He makes these statement because he has a personal complaint that military authorities do not promote him. He concludes that he has attained victory in a wrong way and he could not have been able to achieve it right. For him, since victory is victory whatever way it may come, he should be promoted. Sergius is wrong as Petkoff says; he should not be promoted to put in danger the whole brigade. In short, Sergius is now fully disillusioned. Sergius realizes that soldiering a mere trade, so makes a decision to resign from the post of it. He tells Catherine that he has no ambition to shine as a tradesman. (Shaw, Plays Pleasant Second Volume: 48).

In a word, Shaw in ‘Arms and the Man’ has successfully ridiculed the romantic notions of war and love. Those who participate in wars for the sake of romantic heroism are fools. Wars are not won by valor or weapons, but by will power and presence of mind. According to Shaw, a hero should be equipped by an original morality, which is independent of conventions and moral generalization.

In the 'Arms and the Man' Bluntschli represented the anti-romantic view of war, in fact, the anti-romantic view of everything. According to him, war is not just as in the case of other arts, it is the professional man who can easily excel an amateur in the same way a professional soldier can easily get the better of an unprofessional soldiers. His experience of war and soldiering has taught him that there is no such thing as heroism. A battle is won not by heroism but not by cleverness. It is the duty of a soldier to live as long as he can. For this reason and owing to his instinct of self-preservation, he flees from the field and comes to Raina's bed-chamber where he is ready to employ threat, force, politeness or any other means to save his live. For him, everything is fair in love and war. Make the words uttered by him to Sergius "I'm a professional soldier; I fight when I have to, and am very glad to get out of it, when I have not to. You are only an amateur, you think fighting an amusement."

He has no romantic idea about war. War is sometimes necessary, but it is evil and it should not be glorified. Again, his realism is seen in his realization that food is more important on the front than ammunition. His description of a cavalry charge reveals that his realism is based on the experience and observation of life. Bluntschli is a matter-of-fact man. A man of ordinary flesh and blood there being nothing extraordinary or glorious about him. He would not like to put his life into danger for nothing or to take needless risks. Though used to the sight of war, he gets nervous at the slightest cause. For example, on one occasion, when Raina accidentally sits on his Pistol and then jumps with a shriek, he gets extremely nervous and shies like a frightened horse to the other side of the room. On another

occasion, when she throws out the empty box of chocolate cream, he shies again like a child, as if she had meant to strike him. When asked by Raina to quit her house, he sinks helplessly on the sofa and drops his head on his hands in the deepest dejection. He asks for chocolate and devours them like a child. He is a man with ordinary human impulses and instincts, joy and sorrow. He is representative of ordinary humanity. He is not coward. He gives a satisfactory explanation to Raina. He has been under fire for three days without food or rest and being extremely fatigued has become as nervous as a mouse. He is ready to face a difficult situation bravely, when called to do so. As a practical man, he faces facts, takes things as they are, and opposed to romanticism. In this respect, he is in marked contrast with Sergius and Raina who are sentimental, romantic and live in a world of unreality. As he comes face to face with Raina in her bedroom and exchanges words with her, it appears as if there were a confrontation of realism and romanticism. His views are based on sound reasoning and the facts of life and so he gradually brings about changes in Raina's mind and heart and converts her to his own views. Raina at length, sees reason and begins to view things in their true colors (Dr. Raghukul Tilak, P: 91. 2009).

Shaw is pre-eminently a rationalist. He is not rationalist in the sense that he believes that everything can be understood by reason. As a matter of fact, there is much in his philosophy, which cannot be explained and understood with the help of reason. Thus his theory of life force is essentially mystical and it is difficult to explain it with the help of reason. It is for this reason that Chesterton goes to the extent of calling him a "Colossal mystic". He is a rationalist because he believes that the production

of relevant facts and the employment of argument is the best way of inducing understanding. He is a rationalist because he believes that if a truth is demonstrated often enough and forcibly enough, people will recognize it, and think and act upon it. He has, therefore, used an impressive array of facts and arguments in his war against shams and false conventions, against all that is romantic, i.e., not based on fact and reality.

He is a rationalist because he is an anti-romantic, i.e., opposed to everything not based on fact and reality. He believes in the power of ideas to move and convince, and use his drama as an instrument for the spread of truth. Shaw believes that man, as he progressed from barbarism to civilization, adopted certain institutions and conventions which are neither perfect nor divine, but with passage of time they have come to be regarded as being of a supernatural origin, and are accepted and glorified as such. The people, who have prospered by means of these institutions and whom Shaw calls Have-and-Holders, always try to encourage others in that they especially recognized conventions and institutions are perfect and divine and, therefore, any criticism of them is sacrilege. All this is imposture, as the sacredness and perfection of these institutions has no basis in fact. Shaw's business as dramatist is to shatter such romantic and idealistic notions. He is an anti-romantic, an iconoclast (an idol breaker) who shatters all hypocrisy and illusions by the battering rod of truth.

Shaw is one of those thorough-going realists who have the courage to face the truth and declare that a number of time-honored institutions and conventions are neither holy nor divine and that they must not be allowed to outlast their utility. All his life he warred against such outdated and romantic

beliefs and institutions. Thus in 'Arms of the Man' he exposes the hollowness of the romantic notion of love and war. Shaw's realism is absolutely unromantic and unsentimental. Romanticism is characterized by a great outburst of emotion and sentiment; Shaw's dramas are anti-romantic, entirely devoid of sentiment, C. E. M. Joad explains sentiment as, "Pretending to have feelings in excess of what is due and appropriate to the ostensible object of the feelings." Thus, sentimentalism is excessive and false and in one play after another Shaw has exposed its hollowness. He has exposed the sentimentality of romantic love like that of Raina and Sergius, of the halo surrounding the home, and family, of the glorification of women, of the romance of war and soldiering, and of host of other contemporary beliefs and conventions. He has shown most of our sentiments are based on poverty and inequality, which are the poisons that will destroy our civilization in the long run. Our civilization is based on false assumptions and as long as this civilization lasts there can only be disease, squalor, ignorance and suffering. This makes him a great breaker of conventions, the prince of rebels and iconoclasts. Joad, therefore, regards him as a great liberator. It was with the effect of liberation from a closed stuffy room, that Shaw burst into the closed chamber of late Victorians; he opened the doors of our minds and let in light and freedom. Shaw's theory of life force does a long way to explain his anti-romanticism. This life force is the only reality, all else is merely circumstantial and unreal.

The only fundamental reality is the life force, which operates as an upward drive, as an instinct for betterment. Many of our social institutions and traditions are unreal for they ignore the fundamental truth; rather they

impede the working of the life force. Shaw's socialism is also equally anti-romantic in the 'Widower's House' he shows that our attitude towards slum landlordism is sentimental and romantic. As a matter of fact, we are "as much guilty of slum landlordism as the landlord himself, therefore, sentimental indignation against one practical person is not only futile but also ridiculous." There is disease and poverty and the poor are miserable and wretched but no individual is villain, rather the idle rich are responsible for this state of affairs.

A CONTRAST BETWEEN BLUNTSCHLI AND SERGIUS

There is a sharp contrast between the characters of Bluntschli and Sergius in the play 'Arms and the Man'. Indeed, this contrast is one of the principal source of interest in this play. In the opening dialogue between Catherine and Raina, a romantic image of Sergius is presented to us. Catherine informs Raina that a great battle has been fought between the Bulgarians the Serbians, and that a splendid victory has been won by Sergius. Catherine describes Sergius as the hero of the hour and as the idol of his regiment, Raina feels thrilled to hear the news of Sergius' victory and says that her ideas about Sergius' heroism have proved to be true. This romantic image of Sergius persists in Raina's mind even after Bluntschli has told her about the blunder which Sergius had committed in making a cavalry charge upon the Serbian positions. When Sergius returns from the war and meets Raina, she still treats him as a great hero, and describes him as her king. She still looks at him through the same romantic spectacles, and pays a tribute to his war-like qualities. He addresses Raina as his lady and his saint, and he says that he would like to worship her because he thinks even the best man in the world to be unworthy of her pure passion. Thus, at this meeting with Raina, he talks in terms of the "higher love" and "pure passion". This, he does, knowing that Raina would feel pleasant with this kind of talk. They were talking in language that reflected indeed the higher love. Raina tells him that he has proved himself to be worthy of any woman in the world. Bluntschli, on the other hand, appears at the outset as a person belonging to the world of reality and not to the world of romantic. He bursts into Raina's bedroom feeling frightened of being caught by the pursuing Bulgarian

cavalrymen, and also feeling hungry and exhausted. He has been through the ordeal of fighting on the battlefield for three days consecutively, and he admits that he is not only afraid at this time but also in need of food and sleep. He hungrily eats the chocolate creams given to him by Raina; and he tells her that the experienced soldier always carry food with them, whenever they go to the battlefield while the inexperienced ones carry only weapons. Bluntschli shows himself to be practical kind of man as far as his ideas of war are concerned. He is not only exposes the quixotic approach of Sergius to war and its problems but also explodes the myth of the romantic knight who loves danger and even seeks danger in order to display his daring and intrepidity. Of course, later in the play, Sergius too develops a realistic attitude towards war and towards soldiering, but that happens only later. Sergius shows later that he too has discovered the truth about war and about soldiering but Bluntschli has that realistic view from the very beginning because he has spent as many as fifteen years of his life as a professional soldier on battlefield. In fact, Sergius becomes quite cynical about soldiering in the coward's art of attacking the enemy mercilessly when one is strong and keeping away from the enemy when one is weak. Sergius has also decided to resign his post in the army because he is feeling disillusioned about the military professions.

Another point of contrast between the two men is that Bluntschli is a light-hearted, witty man with a keen sense of humor. While Sergius is somewhat serious, even solemn man, though he is not absolutely devoid of humor. Bluntschli talks light-heartedly and even jovially when he first meets Raina, though he is at this time in grave danger; and subsequently also he

continues to talk in the same light-hearted and jovial manner. He shows a ready wit, and he makes a really amusing remark when, in reply to Sergius' challenge to him, he says that he would fight not with a sword but with a machine-gun because he's an artillery man and not a cavalry man. Sergius, on the contrary, talks earnestly and sometimes even bitterly. He is feeling sour about having been denied the promotion, which he had expected for his heroism in the army. He express annoyance on learning that Louka had overheard a private conversation between Raina and the visitor in her bedroom when he had first met her, and he goes to the extent of challenging Bluntschli to a duel. Bluntschli treats even this challenge to a duel lightly, making jokes about the matter. Bluntschli is a complete extrovert, while Sergius is a thorough introvert. Bluntschli takes everything in his stride, without brooding over it. If for instance, he had failed to win Raina as his wife, he would have gone back home and would have forgotten the whole thing in a matter of days. But Sergius is in the habit of mediating upon every situation which develops. He is a kind of thinker, and not only a man of action.

The most striking point of contrast between Bluntschli and Sergius is that, while Bluntschli is a fully integrated personality, Sergius has a split personality. Bluntschli's character is marked by stability. He is a harmonious personality. Sergius, on the contrast, tells Louka that he is not a one man but several men combined in one. He tells her that he is a combination of six different individuals and he does not know which one of them is the real Sergius. He explains this view of himself to Louka by saying that one of those six men is a hero, another is a buffoon, another a humbug, another a

bit of blackguard and yet another is a coward, and jealous like all cowards. Thus, Sergius has a complex and multiple personalities; and this multiplicity is something, which torments him. Bluntschli, on the contrary, has no inner conflicts. He is perfectly at peace with himself. Of course, it is quite possible that Sergius would, after a year or so of married life with Louka, be able to achieve a feeling of harmony within himself but at the moment his personality is like a house divided against itself. Sergius is presented in the beginning of the play not only as a romantic knight fighting on the battlefield to display his return from war, he meets Raina, he uses the language of romantic love. Speaking with great fervor, and telling her she was the inspiration behind his brave deeds. Even though his love for Raina is not really of the passionate kind, he yet speaks like a passionate lover. Immediately after her words, he tells Louka that he is not much interested in the kind of higher love about which Raina has been talking to him, and he even begins to make advances to Louka. In his dealing with Louka he certainly shows himself to be realist, but in his dealing with Raina he has spoken like a romantic lover who belongs to the domain of fairy land. Bluntschli is in this respect, entirely different from Sergius. He deals with Raina from the very start like a practical man. In the beginning, he only seeks shelter and food from her. Later he comes to take another look at her because he had at the very outset felt attracted by her charm and her kindness towards him.

But even now he does not immediately declare his intentions with regard of her. He continues to speak in a matter of fact tone, without showing in the least, he is in love with her and that he wants her as his wife.

It is only when he has made sure by this time that Sergius is not really in love with Raina. In other words, he makes sure that neither Sergius is genuinely in love with Raina, nor Raina is truly in love with Sergius. Bluntschli's approach to this occasion just as he had shown himself as an excellent bargainer at the time of the exchange of prisoners. He now feels no hesitation in trying to prove that he can afford to provide Raina with all those comforts and facilities to which she accustomed, and which Sergius is in a position to provide to her. Now he asserts that he is financially much better off than Sergius. And he shows his sense of realism when he agrees to being described by Raina as her chocolate cream soldier. We may even all call Bluntschli a prosaic lover. Sergius offers a sharp contrast to Bluntschli; and through this contrast, we become even more convinced of Bluntschli's excellent qualities of head and heart. Sergius' fickleness in love emphasizes the stability of Bluntschli character. Bluntschli is a man perfectly sure of himself. Sergius himself admits to Louka that he is a combination of several individuals, and that he is a complex and multiple personality, not knowing which the true Sergius. Bluntschli is, by contrast, a simple-minded man, though he is very clever, very sharp, and very shrewd. We can appreciate the characters of the two men better because of the contrast between them. (Ramji Lall, P: 150-153. 2009)

CONCLUSION

Bernard Shaw himself calls 'Arms and the Man' an anti-romantic comedy. Shaw himself was anti-romantic by nature. The principle objection raised by Shaw against romantic literature is that it deals with imagery ideas and artificial emotions. So, S

haw decidedly and intentionally wrote the play 'Arms and the Man' in his innovation design of anti-romantic comedy. Shaw Ridicules and satirizes the romantic attitude of love in 'Arms and the Man'. In the play, the romantic lovers are like just butterflies sucking honey from flower to flower. So even being betrothed to Sergius, Raina put a signed photograph on the pocket of the coat given to Bluntschli for his realistic and humanistic attitude to life and for that reason; she gave the photograph as souvenir for her love to her chocolate cream soldier. Similarly, Sergius shows his strange fickleness by shifting his romantic feeling for Raina to Louka, a maidservant in Raina's family. Thus, Shaw shows the hollowness of romantic love between Sergius and Raina upholds Shaw's view of ideal marriage and love. We can say that 'Arms and the Man' is an anti-romantic comedy which admits of no controversy. The dramatist is in doubted successful in his purpose of satirizing romantic notions about war and love in his play 'Arms and the Man'.

Moreover, this does not mean that Shaw falsifies reality, his exaggeration is merely a heightened of reality. In many cases, Shaw has presented facts accurately and realistically and by removing the curtain of romantic and idealism brought by his readers face to face with truth. In 'Arms and the Man', he has told his readers the truth about war, and the

experience of the First World War has actually proved that on the battlefield food is more important than bullets. In short, Shaw is a realist who tries to find out the essence of truth behind the grasp of romantic and respectability.

He is a great iconoclast who has shattered countless romantic shams and conventions. In one play after another, he has shown that our gods are false gods, our ideals are fictions, our religion is superstition, our science is nonsense, our heroes are often monsters of petty, and the truth of his views is now generally recognized.