

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

1.1 George Bernard Shaw as a Dramatist

George Bernard Shaw (1856-1950) was a playwright of the early twentieth century literature. He first gained fame as a music critic, but by then had begun writing essays, political pamphlets and plays. Shaw also won an Oscar Award in 1938 for his screenplay for a non-musical movie version of *Pygmalion* and Nobel Prize in 1925 for the same book. He was a radical socialist and social reformer, and a noted sarcastic wit who remained active until his death. He remains the only person to win both an Oscar and a Nobel Prize. Especially in early years, his subjects offended many playgoers and critics, dealing as they did with such matters as prostitution, religious hypocrisy, slum landlordism, profiteering, and, of course, socialism. Part of his nonacademic training was handled by his mother, a music teacher. Shaw studied music and art at the same time. Resigning a cashier's position, Shaw joined his mother and two sisters in London, where they conducted a music school. Shaw had started writing, at the age of 16, criticism and reviews for Irish newspapers and magazines; in 4 years only one piece was accepted. Shaw lived in London for the 9 years after 1876 supported by his parents and continued to write criticism.

Irish dramatist and critic, G. B. Shaw, born into a musical household, was early initiated into Italian opera and Mozart. He produced more than 57 plays, three volumes of music and drama criticism, and one major volume of socialist commentary. He revolutionized the Victorian stage, and then dominated by artificial melodramas, by presenting vigorous dramas of ideas revealing his mastery of English prose. Much recent

criticism concludes that he ranks as the greatest English dramatist since William Shakespeare.

1.2 Political Activities in the Life of G. B. Shaw

G. B. Shaw, in his twenties had joined a socialist discussion group, and joined the Fabian Society in 1884. He edited *Fabian Essays* in 1887 that emphasized the importance of economics and class structure. For him, economics was ‘the basis of society’. In 1882 Shaw’s conversion to socialism began when he heard Henry George, the American author of *Progress and Poverty*, addressed a London meeting. George’s message changed the whole current of his life. His reading of Karl Marx’s *Das Kapital* in the same year made him a true social activist. For 27 years Shaw served on the Fabian Society’s executive committee. *The Intelligent Woman’s Guide to Capitalism and Socialism* (1928) supplied a complete summary of his political position. It remains a major volume of socialist commentary. For six years, Shaw held office on a municipal level in London town.

Shaw’s literary careers continued between 1888 and 1894 when he wrote for newspapers and periodicals as a highly successful music critic. At the end of this period, he began writing on a regular basis for Frank Harris’s *Saturday Review*; as a critic, he introduced Ibsen and the new drama to the British public. Shaw wrote drama between 1892 and 1947, when he completed *Buoyant Billions* at the age of 91. *Widowers’ Houses*, his first play, was produced in 1892 at London’s Royalty Theatre. Shaw began as a dramatist writing against the mechanical habits of domestic comedy and against the Victorian romanticizing of Shakespeare and drama in general. He wrote, ‘melodramatic stage

illusion is not an illusion of real life, but an illusion of the embodiment of our romantic imaginings' (56).

Shaw's miraculous period began with *Man and Superman* (1901-1903). It was miraculous even for him; in a late play, *Too True to Be Good* (1932), one of the characters speaks for him,

my gift is divine: it is not limited by my petty personal convictions.

Lucidity is one of the most precious of gifts: the gift of the teacher: the gift of explanation. I can explain anything to anybody; and I love doing it (124).

Major Barbara (1905) is a drama of ideas, largely about poverty and capitalism; like most of Shaw's drama, *Major Barbara* possesses questions and finally contains messages or arguments. *Androcles and the Lion* (1911) discusses religion. *John Bull's Other Island* (1904), which is the least known of his major plays, concerns political relations between England and Ireland. *Heartbreak House* analyzes the domestic effects of World War I; it was first produced in 1920. Most of the plays after *Arms and the Man* carry long prefaces that are often not directly related to the drama itself. Shaw systematically explored such topics as marriage, parenthood, education, and poverty in the prefaces. Shaw's popular success was coupled with a growing critical success. *Heartbreak House*, *Back to Methuselah*, *Androcles and the Lion*, and *Saint Joan* (1923) are considered his best plays.

The plays of Shaw express a complex range of impulses, ambitions, and beliefs. Reflecting on his life and his work, he explained at seventy,

If I am to be entirely communicative on this subject, I must add that the mere rawness ... it is that I was born mad or a little too sane, my kingdom

was not of this world: I was at home only in the realm of my imagination, and at ease only with the mighty dead. Therefore I had to become an actor, and create for myself a fantastic personality fit and apt for dealing with men, and adaptable to the various parts I had to play as an author, journalist, orator, politician, committee man, man of the world, and so forth (228).

After moving to London in 1876, Shaw worked for years as a music and art critic, wrote book and theatre reviews, and was an active member of the socialist Fabian Society. In his first play, *Widowers' Houses* (1892), he emphasized on social and economic issues instead of romance, adopting the ironic comedic tone that would characterize all his works. He described his first plays as unpleasant because they forced the spectator to face unpleasant facts; these plays include *Mrs. Warren's Profession* (1893), which concerns prostitution and was barred from performance until 1902. He then wrote four pleasant plays, including the comedies *Arms and the Man* (1894) and *Candida* (1895). His next plays include *Caesar and Cleopatra* (1899) and *Man and Superman* (1905). He used high comedy to explore society's foibles in *Major Barbara* (1905), *The Doctor's Dilemma* (1911), and *Pygmalion* (1913), his comedic masterpiece.

Shaw's other writings and speeches made him a controversial public figure for much of his life. G. B. Shaw, ambitious to write, left Dublin and his childhood's genteel poverty to join his mother and sisters in London. His novels were rejected first by publishers, but later, after his steady labour in all literary, music, and theatre criticism he proved himself popular. In addition to literature, Shaw sustained long-lasting passions for music, humour, politics, art, vegetarianism, and also photography. In 1898 he began to

photograph his friends, his wife, and street scenes. He was also an enthusiastic defender of photography's artistic value.

Shaw's literary reputation was first established as a music, art, and theatre critic for various London periodicals. Many of Shaw's later plays are remarkable for their experimental character. Plays such as *Geneva* (1936), portraying the age of Fascist ideologies, reveal a sense of near despair about national and international political organizations. He died of illness precipitated by a fall from an apple-tree he was pruning in his garden at Ayot St Lawrence. Most of the plays of Shaw's early and middle period, up to and including *Heartbreak House*, were developed from the mould of late nineteenth century, naturalism.

With the science fiction scenario of *Back to Methuselah*, Shaw entered the final phase of his play-writing career. In later play such as *Too true to Be Good* (1931) fantastic incidents become increasingly common. Whereas the characters in Shaw's early and middle plays are drawn with psychological insight, in later work the characterization tends towards allegory and cartoon. As an iconoclast with an Irish sense of distance from the English life, he enjoyed and mocked himself; he employed his gifts in the exposure of insincerity and hypocrisy in his time, and in the subversion of self-righteous value systems. A Shaw play leaves not so much the sense of a proven thesis as awareness of open-ended possibilities and irreducible complexity, and of the depth, subtlety, and humour of his treatment of human relationships.

1.3 What *The Apple Cart* Is?

G. B. Shaw was a freethinker, defender of woman right and advocate of equality of income. He undoubtedly focused on then existed political corruption in his works, *The Apple Cart*. To clarify corrupted political situation he states, how he can govern the country if we have all the power and he has no one (42). According to Shaw, it is not the politics which is dirty but the politicians who litter it, to all over the world by playing the game of blaming others for their own failures. Although political groups such as the king and his court, politicians, members of the parliament, the Prime Minister and other members of cabinet who have different significant responsibilities, suffer from political corruption. The practical democratic responsibilities are not followed for overt description as he further says, 'political or a king who is just that and the nothing else all day and everyday is a lopsided creature, a human monster (122).

Shaw's dramas are the expression against exploration, corruption and bankruptcy. His life was dedicated for political betterment through literary work. As a genius versatile dramatist, his main focus is political improvement. The play focuses on the tussle for political central stage between king Magnus who is an affable monarch and his Prime Minister Proteus, who is abrasive, wrong headed and the wooden of thought and imagination. The long political conflict brings negative influence upon common people.

The Apple Cart, a political extravaganza, is a 1929 play by George Bernard Shaw. Though it offers some laughs, the play is primarily a reflection on a number of political philosophies and characters who frequently deliver lengthy speeches defending their views. It follows the fictional King Magnus and his mistress Orinthia as they match wits

with a Prime Minister, Proteus, who seeks to strip the monarchy of its remaining political powers. As Shaw puts it succinctly in the Preface,

It is a comedy in which a King defeats an attempt by his popularly elected Prime Minister to deprive him of the right to influence public opinion through the press and the platform: in short, to reduce him to a cipher. The King's reply is that rather than be a cipher he will abandon his throne and take his obviously very rosy chance of becoming a popularly elected Prime Minister himself (118).

The Apple Cart is an incongruous political satire by George Bernard Shaw, which respectfully revived the theatre. The production was vibrant and passionate; however, Shaw's writing is exceedingly intellectual and dense. Thus, while the production was engaging and enjoyable, it required much concentration and attention. The plot of *The Apple Cart* concerns a monarch who is assaulted by his elected cabinet. They feel that the king is too meddling and threaten to resign if he does not sign an ultimatum, which in effect would turn him into a powerless figurehead. Either way, the king would be doomed, without a cabinet or without power; his challenge is the play's catalyst. What follows is political debate, as many sides and problems are discussed and revealed. Added to the commentaries on politics, the play is a brief interlude on marriage and adultery as well as a scene with an American ambassador mocking democracy and capitalism.

Shaw's insight is clear and the picture he paints of politics' problems is adept and prophetic, especially considering when he wrote it. The play is witty and dry, however, and there are no chuckles and few stinging one-liners. The language is talkative but stimulating. The play has a slow start but builds up its shape strongly as it continues.

Despite the play's challenges, it is moving and interesting. It has assigned different dialects to the cast, presenting the distinct classes surrounding the king. His staging kept the audience on its toes, much like a tennis match pitting the king in one corner against his rivals in the other.

The outstanding assembly was engaging and tight. Overall, *The Apple Cart* was a divine production of an overtly intellectual play. It would not disappoint anyone in the mood for serious, political contemplation.

Anyway, Shaw's dramas simply create positive impact to the reader but the core theme is political upheaval and devastation of country's situation. Thus well evaluation of Shaw's dramas show combined contemporary political problems and its paradoxical result however; *The Apple Cart* is entitled as political extravaganza, in two acts and an interlude. But practically it was misunderstood. Shaw was roundly denounced as a renegade, as a traitor to socialism and belated convert to monarchy. The play concerns itself with conflict between the king of England and his labour cabinet in the year of 1962. The popularly elected prime minister endeavors to deprive the king of almost the only real power left in him, the right to influence public opinion through the press and platform. King Magnus, who is exceedingly clever, declines the role of cipher offered him, and threatens to abdicate, win a parliamentary seat as a commoner, and run for the post of prime minister himself. The solution, the incumbent dare not to accept since it would, rally the antidemocratic vote against him and inspire a rival in the person of the only public man whose ability he has to fear.

A careful reading of *The Apple Cart* clearly shows that the real conflict is not between monarchy and democracy, but between these two and capitalism. As a Fabian

along with Webbs, Shaw would have liked a new reform bill for the British. Several new federal legislatures complete organization of local government boards and approved co-ordination of international affairs with United Nations. Because of its folly, its purposelessness, its glorification of the material, its greed and its rapacious over production capitalism in his view had brought the world to its present precarious pass. His solution for the world's sickness is men and women of characters, politicians and statesmen of capacity, efficient government with wholesale devolution and redistribution of authority, elimination of private property and equal allocation of national income to every citizen from birth to death.

1.4 *The Apple Cart and Contemporary Politics*

Lloyd George came to power in December in 1916 with central government machine apparently unable to cope with strains of Britain's first total war. The main creation of small war, that cabinet of non-departmental ministers and provision of secretariat were not able to implement decisions. During his partnership, distinction that has been emerging over the fifty years between private and political level was under confusion. Earlier administration and their most private secretaries had been drawn from civil service and returned to their Whitehall department.

The accession of the country's labour government in January 1924 then marked the first time that the transfer of power from one party to another had not been accompanied. This was a significant step on the path to establishment of permanent impartial office staff. Ramsay MacDonald retained the exiting set of private secretaries, and his pattern continued in the subsequent change of power at the end of 1924. Ronald Water House

served three prime ministers as private secretary between 1922 and 1928, two conservatives and one labour. Over the previous half century, no private secretary who had served a liberal prime minister, worked for a conservative successor or vice versa.

MacDonald, temperamentally, was unable to delegate and was initially so suspicious of the political affiliations of the officials that insisted on opening his entire letter personally. He never brought himself to make full use of the well-tired official machine, which was now at his disposal; as a result, MacDonald worked harder than he needed to have done, a factor that continued to personal and political exhaustion.

MacDonald relied on Rose Rosenberg, his personal and private secretary as leader of the labour party since 1922, who was installed in an office leading out of the cabinet room and had controlled over a secret cupboard of documents to which only she and prime minister had access. Rosenberg also handled the press, including arrangements during the foreign tour to the USA and Canada in 1928 at the start of his second premiership when he organized a traveling party to 'fifty to sixty' journalists on the ship and on land fed them regularly.

The tireless Rosenberg was also MacDonald's link with parliamentary about party. MacDonald would command, "Rose, go and feel, pulse of the house!" (85) On top of all this work, she was the gatekeeper controlling access to the prime minister and prepared his daily diary in the form of a set of cards placed on his desk. When she resumed her role on MacDonald's return to power in 1929, a political appointee in association with private office helped her.

MacDonald's first government in 1924 saw the introduction of the system of ministerial cars and drivers. His finances had been severely stretched by the obligation of

entertaining and giving gratitude to staffs. His predecessors were much healthier men. But Macdonald was less worried about the loyalty of his officials in the second period of labour government after 1929, which had turned the principles of Fabian Society. G.B. Shaw has picturized this through *The Apple Cart*.

“*The Apple Cart* is the exposition of the problem but not the solution of the problem” (Gassner 673). Shaw has produced *The Apple Cart* in 1930 as fantasia about the conscious king who seized power and tried to make sense of the shady business of governing. A disjointed but charming play full of bubbling humours, a devastating satire with bang being a government that is led by the labour prime minister, Proteus but actually controlled by Breakages Limited. Shaw’s monarchial solution, patently untenable, the solution of drama left hanging in the air, the play is just exposition of problem in the form of fable.

Shaw is often accused of anti-political writer. It is said that Shaw’s drama is the presentation of negative aspect of monarchy, democracy and politics. In *The Apple Cart*, Shaw talks about the British political system but he does not make clear about the negative impacts on politics. Shaw presents the conflict between monarchy and prime ministership.

All literary interpretations and critical studies have proved that the play as political extravaganza rather than as something that manifests different power spectrum. Some critics complain that Shaw defends himself in the Preface saying, ‘But that is not all the relation between two. Both play with equal skill. And the King wins, not by greater astuteness, but because he has the ace of trumps in his hand and knows when to play it’.

(209)

Shaw clears the position of King Magnus and position of Prime Minister, Proteus. He does not think it is the victory of King Magnus rather he is dragged into the situation. He defends himself that he is not an anti-democratic and inclined towards dictatorship. He says, 'They still regard democracy as the under dog in the conflict. But to me it is the king who is doomed to be tragically in that position in the future into which play is projected'. (Preface 209)

Shaw says whether it is democracy or monarchy no one can do anything in the grip of Breakage Limited or Capitalism. The prime minister is compelled to tear the ultimatum as he checks the king from abdicating in favour of his son and going to the general election. Even at the end of the drama, the problem of the drama is left unsolved in such case; the king gets only nominal victory.

CHAPTER TWO

2.1 Power: An Overview

Power means the ability to control people or things. In association with kinship and glory, it was included in the ultimate scriptural tribute to the Supreme Being. President or Prime Minister is said to have power or to lack it in the requisite amount. In the same way, other politicians are thought to be gaining power or losing it.

Corporations and the trade are said to be powerful. Britain, once which was great and powerful, is becoming less in power now. The history of United States tells us that the United States has been losing some of its industrial power to Germany and Japan. Max Weber, German sociologist and political scientist, put the definition of power, “The possibility of imposing one’s will upon the behaviour of other person” (Power 323).

This is the common perception that someone or some group is imposing their wills and purposes on others, including on those who are reluctant or adverse. The greater the capacity to impose and achieve the related purpose, the greater the power is. It is because power has such a commonsense meaning that it is used so often with so little seeming need for definition. But little more power is so simple. It is highly interesting question as to how power is imposed, how the consequence of other is achieved. It is the threat of physical punishment, the promise of pecuniary reward, the exercise of persuasion or some other deeper forces that cause the person or the person subject to the exercise of power to abandon their own performance and to accept those of others. It is the question how power is enforced what accords access to the methods of enforcement that *The Apple Cart* addresses.

The instrument by which power is exercised in *The Apple Cart* is a sense of condign power, sources, although other power exercises are interrelated to complex fashion. Some use of power depends on its being concealed on their submission not being evident to those who render it. In modern industrial society, either the instruments subordinating or some people to the will of others and sources of this ability are subject to rapid change. Much of what is believed about the exercise of power, delivering as it dies from what was true in the past, is obsolete or obsolescent in the present. There are three trails on its contributions that accord the right to its use. They are condign, compensatory and conditional power.

Condign power wins submission by inflicting or threatening appropriately adverse consequences that are vividly and apparently found in *The Apple Cart*. Compensatory power in contrast, wins submission by the effort of affirmative reward by giving something of value to the individual. In an earlier stage of economics, the development, as still in the rural economics, the compensation took vivid forms-including payments in kind and the right to work a plot of land or lords' fields. A personal or public rebuke is a form of condign power. However, in the modern economy, the most important expression of compensatory power is, of course, pecuniary reward.

In common feature of both condign power and compensatory power that the individual submitting is awarded to his or her submission in some case compelled and in the other rewarded. Conditional power, in contrast, is exercised by changing beliefs, persuasions, education or social commitment to what seems natural, proper or right causes the individual to submit to the will of others. The submission reflects to the preferred course, the fact of submission is not recognized. Conditional power more than condign or

compensatory power, is central as we shall examine, to the functioning of the modern economy and policy like in capitalists and socialist countries.

Personality is the common reference certainty to the personal tracts that go access to one or more of the instrument of power. In the primitive societies, it transferred through physical straight to condign power. It is a source still retained in some household, a youthful community by the larger, more muscular males. However, personality in modern times has its primary association with conditioned power-with ability to persuade or create belief.

Property accords an aspect of authority, a certainty of purpose and this can invite conditioned submission. But its principal association, quite obviously, is with compensatory power. Property-income provides to purchase submission. Organization, the most important source of powering modern societies, has it's for most relationship with individual power. Organization is mostly required to exercise power. From the organization, then comes the requisite preservation and resulting submission to the purpose of the organization but it is in the case of the state, also has access to condign power to claviers forms of punishment. An organized group has greater or lesser access to reach to compensatory power through the property, which they are possessed.

These three resources of the power bring up into final point. As there is primary but not exclusive association between each of three instruments by which power related instruments. Personality, property and organization are combined in a various form. From this comes a varying combination of instruments for the enforcement of power. The isolation and the separation of the sources and instrument in particular exercise of power is

the assessment of each of the importance of relative importance of corporate power and political power which go on their benefit.

Individual and group seek power to advance their own interest, including notably, their own pecuniary interest and to extend to others. Their personal religion or their social values or to win support for their economic and other social perception of the public good, the business man buys the submission of his workers to serve his economic purposes to make money.

As a religious leader tries to persuade his congregation or his radio or television audience because he wants them to think his beliefs should be theirs. Similarly, the political leaders seek the support and submission of their voters so that they may remain on chair. The conservationist seeks to enforce respect for his preference on those who make automobiles crown factories. The latter seek submission to their desire for lower costs and less regulations. Conservationists seek submission to their view of the socio-economic order and the associated action; libels, socialists seek similar submission. Organization coming together of those with similar interests, values or perceptions is integral to the winning of such submission, to the pursuit of power.

Everyday language comments regularly on the reasons for which power is being pursued. If it is narrowly confined to the interest of an individual or group, one says it is being sought for selfish ends; if it reflects the interest or perception of a much large number of people. Individuals and groups seek power to advance their own interest and to extend to others.

Power is pursued not only for the service it venders to personal interest, values or social perceptions, but also for its own sake, for the emotional and materials rewards

inherent in its possession and exercise. The pursuit of power, for the sake of power can't be admitted. The reality is as ever part of the public consciousness. Politicians are frequently described as 'power hungry'. The obvious implication is that they seek power to satisfy as appetite. Corporations take over other corporations not in pursuits of profits but in pursuit of the power that goes mild direction of a yet larger enterprise. A politician can be seen by some as powerful and thus effective leader; seen by others, he is dangerously ruthless. Bureaucratic power is bad public servants with power to render effective public service are very good. Corporate power is dangerous, so however is a weakly administered enterprise. Unions in their exercise of power indispensably defend the rights of workers.

Yet power is not a proper subject for indignation. The exercise of power, the submission of some to others is inevitable in modern society; nothing whatever is accomplished without it. It is subject to be approached with a skeptical mind but not with one that has fixation of evil. Power can be socially malignant; it is also socially essential. De Jourenel puts, 'Power has two aspects... It is a social necessary... it is also social menace'. (283)

2.2 Power in *The Apple Cart*

Power is a universal phenomenon; a fundamental and essential tool of human society. Society is built on some instinct of power such as the relationship with father exercising his power over his son. Max Webber writes in his essay: 'power and ability to control the behaviour of others even in the absence of their consent' (Power 135). Robertson Raw quotes, 'the capacity to participate effectively in a decision making

processes (Anatomy of Power 135). And Gerald Marwell defines it as, ‘the capacity to get things done despite obstacles and resistance’. (136)

There are many types of power and varieties of overcoming resistance, for instance, one can threaten, cajole, influence, coerce, wheedle, persuade, beg blackmail and inspire to get things done. But power on a large scale is almost always embodied within the organizational structures whether they may be governments, political parties, churches or protest movements. In each of the setting, power involves a gamble because there is always risk that the empowered people will betray the common trust.

Power reveals itself in many forms and shapes just as constitution, sovereignty, juridical and economic system does. Marx’s apparatus is analyzed in two forms, the economic and political. Ideology plays a vital role in superstructure and inter-structures. A new exercise of power emerges which is probably even more important than constitutional reforms and new forms of government established at the end of the eighteenth century. Power negates, obstructs, represses and suppresses and influences others. In feudal societies power functions essentially through signs and levies in the form of taxes. All the power of state in sphere of capitalism comes into being which exercises itself through social production and social services. Power is manifested in wealth, status authority, prestige and organizational efficiency. In this context Robertson Raw writes, ‘Power is not just gun, it is not just a baton, it is not just a hundred dollar bill that can be passed from one hand as kind of entity of power. Power is a relationship among human beings’. (Anatomy of Power 61)

The struggle in *The Apple Cart* is between the founding institutions, democracy and monarchy; and plutocracy maintains the game of power exercise reflecting prophetically

the political scenario in the nineteenth century in the Great Britain. The real exercise of power begins from the first meeting with king. Every cabinet ministers, including the prime minister are centered on the crisis- the crisis is royal veto of king uses in every speech whenever he is in front of press and public openly. The king replies when the ministers can talk openly of their powers, there was nothing wrong in his statement about his right of veto. The main issue is again lost in the noisy quarrel of the cabinet ministers. The prime minister makes it clear that if the king wants to run the government, the king should not make political speeches, which express his personal views. For example, he should not tell the public that only his power of veto can protect them against the rich that the cabinet ministers only quarrel among themselves and do nothing for the people. All such statement must be stopped forever he further says that even if he disagrees with cabinet, he should not tell it to the people.

King Magnus tries to explain to the minister that public opinion affects a king more than the cabinet. Magnus puts on words,

Democracy is a very real thing, with much less humbling about than many older institutions... but to whomever clever enough to get them. (60)

He further says power is neither in the hand of common people nor in the hands of kings. Real power is controlled by anyone who is clever than others. He express that he is also in the race of power so he does not wish to sign the ultimatum, for this he quotes,

I think I am in the running. That is why I do not bound to accept this ultimatum by signing it. I put myself out of the running. That is why I do not bound to accept this ultimatum by signing it I put myself out of the running. Why should I? (60)

He thinks by signing the ultimatum, he would be out of race of power. The king firmly states that he does not want old governing class again come back to power. But he wants the country ruled by persons who are not affected by ignorance and superstitions. King Magnus tells the cabinet not to tiniest his power. His concluding words are, 'But whilst you continue to support me as a separate and independent estate of the realm... I may defeat you but that your success to certain if you insist'. (63)

The king, in spite of his application to the cabinet ministers seems to be a vain or in a useless condition, which the following dialogue, clarifies-

Amanda:Sorry sir, but there isn't room for two monarchs in my realm. I am against you on principle because the talent for mimicry isn't hereditary.

Magnus: I see that my appeal has been in vain. I do not reproach you, ladies and gentleman, because I perceive your situation is a difficult one. The question is, how to change it.

Nicobar:Sign the ultimatum; that is how.

Magnus: I perceive gentlemen that I have come to the end of your patience. I will tax it no further; you have been very forbearing; but I must have until five o'clock this evening... ladies and gentlemen. (70-71)

All the cabinet ministers are in favour of signing the ultimatum by the king so the king seeks the time till five o'clock to think over the matter. In the second meeting the prime minister urges the king to give quick decision about the conflicting case, which is main problem of the drama. Proteus says to king Magnus that he intends to end the

discussion and tells in a diversionary tactic. He wants to know whether the king is ready to accept the ultimatum or not. So, he says to the king,

In plain terms we require from you on unconditional surrender. If you refuse it then I go to the country on the question whether England is to be an absolute monarchy or a constitutional one. We are all agreed on that: there will be no resignations. (96)

The king accepts the terms of the ultimatum. He opts to be a constitutional monarch, for he can not do without them, but when he is asked to sign the ultimatum, he warns them that is not to because in doing so he will be making promises which he would break. Magnus says, ‘. . . accept your constitutional principle without the slightest reserve; I can not sign your ultimatum... which I know I should break’. (97)

Magnus further says,: ‘when an honest man finds himself incapable of discharging of the duties of a public post, he resigns’ (97). When other ministers oppose him from resigning, the king again adds. ‘I can not resign. But I can abdicate’. All the ministers are greatly surprised at this sudden and unexpected announcement of giving up his throne. He informs the cabinet that in his place, his son Robert will become the king, and he would make a better constitutional monarch. King Magnus says that he is abdicating but he will remain active in politics. He says, ‘I think with my all heart, but there is a misapprehension... I have no intention of withdrawing from an active part in politics’. (101)

Although he was greatly affected by their feelings, so no need of leave taking. He plans to dissolve the parliament and announce fresh election, which his words clarify

themselves, 'I am looking forward to a most exciting and enjoying tune. As I shall of course dissolve parliament, the fun will begin with a general election'. (102)

The following dialogues express clearly how the king is able to hold his power in his position, how he influences other members of minister and son.

Magnus: There is no imposing... I shall be in a better position as a commoner than as a peer. I shall seek a parliamentary seat. It is my intention to offer myself to the royal borough of Windsor as a candidate at the forthcoming general election. (102)

The king wants to give up all his titles and become a common man standing in the general elections. His decision causes a great confusion among the ministers which the following dialogue clarifies,

Proteus: This is treachery.

Balbus: A dirty trick.

Nicober: The meanest on record.

Pliny: He'll be at the top of the page.

Crassus: Humbug!

Lysistrata: I wish you, majesty every success.

Boanerges: Well Said! Well Said! Why not?

Amanda: Hear, hear! Fair playboys! Why shouldn't he go into parliament with us?

It is clear that the male ministers are not happy with this announcement but Lysistrata and Amanda praise the king's decision. The king further tells them that when he

is elected to the house of common, he will form a party. And then the king, his son Robert, will invite the majority party to form the government. So Magnus clears out,

I shall naturally endeavor to form a party. My son, King Robert, will have to call on same party leader who can depend on the support of the House of Commons to form government. He may call on you. He may even call on me. (103)

The prime minister understands the threats of the king to abdicate his son and form a new party. He quickly decides the situation is as it was before and clears out to tear up the strokes and throwing the pieces away and says,

There is not going to be any abdication. There is not going to be any general election. There is not going to be any ultimatum. We go on as before. The crisis is washed out... your ace of trumps from the hands I played this morning. (104)

In such a way the conflict is cleared out.

King Magnus is the central figure in *The Apple Cart*. He makes a forceful justification of the rights of the king and tells his of the great good that he can do for them. He stresses his own difficulties and problems. Kings are much maligned persons, all sort of scandalous charges are leveled at them and if they protest and show that the charges of moral looseness are false, they are likely to loose their popularity with people. Moreover, he himself can be served as a convenient scapegoat for them. They can easily blame him their own faults and shortcomings and he does not mind it for his future does not depend on the vote of the people. The king says on his speech,

I stand for the future and the past, for the posterity that has no vote and the traditions that never had any; I stand for the great abstraction for conscience and virtue: for the eternal against the expedient; for evolutionary apposite against the day's gluttony; for intellectual integrity, for humanity, for the rescue of industry from commercialism and of science from professionalism, for everything ...I have no elections to fear, if any newspaper magnate dares offend me, the magnate fashionable wife and marriageable daughters will soon make him understand that the king's displeasure is still a sentence of social death. (65)

The king ends his speech with fervent appeal,

But whilst you continue to support me as a separate and independent estate of the realm, I am your scapegoat; you get the credit of ...Think once; think twice for your danger is not that I may defeat you, but that your success is certain in you insist. (Ibid)

This is a speech from a shrewd, clever and determined man, and the cabinet is much impressed. But Proteus, who is also determined and shrewd, presses the king to sign the ultimatum or face the ensuing crisis and its consequences. But the king seeks time till five in the evening when he promises to tell them on his considered decision. It is agreed that the second meeting of the cabinet would be held at five that very evening and all leave for their lunch full of suspense and anxiety.

The second meeting, the shortest but is a decisive one. In the beginning, the king aggresses to sign the ultimatum proposed by the prime minister as well as cabinet

ministers. The prime minister as well as cabinet ministers are happy on this account. But later, king Magnus backs his words and says,

Thank you. Therefore, whilst accepting your constitutional principle without the slightest reserve, I can not sign your ultimatum, because be doing so I should be making personal promises which I know I should break- which in fact I must break because I have forces within me which your constitutional limits can not hold in... I can not reason I can not abdicate. (101)

The king is ready to abdicate rather than to resign. He further says that he would give up his kingship from a party and contest the elections as a commoner. He may then be the prime minister and rule the country with his son, Robert, as the constitutional monarch. The prime minister in another hand understands the implication of the decision. He, therefore, tears off the ultimatum and goes away saying that the things with continue as usual. At last, the clever king has upset the existing arrangements.

King Magnus is certainly a great character, a man of genius, and he makes witty and wise speeches, but the other characters, particularly his ministers are muddle-headed and people of no consequence. As A. C. Ward puts it:

The truth is that in the character in king Magnus, Shaw created a genius who ran away, with his creator. This was neither a fault nor an accident for which Shaw should be blamed ...He thought life force as a power whose purpose it is to evolve better world, a great imaginative writers such as Shaw are themselves the gents of the ideal process of betterment through

the characters they are lead to create and the thoughts and aspirations they encourage in their leaders and audiences. (116)

Magnus is a great character not because he is a king but because he is better democrat than the supposedly democratic cabinet. He sets a good standard of life above the calculation of expediency temporary advantage. This, in the minds of his cabinet ministers, is like laughing stocks as they are of low intelligence and skill. They have always to be reckoned in accordance with such other standards as they meet. There is no absolute standard and it is a triumph of dramatic characterization. It comes near to wrecking the play as a work of dramatic art, for his genius throws the piece out of balance. While we observe it closely neither we see practical triumph nor does the king achieve a moral victory. This actually is not victory of the king but a force of check and balance.

2.3 Organization and Economic Power

Power is dependent up on psychological such as that of Galileo or Plato may exit without any corresponding social institutions. But as a rule, even such power is not important unless a political party or some equivalent social organism propagates it. An organization is a set of people who are combined by virtue of activities directed to common ends. It may be military or political, economic or religious, educational or athletic and so on. Every organization whatever its character as purpose, involves some redistribution of power. There must be government, which takes decisions in the name of whole body and has more power than single members.

As man grows more civilized and grows more complicated, the advantage of combination becomes increasing evident. Competition for the power is two sorts: between

organization and between individuals for leadership within an organization. Competition between organizations only arises when they have objects which are more or less similar, but incompatible; it may be economic or military by means of propaganda. When Napoleon was engaged in making himself emperor, he had to create an organization devoted to his interests and then to secure its supremacy. In the same King Magnus seeks support from other sources.

The growth in the size of economical organization suggested by Marx in his views on the dynamics of power is relevant one. Much of what is said on this subject is proved true. And that is applicable to all organizations that give an outlet to power impulses. In Italy and Germany, the relation between big business and the state is more intimate and obvious than in other democratic countries. But it would not be a mistake to suppose that a business like Breakages Limited controls the state. On contrary, in Italy and Germany, the state has used the fear of communism to make itself supreme big business as over everything else. For instance in Italy a very drastic levy is being introduced, whereas a much milder form of the same measure proposed by the British labour party caused outcry. The desires of an individual can be collected into groups, each group constituting what some psychologists call a 'sentiment'.

Where there is politically important sentiment it is obvious that there will be sentiments of a version, such as fear of pain, laziness, dislike of foreigner, hatred of alien, creeds and so on. A man's sentiments at any given moment can be complicated products of his nature, his past and his present circumstances. Each sentiment, in so far as it is one, which many men gratify in co-operation, will be given opportunity to generate one or more organizations designed for its gratification. Aristocracies are organizations of certain

families to procure their own privileges at the expense of the rest of the community. Such organizations involve, in a greater or lesser degree, sentiments of aversions, fear, hatred, contempt and so on. Where such sentiments are strongly felt, they are an obstacle to the growth of organization and its government derives satisfaction from power. Consequently, there is an interest unidentical with that of the members. The desire for universal conquest is therefore likely to be stronger in the government than in members. Nevertheless, there is an important difference between the dynamics of organization embodying sentiments to be realized by co-operation and that of those whose purpose essentially involves conflict.

It has been customary to accept economic power without analysis, and this, in modern times is due to undue emphasis upon economics, as opposed to war and propaganda, in the casual interpretation of history. Apart from the economic power of labour, all others consist of being able to decide by the use of armed forces necessary. They shall be allowed to stand upon a given piece of land and to put things into it and take things from it. The owner in this respect strikes so far as possible. As soon as they are tolerated by the state, ownership ceases to rest wholly on the employer, and begins to be shared in the same degree with employees.

Credit is more abstract than other kinds of economic power. It depends upon the legal right to transfer a surplus of consumable commodities from those who have produced them to others. They are engaged in work which is not immediately productive. But in the case of private or corporation, law can enforce the obligation, but in the case of government, the ultimatum is the military power of the governments for treaties and international law.

The connection of economic power with government is to some extent reciprocal; that is to say a group of men may acquire military power and having acquired it, may possess economic power. The ultimate acquisition of economic power may, in fact, be their original motive in combining. The economic power within a state although ultimately derived from law and public opinion, easily acquires certain independence. It can influence law and corruption and public opinion by propaganda. It can put politicians under obligations, which interfere with their freedom. It can threaten to cause financial crisis. But there are very definite limits to what it can achieve.

It has been unable especially to introduce Asiatic labour in California or Australia, except in the early days in small numbers. It has been unable in Great Britain, to avoid heavy taxation of the rich. And it has been unable to prevent socialist propaganda. It can prevent governments composed of socialist from introducing socialisms, and if they are obstinate it can bring about their down fall by engineering a crisis and propaganda. If these means were to fail, it could stir up a civil war to prevent the establishment of socialism. That is to say, where the issue is simple and public opinion undecided or baffled by the complexity of the issue, the plutocracy can secure a desired political result.

The power of trade union is the converse of the power of the rich. Trade unions can keep out coloured labour, prevent their own extinction, and secure heavy death duties and income tax, and preserve freedom for their own propaganda. But they have failed to bring about socialism or to keep in power government which they liked but which a majority in the nation did not.

Thus the power of economic organizations to influence political decisions in democracy is limited by public opinion, which on many important issues, refused to be

swayed even by its intensive propaganda. Democracy, where it exists, has more reality than many opponents of capitalism are willing to admit what happens in *The Apple Cart*, the Prime Minister, including cabinet ministers, the King and representative of trade union want to serve their own self interest.

2.4 Organization as Manifestation of Power

Organization as manifestation of power in the nineteenth century and continuing some decades into the twentieth, the modern state was widely seen as the instrument of industrial capitalist power. On this, Marx, in the European revolutionary tradition, Jorstein Veblers and Lincoln Steffen in the American critical tradition have entirely agreed. It was, as noted, an exaggeration, the state also reflected and served the diverse purpose of its citizens was on its service on industrial interest. *A Twentieth Century Fund* study includes,

into this century would anyone have thought of conflict between government and industry, a common place, expectation in our own day.

There were also in the last century a certain exclusivity in the exercise of industrial power; both directly and through the state, it was power. (175)

Nothing rivaled the personality, property and organization of the industrialist in winning submission. A striking feature of this age is the large number of organized groups, trade unions, associations, political parties, communities and farm organizations that seek to appropriate the instrument of power of the state for their own purposes. Departments, agencies, authorities, public corporations, and armed service have been original sources of power.

The modern state unites within its structure of all three resources of power: political personality, property in the form of the resources it commands and dispenses, and organization, it has manifested access to all three instruments of enforcement. It is the sole possessor of condign power and display of conditioned power. All three sources of power were exercised in the last century and before, which is a real and vivid example in *The Apple Cart*. The playwright has given it as the political shape of contemporary age. In considering the exercise of power through and by the modern state, it is useful, even necessary, to distinguish between outer and inner orientations of the government and mediating forces between them. The outer orientation is the legislature, the voters and great mass of organization that bear on them.

The original power of the presidency is considerable, there could conceivably be more error in exaggerating than minimizing it. A very large part of what superficially appears to be presidential power, which mediates confuting exercise of power. This meditating power should not be through a small thing. But the result from its exercise is not the original will of the president or his staff but that of one or another of the centering organizations. There is also the illusion of power, a factor that has been greatly enhanced by the modern reliance on social conditioning, since the submission won by any exercise of conditioned power is subjective and relatively invisible. If the king makes a television address or publicize a new weapon policy or pleads for support for his budget, that will certainly be a favourable response from the kingly purpose. The illusion of power is also heightened by those who are close to the king, kingly acolytes and particularly enthusiastic in its exercise by emphasizing the power of the chief executive enhance in the public eye, and this, in turn, becomes a compelling contribution to self.

2.5 Shaw's Views on Capitalism and Socialism

G. B. Shaw lived through the periods of profound social and political upheavals and changes and rapid technological developments. He took a lively interest in everything that went around him. His ability to deliver trenchant, entreating and unorthodox opinions on almost any proposed topics made him a natural and much sought for journalists. He belonged to the upper classes. He did not rise up from the proletariat to the status of landed gentry, but belonged to an impoverished branch of the landed gentry. Shaw says, 'I read Marx and was exactly in the mood for his reduction of all the conflicts to the classes for economic mystery, of all social forms to the economics forms of production and exchange.' (Shaw's Preface 233)

But the real secret of Marx's fascination was his appeal to an unnamed, unrecognized passion of hatred in more generous souls among the respectable and educated sections for the accursed middle class institutions that had starved, prevented misled and corrupted them from their cradles. His theme was an appeal for economic equality on the surface that only will take place in the mating of human beings, when class divisions are abolished. Then the superman and super race will not evolve as in natural selection.

A major work based on politics in the period between the two world wars was *The Intelligent Women's Guide and Socialism and Capitalism* (1928). The arguments in that book were much in line with ideals and policies of Fabian Socialism. The goals of socialisms were to be achieved by gradual, non-violent means within the framework of dramatic institutions. But there are many signs in the late 1920s and 1930s, of an

increasing disillusionment with democracy. It is the result as in *The Apple Cart* (1929) and *The Rocks* (1933), he presented democracy in England in a state of chaotic disarray.

Shaw's earlier fascination with autocratic figure, as exemplified in his portrayal of Caesar in *Caesar and Cleopatra* and undershaft in major Barbara, came to the surface again in his creation impressively intelligent and politically adroit monarch, King Magnus, in *The Apple Cart*. A far less gentle figure of autocratic powers than King Magnus was beginning to emerge as dominant force on the larger stage of European politics. Shaw was clearly impressed by, and attracted towards the leaders of major totalitarian regimes of the 1920s and 1930s. Stalin, Hitler and Franco, and sometimes, he displayed a disturbing detachment in his attitude towards their means of gaining and maintaining power.

Marx expounded theories of socialism, surplus value in economic and the materialistic conception. Hyndman absorbed as best as he might with vague but grandiose ambitions, he fatuously dreamed of resurrecting the corpse of Christians and bringing about a great economic and social transformation. Archibald Henderson quoted in Marxist view: "England is the one country in the world in which peaceful revolution is possible". (Shaw: *Man of the Century* 221) But in response, Disraeli warned him that England was a very difficult country to move. Shaw on the other hand fully acknowledges his indebtedness, often in extravagant measure to those who exerted a transforming influence upon his life and character. In a letter to Archibald Henderson in 1904, George Bernard Shaw says,

Henry George's speech that kindled the fire in my soul, it flashed on me then for the first time. He again wrote a year later, that the conflict between religious and science... over through of Bible. (Shaw: *Man of the Century* 217)

After hearing Henry George and reading *Progress and Poverty*, Shaw was profoundly impressed by George's conclusions and suggested remedial measures. At an early period he attended a meeting of the Democratic Federations. But he was mostly influenced by George's propaganda of land nationalization, and protested in his characteristically maddening way against drawing a remarkable track on his mind. Aware of the appalling ignorance of the economics, Shaw at once proceeded to remedy of his education in this respect. He read *Das Kapital* and found that advisors were awestruck, as they had not read it themselves. Shaw says,

That was the turning point in my career: Marx was revelation. His abstract economics, I discovered later, were wrong, but he rent the veil. He opened my eyes to the facts of history and civilization, gave me entirely fresh conception of the universe, and provided me with purpose a mission in my life. (Preface 235)

Shaw was completely carried away by *Das Kapital* as Samuel Butler was by *The Origins of Species*. At this crucial moment in his career, Shaw was exactly in the mode for Marx's reduction of all the conflicts to the conflicts of classes, forms of production and exchange. On a first reading of capital, he could not make the two ends of the economic argument meet exactly. Marxist theory awoke instant response on Shaw. It changed the tenor of his life. As a result, he became a pure socialist. In *Das Kapital*, he found the concrete expression of all those social convictions, grief and wrongs. Like Moliere's comic characters who suddenly discovered the pervasiveness of prose. Shaw discovered that he had been a communist all his life without knowing it. A great change has come into

economics, from the school of abstract and deductive analysis represented in the Fabian essays, to the modern school of historical investigation and analysis of documents.

CHAPTER THREE

A Textual Analysis

3.1 Capitalism and Breakage Limited in *The Apple Cart*

Capitalism is an economic system in which a country's business and industry are controlled and run for profit by private owners rather than by the government. Capitalism is related with economic analysis. Marx's over-riding interest in the work is always in the dynamics of bourgeois society; the primary object of capital is to disclose the economic law of motion of society, through an examination of the dynamics of the productive foundation upon which it rests.

According to Marx capitalism is a system of commodity production. In the capitalist system, producers do not simply produce for their own needs or for the needs of individuals with whom they are in personal contact; capitalism involves nation wide and often an international, exchange market. Every commodity, Marx states, has two fold aspects: its use value, which is realized only in the process of consumption; has reference to the needs to which the properties of a commodity as a physical artifact can be employed. Exchange value refers to the value of a product. It presupposes a definite economic relation, and is inseparable from a market in which goods are exchanged; it only has meaning in reference to commodities.

Breakage Limited holds the socialist ministers into its grip. The prime minister does not hesitate to lunch at the cost of Breakage Limited when he was invited to do so. The cabinet ministers including prime minister who are from labour party never hesitate to

dine with Breakages Limited. The following dialogue clears the hold of Breakages Limited upon ministers,

Crassus: Come and lunch with me-all of you.

Amanda: What opulence! Can you afford it?

Crassus: Breakages will pay. They have a standing account at the Ritz. Over five thousand a year, it comes to.

Proteus: Let us spoil the Egyptians.

Boanerges: (with Roman dignity) My lunch will cost me one and six pence; and I shall pay for it myself (he stalks out). (71)

Now any object, whether it is a commodity or not, can only have value in so far as human labour power has been expended to produce it: this is the core proposition of the labour theory of value which Marx takes over from Adam Smith and Ricardo. It follows from this that both exchange value and use value must be directly related to the amount of labour embodied in the production of a commodity. It is clear, Marx says, the exchange value can not be derived from use value. This can be shown by the example of the exchange value of two commodities such as corn and iron. The fact that we can express the worth of these two products in terms of each other, and in quantified form, shows that we are using some common standard, which is applicable to both. This common measure of value has nothing to do with physical properties of corn or iron, which are incommensurate. Exchange-value must then rest upon some quantifiable characteristic of labour.

There are obviously many differences between specific kinds of labour. The actual tasks involved in the work of growing corn are very different from those involved in the

manufacturing iron. Just as exchange value abstracts from the specific characteristics of commodities and treats them in abstracts quantitative ratio, in the derivation of exchange value. Abstracts general labour can be measured in terms of the amount of time expended by the worker in the production of a commodity. Abstract value is the basis of exchange value while use of labour is the basis of the use value. The two aspects of commodities are simply an expression of the dual character of labour itself as a labour power, the physical expenditure of human energy is something common to all forms of productive activity; and as a definite kind of labour, a specific set of operation into which this energy is channeled is something peculiar to the production of particular commodities for specific uses.

Abstract labour is a historical category, since it is only applicable to commodity production. Its existence is predicated upon what are, for Marx, some of the intrinsic characteristics of capitalism. Capitalism is a far more fluid system than any system that preceded it, demanding that the labour force should be highly mobile and adaptable to different kinds of work.

The conditions of modern manufacturing and industrial production allow the worker to produce considerably more in an average working day, than is necessary to cover the cost of subsistence. Whatever the workers produce over and above, this is surplus value. If, say, the length of working day is ten hours, and if the worker produces the equivalent of his own value in half that time, then the remaining five hours work is surplus production, which may be appropriated by the capitalist. Marx calls the ratio between necessary and surplus labour, the rate of surplus value or the rate of exploitation. Theory of surplus value, as with all Marx's concepts, has a social rather than a biological reference. The labour time necessary to produce labour power can not be defined in purely

physical terms but has to be ascertained by reference to culturally expected standards of living in a society.

The merchants, in contrast, were largely anonymous; they were not individuals but a class, where one did emerge to popular recognitions, was significantly called a merchant prince. He had acquired some of the feudal emphasis on personality, which contains personal qualification, financial and commercial acumen, and willingness to take risk, ability in assessing it.

The prime exercise of power by the merchant capitalist was over workers, artisans and craftsmen whence came the goods and over the quality and price of goods that he sold, the most important being cloth and thus over the consumers who needed and purchased them. This was relatively mild and benign exercise of power.

Both suppliers and consumers are alternative of producing and buying or of seeking out other sellers or buyers. However, need for a market and livelihood and for product can be compelling, and it was prime feature of merchant capitalism that it provided careful safeguards against promiscuous resort to alternative buyers of sources of supply.

The power of any merchant could be sadly reduced more for a product of given quality or after to sell one for less. Competitions were seriously adverse to merchants' success. To ensure it, organization becomes significant as source of power. Property remained central as source of power; there was however, another dramatic change in character. It was no longer the stock-in-trade and other working capital of the merchant but fixed interests, mills, factories, machinery of the industrial capitalist. Conventional historiography also accords a much-enhanced role to personality with industrial devotion.

The entrepreneur independent is innovative, resourceful, sometimes ruthless, always intelligent becomes a key figure on the economic scene.

Personality as a source of power is wonderfully attractive to the more susceptible historian as in modern times, to move impressionable journalists. Industrial capitalism possessed its strength, in fact, to its access to all three sources of power to property in mill-machinery and working capital, to a great form of organization binding workers to the industrial firm; and of source, to the entrepreneurial personality.

Lysistrata, the power minister, is fully justified in her complaint that private capitalism certainly thrives on things as destruction, waste and disease. Thus destruction, damage, disease and drunkenness have become vested interests. She seems to be anti-socialist as she has claimed that socialists have let private enterprises and corporations to take root out in the country.

Lysistrata, is keenly aware of the damage being done to the country by which exploitation of capitalism. The other ministers also inwardly know that largely big business and industrial magnates are running government. She is the only minister who not only recognizes, but also points out at this meeting, the harmful role that Breakages Limited is playing in the country. Breakages Limited buys off, suppresses or destroys all new inventions in order to earn huge profits at the expense of the nation.

Lysistrata puts it as,

Every new invention is bought up and suppressed by Breakages Limited.

Every breakdown, every accident, every smash and crash, is job for them.

But for them, we... without battering and tearing the vitals out of every

wagon and sending it to their repair shops, once a week instead, once a year.

(67)

It is because of big private concerns like Breakages Limited that England is denied the use of all sorts of new inventions, which can be of great good to the people. Breakages Limited is such a power concern that it can throw even Lysistrata out of her office in the cabinet if she opposes its capitalistic plans, designs and schemes. She fears that her department may someday come into the hands of such drunkards as Moudly Mile with support of Breakages Limited, she further makes it clear out in her own words: 'If I could stand up against the monster with its millions and its newspapers and its fingers in every pie. It is hear breaking'. (68)

Lysistrata is much annoyed that she bursts into tears; she says the price costs twice because they buy and hide all the new inventions. As their work is to mend things, they want more and more things should be broken in the country. As a result, they can buy huge everything. Her concluding words are,

One of their dictators told me to my face that by lifting up his finger he could get my windows broken by the mob; and that Breakages Limited would the job of putting on new glass... is outrageous in their interest; that is, to make failure of it that Joe will have sell it to Breakages limited, at scrap iron prices. I ... oh, it is beyond bearing. (68)

In his preface, Shaw says that industrial and social life is set in a huge communist framework. He blames the big capitalist enterprises, which run to the government for help as a lamb runs to its mother. He says that they can't even make an extension of the railway tube in London without government aid.

In short, Breakages Limited symbolizes private corporate, and it symbolizes, further, the trend towards plutocracy in England. Thus Breakages Limited can be said as integral to the theme of the play. Shaw, influenced with Marx, was a man of strong socialist views and was opposed to private capitalism being allowed to acquire too much power in the country, and socialism tries to minimize the operations of private capital.

In the preface to *The Apple Cart*, Shaw makes his position perfectly clear. He points out that during World War I, Britain had committed a great blunder by handing over to private enterprises the task of supplying weapons to the army. He says the government had then felt compelled to take the work of manufacturing weapons out of private hands, and to execute the work in factories owned by the government.

3.2 Democracy and The Cabinet Ministers in *The Apple Cart*

A system of government in which all the people of country can vote to elect their representatives, is the dictionary definition of democracy. There are as many definitions of democracy as politicians, theorists and definers. Among them Abraham Lincoln's definition is often quoted: 'democracy is the government of the people, for the people and by the people' (Preface 215) This definition gives as standing amid the carnage of the battlefield of Gettysberg, and declaring that all the slaughter of Americans by Americans, to do in *The Apple Cart*, is a potential caveat. Shaw explains meaning of democracy in the preface,

. . . one: Government of the people: that evidently is necessary: a human community can no more exist without a coordinated control of its breathing and blood circulation. Number two: Government for the people is most

important. Dean Inge puts it perfectly that democracy is a form of society, which means equal consideration for all...Government by the people; all the monarchs all the tyrants, all the dictators, all the Die-hard Tories are agreed that we must be governed with equal consideration for everybody...Government by the people never can be reality, is a cry by which demagogues humbug into voting for them. (Preface 216)

Now the question arises here, if people can not govern themselves from being at the mercy of those who can govern, and who may quite possibly through paces, grates and scoundrels, the primitive answer is that they are always in a huge majority. If ruler oppresses us intolerably, burn their horses' heads, and when they have lost their heads, they are likely as not to burn the wrong house, tear the wrong man to pieces. Shaw points in his preface to *The Apple Cart*, 'I think we may take it that neither mob; neither violence nor popular movements can be depend on as checks upon abuse of power by government.' (331)

Shaw further adds that one might suppose at least they would act as last resort when an autocrat goes mad and commits outrageous excess .Shaw proceeds to give examples of democratic government how they behave and how they exercise power over others. He points, 'For a genuinely democratic execution of unpopular statement turning to the brothers De Witto were to turn pieces by a Dutch mob in the seventeenth century.' (Introduction to Preface-xxiii)

The brothers, here, were neither tyrants, nor autocrats, on contrary, one of them had been imprisoned and tortured for his resistance to the despotism of William Orange; and other had come next to him as he came out of prison. The mob was on the side of autocrat.

The shortest way for a tyrant to get rid of a troublesome champion of liberty is to raise hue and cry against him as an unpatriotic person, and leave the mob do not rest after supplying them with a well-tipped ring-leader. Nowadays, the revolutionary calls this direct action, and the police agents control that action. In this regard Shaw remarks,

Democracy, then, can not be government by the people: it can only be by consent of the governed. Unfortunately, when the democratic statement purposes to govern the people by their own consent, the ruler ... Thus government which used to be a comparatively simple affair today has to manage the enormous development of socialism and communism. Industrial and social life is set in a huge communistic framework of public roadways, streets bridges, and water supplies. (Preface 218)

Democracy can keep pace with developments of truth that are being forced on us by the growth of national and international corporate action. The central body of democracy is the government. It may be in the form of a council, a municipal corporation, and a country council or district council. It may be board of directors of Joint Stock Company or trust made by combining several joint stock companies. In his preface, Shaw contends that several joint stock companies such as boards elected by the votes of shareholders are little, within the states and some of them are powerful. In such a context, if there is no king as head of the country, there is of course a chairman or the president as head of the country. And the people of the nation are organized at the mercy of the parliament. The power, in *The Apple Cart*, pictures through the king and representatives of parliament how it is formed and shows how they fail to fulfill their promises when they are in leadership as now they are influenced by money or are helpless in the presence of

capitalist. The government is at the mercy of the private corporation as it is upon them that people of the nation are in the hands of corporate bodies for the satisfaction of their everyday needs. Dean Inge posits, 'Our general elections have become public actions at which the contending parties bid against one another for votes with each promising us a large share that the other of the plunder of the minority'.(Preface 228)

No one can govern if anyone entrusts the immense powers and revenues, which are necessary in an effective modern government to an absolute monarch or dictator. If anyone resorts to a committee or parliament of superior persons, they will set up an oligarchy and abuse their power for their own benefit. As Shaw says, 'Our dilemma is that men in the lump can not govern themselves and yet, as William Morris put it, no man is good enough to be another man's master'.

Here, Shaw doesn't fail to point that power can be exercised in carrying out or in neglecting their responsibility. Kings and ministers are equally possessed with power but in the democracy of Great Britain the King wins. While examining the text in the context of democracy, some wasteful opinions are employed rather than the real principles. Actually it seems, democracy is the exhibition of the spot of power. Anybody who can demonstrate the greater and influencing power can win or can be ahead of al others.

To prove this, a clear example is picturized in *The Apple Cart*. King, Magnus and Prime Minister Proteus are equally equipped with skill and ability but at the end of the drama, victory goes to the King. So, democracy seems to be extravagant the indication of which is evident in an example Shaw quotes in the preface,

Begin our study of democracy... picking your pockets. Democracy is compared with a big balloon with gas or hot air, which is floated in the sky

in order to keep our eyes constantly fixed on it so we may not have time to think how we are robbed or cheated. In general elections, the labour party, which is the communist party in the text, was expected to come into power ...if labour party was voted to power, England would have to pass through a bloody revolution just as Russia did in 1917. (Preface by Bernard Shaw 328)

This indeed is the real exercise of power to gain authority, which depends upon knowledge of tactics. How different kinds of rulers exercise power to carry on their own benefit or interests are described. Shaw opposed the definition of democracy by Abraham Lincoln thus, 'Democracy, then, can not be... of the governed' (331). In Shaw's view democracy can not be government by the people because all people are not fit to govern and therefore, democracy has to be government by consent of the people, which is already mentioned above. Democracy has become the weakest as the ministers and the King does not follow the rules and regulations of democracy.

The prime minister is the second major character, or a counterforce in *The Apple Cart*. The cabinet ministers are of later standards. They are not behind to get their own way by making sense, flying into calculated rages, and substituting vulgar abuse for argument. A clever minister who involves himself in a duel with his king, is not careful, not to choose the weapons at which the king can beat him. The Prime Minister Proteus does not want the King to be more powerful; he just wants the king to be a constitutional one. In this course the Prime Minister has said, "I am far more subject...dare not look over a hedge" (60)

Proteus claims that only the ministers can veto a course of action and not the King for they are representatives of the people. Magnus says if the ministers do something

wrong, they can save themselves from blames by saying that they did what people wished for. But actually, the ministers do it, for the people can neither think of those things, nor understand them. The ministers can shift the responsibility to the people. But the King can't do so. A political leader who has become powerful by appealing to the feelings of common men may command the worst crimes. He will not be blamed for it but a king is blamed even for a little error of judgment.

Nicobar, the foreign secretary in the cabinet of King Magnus is of suspicious nature. So, neither he has faith in the King nor on the Prime Minister and other cabinet ministers. In Act I of *The Apple Cart*, there is a discussion between the King and cabinet, and king is not in good terms. Nicobar quotes: 'Don't quibble...stir them against us' (50)

Nicobar charges the King with trying to keep the people poor so that he may pose as their champion and say that it was the quarrelling among the ministers of cabinet and that has kept the people poor. But the King objects to Nicobar's words, "squabbling and bumbling" as it was of fact that was the prime minister who had used these words. Nicobar clarifies by pointing out that the prime minister had simply quoted the words from newspaper, which are subservient to the king and which flatter him and criticize the ministers in order to please him. As a matter of fact, members of the cabinet want that higher wages should be paid to workers, but the king always oppose the more enlightened of the industrialists who pay such higher wages. But the workers want higher wages. They understand why they are better off, and they understand the truth that it is the king who comes in the way of prosperity. The king can not mislead them for any length of time, nor can he incite them against his ministers. That is why they are confident that in the long run they will be able to defeat his machinations. He will not be able to instigate workers

against them. He says, 'What we say is that the king has no right to remind his subject of anything constitutional except by the advice of the Prime Minister, and in words which he has read and approved'. (53)

King Magnus points out that ministers are playing into the hands of capitalists. He tries to tarnish the character of prime minister, Proteus, who resorts that if the king indulges in character assassination. He also can throw mud at him by pointing out that he is a man of loose morals.

The meeting is called to discuss a purely constitutional question and they must limit their discussion completely to the subject. He does not like to discuss their personal differences in public but if the king does so they are prepared to give him suitable reply. They have challenged his right to veto the decision of his cabinet, and their discussion should be confined strictly to this matter. As they are the challengers, the choice of weapons lies with the king. If he chooses the weapons of scandal, they will fight him with this very weapon. They will tell the people that the king has used unfair means for his own personal advantage, they will also reveal to the people the moral weakness of the king.

Proteus refers to the rules of dueling. In a duel, person challenges another to a personal fight. The choice of weapons often lies with the person who has been challenged. Here the minister has given the challenges, and so the king has the right to use the weapons he likes to fight with.

Joseph Proteus, the Prime Minister in the cabinet of King Magnus, is a shrewd diplomat and a clever politician. But other ministers have no adequate knowledge of human psychology. They have no great capabilities for administration and most of them are idlers or self-interested people who care much neither about their duties nor for the

welfare of their people. Most of them are his eyes, as they don't want any problem to poison their day to day life. The credit goes to Proteus that he can control such a cabinet, the members of which are constantly squabbling, quarrelling and making mistakes. None of them except Mr. Boanerges, holds any original views either in political or in economic matters. So he forwards, 'if two men ride the same horse, one must ride behind' (6). This view he gives when the prime minister tries to make the king sign the ultimatum. The Prime Minister does not have to deal with difficult ministers but with a difficult king who is infinitely much more than a match for him. Proteus' colleagues are all invertebrate cowards who have neither the inclination nor the guts to fight with the King either single handedly or even jointly.

King Magnus, against whom Proteus has to fight, is by no means a negligible adversary. Magnus is, of course, a constitutional monarch. So he is supposed to speak or act only on the advice of his Prime Minister. But he refuses to be a dummy. He insists on the exercise of his reserve power. Like the veto, when the occasion so demands, it is on this issue that Proteus clashes with the king over a very vital political issue. But Magnus is a forceful personality who is also a very clever diplomat. Proteus has to deal with him carefully.

The Prime Minister uses all possible tactical weapons to score over the king. Proteus is sure that the people are behind him so the Prime Minister intends to resign if the king doesn't sign the ultimatum. He further says to the House of Commons that he can not be the prime minister under a king who does not respect the laws of the country. On this issue he is sure; the king will have to yield. He chooses a very careful and deadly weapon to the astute king. But unfortunately, the king is a superior duelist. The king threatens to

abdicate and contest elections as a commoner. On judging the king's views, the prime minister quietly takes back the ultimatum from the king and he tears it to pieces.

William Boanerges is the president of the board of trade to which position he has risen from a mere mechanic. He is a member of Ramsay MacDonald. His family background is known through his own words, 'I was born, in to a gutter... picked up by a policeman at the foot of captain Coram's statue. Adopted by the policeman's grandmother, bless her!' (37).

Boanerges is popular with workers because of his love for the labourers and partly because of his power of speech which the working class is easily moved or influenced by. He is of the view that all kings or his ministers should be addressed and treated just as in a republic where no distinction of class or rank is made. There are only two honest and truthful men in *The Apple Cart* they are king Magnus and Mr. Boanerges. The king is a diplomat and a politician but Boanerges is clever and transparent as glass.

Boanerges, in short, is too simple minded to follow the intricacies of diplomacy. He is unable to read between the lines. He does not know when the king is in earnest and when he is pulling other people's legs. For instance, when the king declares at the morning session of the cabinet that he has no option but to surrender, Boanerges takes the statement at its face value. His simple heart is deeply touched by the king's self sacrifice. He bursts into a song to mark the occasion Proteus rebukes him and warns that the king is only having a joke at their expense.

Balbus is the Home Secretary in the king's cabinet. But he is rude and blunt to Magnus without any reason for example, when Magnus says that it is his duty to sound a note of warning to the ministers of they make any move to lead the country on the wrong

path, Balbus cries out like a fool that it is the ministers alone who have the right to warn the people. When the king purposes to abdicate, Balbus foolishly says that the king can abdicate only on the advice of the prime minister. When Magnus says that he intends to contest the elections to the parliament as a commoner after his abdication, Balbus declares that king's move is a foul trick. He further adds that the king is a mean hypocrite, despite his pretence at grandness and good manners. 'A retired king can't have plans and a future' (101)

When King Magnus has delivered the magnificent speech in Act I of the play, Balbus takes the opportunity of congratulating the king and putting forward his request to Magnus for bringing into the cabinet, he says,

Now that they are all gone and don't mind saying that if anything should even happen to the throne, and your majesty should become a president with a cabinet to pick up, you might easily find a worse Home secretary than me, with all my fault (78).

When Proteus tears the ultimatum into pieces and repeats his request for the appointment of Balbus as a cabinet minister, he suggests that if ever England became a republic with Magnus as its president, king Magnus should offer him some respectable position. Actually Balbus becomes a frequent butt of other cabinet ministers' fun throughout the whole drama.

Pliny, the chancellor of the exchequer in the cabinet, contrasts with other ministers not only in etiquette and manners but also in his ability to control his temper even when others get agitated and lose self-control. Pliny always tries to bring about harmony and peace, wherever there is an exchange of words and tempers. Whenever other ministers

happen to indulge in mutual recriminations, Pliny pacifies them with some pleasant remark like telling them that it would be impossible to form a new cabinet all of a sudden. He reminds humourously that even if they want the cabinet to be reformed, they should at least wait for the arrival of king.

While dealing with the king, Pliny uses entirely different tactics for example, when Magnus tries to exploit the division in the cabinet, he politely reminds him that all the ministers are united so far as the ultimatum is concerned or so far as the cabinets position to the king's power of veto is concerned. Pliny says to the king, 'Oh, come! Don't be hard on the lad, sir. He has plenty of brains' (98).

He advises the king to sign the ultimatum because he has got to do so sooner or later. When the king informs the cabinet that he is going to abdicate, neither Pliny nor anybody else realizes the real motive, which lies behind the king's threats of abdication. Pliny, therefore, congratulates the king on his gentlemanly resolution and even bids him a touching farewell.

Crassus is the colonial secretary in the cabinet of prime minister. A political jobber, he has become minister by the influence and power of Breakages Limited. He, for want of self-confidence, is always afraid of the crisis in the country when Proteus threatens to resign; he is extremely nervous and worried because he does not like to lose his job. That's why he says, 'there won't be any poll. It will be a mock- over'(103). He suggests the ultimatum to be left in the hands of the prime ministers is leading the country to complete ruin as they are ignorant of the dangers and risks involved in their ultimatum. Crassus emphasizes that he is being undemocratic if the king does not abide by the decision of the

cabinet. Even though the situation requires his suggestions, he fails to assert himself, as he seems to be a jobber only in the play.

Amanda, the Postmistress General in the cabinet of Joseph Proteus is a good democrat. Although she may like the king, she is not prepared to accept that the king should have the power of veto. She knows that as an individual the king is far cleverer than his ministers. But being a democrat, she believes that the ultimate power should be in the hands of the cabinet. That is why she joins Proteus for not allowing the king to evade the issue of the ultimatum.

Like Amanda, Lysistrata likes King Magnus because he is intelligent, strong-willed and devoted to duty and also quick to understand not only her way of thinking but also those of others. When king Magnus threatens to abdicate and to stand for election to the parliament as a commoner, Lysistrata feels very encouraged because she is sure that if Magnus becomes the prime minister, he will surely deal firmly with concerns like Breakage Limited. But when Proteus tears the ultimatum to pieces and allows the king to continue as the constitutional head, her disappointments are equally great.

Orinthia is called by king Magnus frequently as 'Orinthia, the Beloved!' It is the most romantic name in his eyes. But Orinthia is angry with the king and alleges that it has been picked from second hand book found in some wayside bookstall she shows to the king. The quarrel between the king and Orinthia is the quarrel between a man of genius and the life force working through the woman.

Different kinds of characters are employed in the drama. Some are of king flavor and some are of prime minister's directly or indirectly. Orinthia is one of them. She makes a brief appearance only in the short interlude between Act I and II of the play. She has her

own suit in the palace of king Magnus and his beloved. But there is a purely platonic relationship without any physical contacts.

Above mentioned different characters under democratic pretexts play in the side of their own self interests. And this proves that they exercise power to get each of their missions into their grips.

3.3 Constitutional Monarchy or Power

Of the different kinds of powers, which we have mentioned earlier, *The Apple Cart* exposes political power. Politics, though it evidently is, King Magnus can also be studied under the heading-kingly power. Here is an attempt to examine the term. The origin of kings, like that of priests, is prehistoric and early stages in the evaluation of kingship can only be conjectured from what still exists among the most backward savages. The king is a man who leads his tribe or nation to war who decides when to make peace. He makes laws and controls the administration of justice, the king, moreover, a sacred person. The man whom we regard as a chief may have only religious and ceremonial functions to perform; sometimes, like Lord Magnus, he is only expected to give banquets. Sometimes he declares war, but takes no part in fighting, as he is supposed to be as a sacred.

Migration and foreign invasion are powerful forces in the destruction of customs and therefore in creation the need of government. At the lower level of civilization at which there are rulers of worthy to be called kings, the royal family is sometimes of alien origin and has won respect, initially, by some definite superiority. It is clear that must have played a great part in increasing the power of the kings, since in war the need of unified command is obvious. To make the monarchy hereditary is the easiest way of avoiding the

evils of a disputed succession; even if the king has the power of appointing his successor, he is sure to choose over of his family. But dynasties do not last for ever, and every royal family begins with a super of foreign conqueror. Usually religion legitimizes the new family by means of some traditional ceremony. Priestly power profits by these occasions; since it comes to be an essential support of the royal prestige. What ever may have been the stages by which the primitive chief developed in to the historical king; the process was already completed in Egypt and Babylonia at the earliest period of which records exist. The great Pyramids considered to have built 3000 BC and its construction would only have possible for a monarch possessed of immense power over his subjects. Babylonia, at this period, had number of kings but they were very completely rulers in their respective areas.

The new monarchies, in England, France and Spain were above the church and above the aristocracy. Their power depends upon the support of two growing forces, nationalism and commerce. So long as they were felt to be useful to these two, they were strong, but when they failed in these respects there was revolution. Traditional power when not destroyed from without runs almost always, through a certain development by sloth, folly or cruelty it gradually forces man to become skeptical of its claims to divine authority, since these claims have no better source than habit, criticism, once aroused easily disposed of them.

The British parliament gradually acquired the power of the king, without destroying the respect for monarchy. The substitution of the republican form of government for hereditary monarch; where it has been sudden, has usually led to various kind of trouble, since a new constitution has no holder men's mental habits, and will only be respected broadly speaking, in so far as it accords with self interest. Ambitious men,

therefore, will seek to become dictators, and will only desist after a considerable period of failure. If there is no such period, a republican constitution will fail to acquire that solid over men's thoughts that are necessary for stability, the chief revolutionary movement of our time is the attack of socialism and communism upon the economic power of private person.

The king controlled or limited by constitution is called constitutional monarchy. The constitutional monarchy can not enjoy his power beyond the constitution. The representatives of the parliament make constitution. The constitution's rules and regulations or some tie called limitation bar, if it is crossed, one may get punishment. In constitutional monarch the king is not all in all or law is not at the hand of the king. The king is like rubber-stamp, as the king has to sign everything that parliament passes in the parliament, the king can never oppose or reject but he can suggest to improve, avoid or to add in the laws. But in *The Apple Cart* King Magnus is a confusing type at the end of the drama. The king seems to be involved in interest of the people. In the beginning of the drama, he seems to be a constitutional one but gradually he can not avoid exercising power. So he leads to be run more than constitutional king as a monarch. In this course, the king tells Boanerges that the India-rubber stamp theory will not work.

The old divine theory worked because there is a divine spark in us all...but the India-rubber stamp theory beaks down in every real emergency, because no king or minister is the very least little bit like a stamp, he is a living soul (36).

King Magnus is in favour of kingly power from the beginning. The difference is that he does not intend to show and frighten the cabinet ministers. The king does not like to

be a puppet or a scapegoat rather an idle set up by group of plutocrats. He is not sure of his future that may end at any time or moment in following days.

Magnus expresses great pleasure in meeting with Boanerges. He treats Boanerges as if he was a very powerful personality. He does his best to flatter him and thus gets his support in the crisis. Magnus even says that he fears Boanerges because he could shake the throne on quite a few occasions. Boanerges warns the king that he will talk to him in a way in which king has never been talked before. The king pretends that he is greatly impressed by Boanerges and that he is afraid of his power. The following dialogue throws valuable light on the shrewdness of the king as politician,

Boanerges: I warn you it won't be agreeable. I'm a plain man.

Magnus : A very plain man. Not at all, I assure you.

Boanerges: (indignantly) I was alluding to my personal appearance.

Magnus : (gravely) Nor was I. Do not deceive yourself. Mr. Always had been Enigma.

Boanerges: (surprised and enormously flattered: he can't help smiling with pleasure). Well, perhaps I am a bit of an Enigma. Perhaps I am.

Magnus : (humbly) I wish I could see through you, Mr. Boanerges. But I have not you sort of cleverness. I can ask you to be frank with me. (34)

Thus, Boanerges who had been hostile to him before becomes friendly now. The king knows how to bring people around.

Boanerges tells the king that he is nothing more than India rubber stamp. The real power lies in the hand of his minister. The king replies that both he and Boanerges are India rubber stamp because both of them have to sign the papers bought to them even if they do not agree with what is written in them. On ancient times, he says, the king was worshipped and considered to be a god. Though now it may appear silly, it was no strange as regarding king as an India rubber stamp. At least the king is human living being and not a piece of rubber, brass and wood, and adds that even the ministers are used as India rubber stamp by the officials of their departments. This is because a minister can't know everything, and be present everywhere. Thus the king totally rejects the India rubber stamp theory and adds that the old divine right theory could work because there is a bit of the divine in every king but no king is no anyway like a rubber stamp the above mentioned dialogue clarifies it.

King Magnus, flattering to Boanerges clears out no other ordinary person could have risen to such a high position. He had reached such heights by his merit and hard work. Boanerges in turn tells King Magnus that he too is a clever person. The king further adds that if ever England becomes republic, Boanerges is the only one in England fit to be become the president. The king says presidents have more power than kings. The kings are only puppets in the hands of the rich class. But president is elected by the people to protect them against the rich. But still Magnus prefers to remain a king instead of becoming the president, for Magnus says:

I am very secure. I escape the dreadful and demoralizing drudgery of electioneering I have no voters to please. Ministers come and go. But I go forever. (38)

Magnus considers even the position of Boanerges to be precarious, for if the union workers do not vote in his favour, Boanerges will lose the seat. Only a person who drinks too much can be dismissed from the position of a trade union official. He tells the workers that they have the highest power in the right manner by voting for him. King Magnus then asks him as to what would happen if a greater talker than Boanerges also contests elections. Boanerges replies that he is quite capable of dealing even with such a person. The king pretends to be greatly impressed by the various qualities of Boanerges and continues to flatter him.

CHAPTER FOUR

4.1 Monarchy, Democracy and the Political Corruption

Many of Shaw's plays were either banned by the censor or refused for production. He began the practice of writing the challenging, mocking, eloquent prefaces to his plays, which were sometimes longer than the play itself. *The Apple Cart* is Shaw's comedic play in which the King defeats an attempt by his popularly elected Prime Minister to deprive him of the right to influence public opinion through the press: in short, to reduce him to a cipher. Shaw's *The Apple Cart* is a futuristic high comedy that emphasizes Shaw's inner conflicts between his lifetime of radical politics and essentially conservative mistrust of the common man's ability to govern him. King Magnus regards his royal office as a safeguard of the long-range and long-lasting values as opposed to the politics of experience. G. Wilson Knight regards '*The Apple Cart* as a dramatic essay on aristocratic and royal valuation'. (Kaufmann 121)

The party is made up of constituency organization corresponding with the constituency boundaries of the parliamentary elections and constituency. Organization itself is based on a division into wards which in turn correspond to the ward boundaries of local government. The party machine, however, is not geared to pursuit of idealistic principles but pursuit of political power. The main source of power in this instance is not its individual members but trade union affiliates. Sooner or later, these elements, seeing the prospects of power being jeopardized by the pursuit of principles will have begun to apply their own pleasures, for no mass education campaign can be waged without money, which in this instance only the trade union can provide.

Election costs money and require a fairly strong local organization to ensure that it is spent effectively. There is no point at all in printing forty or sixty thousand carefully worded election addresses if there is no supporting organization of people available who will address and ensure they reach the individual members of the electorate. It may be that a local party to a man may be in complete accord with policy views of the recalcitrant who represent them in a parliament. They may decide after his expulsion to continue to give him their support, which in effect will mean that the local party machine is at war with national party machine.

In democratic countries, the most important private organizations are economic. Unlike secret societies, they are able to exercise their terrorism without being illegal, since they do not threaten to kill their enemies, but only to starve them by means of such threats, which do not need to be explicitly altered.

A government is usually called democratic if a fairly large percentage of the population has a share of political power. The most extreme Greek democracy excluded women and slaves, and America considered itself a democracy before women had the right of vote. Democracy, as a method of government, is subject to, some limitations, which are essential, and to others which are, in principle, avoidable. The essential limitations arise chiefly from two sources; some decisions must be speedy and others require expert knowledge. When Great Britain abandoned the Gold Standard in 1931, both features were involved; it was absolutely necessary to act quickly, and questions involved were such that most men could not understand. Democracy, therefore, could only express its opinions retrospectively.

In capitalistic enterprises there is a peculiar quality of purpose: on the one hand they exist to provide goods or services for the shareholders. In political organizations, politicians are supposed to aim at the public good, not only at maximizing their own salaries; this pretence is kept in even under despotism. This is why there is greater hypocrisy in the political sphere than in business. But under the combined influence of democracy and socialistic criticisms, many industrial magnates have acquired the art of political humbug, and have learned to pretend that the public good is their motive for making a fortune. This is indeed, another example of the modern tendency to coalesce politics and economics.

The major concern with power is language, society and finally politics. Politics is a social system, knowledge is associated with society but not individual mind and consciousness of the language is not the personal property. Politics is an example of discourse involved in power. Modern political organizations are formed within knowledge and power. Knowledge is produced through society from which originates the power that is related between the subject and object as well as the ruler and the ruled.

The present world is highly intellectualized by which the way of exercising power is not revolution of bloodshed, but change of concepts and beliefs of the individual in society and change in beliefs becomes successful through the power of politics. Everyone directly or indirectly is involved in the power of politics. Magistrates and psychiatrists, doctors and social workers and teachers and other members of society participate and support the global process of politicization. Power is misused as domination, the new technology of the exercise of power is more important than constitutional reforms and establishment of new forms of government. When a form of power comes into being, it

begins to exercise itself through social production and social service. A real and effective interpretation of power is necessary, in the sense that power has to be able to gain access to individuals whose acts affects others behaviours.

According to Shaw, all miseries of the human world, following very wrong impulses that are directly opposed to the life force brings about all the misfortunes and calamities of human life. The dominant authority does not intend to exercise the social content but believes with juridical characteristics in the nature of power as the West, in general insisted for so long on seeming power exercised as juridical negative rather than as something technical and positive. In this sense Foucault says:

The power is mediated through the forms of prescribed in the great juridical and philosophical theories, and there is fundamental and immutable gulf between those who exercise power and those who under go it. (Will and Power 114)

Thus, political theories are busy with problem of sovereignty. But the authority changes the constitutions to enable them to control and maintain the facilities and power as a result, conflict takes place in the real exercise of power in which linguistic discourse plays a vital role either to shift or to remain as it is. Politics is used as a tool for gaining power. Power is the most fundamental in entire political world; the political process is the shaping and exercising of power that men seek in their political system, which are there at various levels of cultural, economic and political development, to get power which is not exercised but imposed. This sort of politics is based on competition of power. It is a kind of ladder of opportunism that craves neither for truth nor for justice. It is an uncontrollable passion or power. Wealth is the source of the economic dimension of power in societies

divided into classes, the class that owns the means of production has the control to exploit other classes.

Even Mao-Tse-Tung realized the importance of ideological transformation for stabilizing the base of socialist power in which it is obvious that politics is for power and power works for politics. Power which takes the forms of domination is the source of fear and terror but this type of power is established with philosophical discussion of knowledge in which everybody believes. The philosophical discouragement of establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat is a search for power. It is by power of philosophy by which the revolution against their common exploiters is carried out by the proletariat. A further connection of the philosophy of the classes will join together to overthrow the power imposed on them for which physical power is required again.

Power changes with changes in knowledge. The dominant class becomes weak with use of force of all aspects. The crises of economic and unbearable injustice on the Haves not create a situation for struggle against the exploiters who have to forsake their pleasure of automatic power. The proletariat drives out the non-proletariats establish control but as they obtain authority the philosophical vision of the politics of equality that they fought for each forgotten as soon as the rulers take their controlling position. They again emerge, the power holder dominant class and class of Haves-not. So the revolution of Haves not for the welfare and equality of power is cheated again by the use of the same power, which was achieved, with the discourse of politics, such kind of power is not real power. It is to be exercised between subject and the object. Power should not be the gap between them but should be used as a bridge between the rulers and ruled one, which the balancing element is disrupted.

CHAPTER FIVE

5.1 Conclusion

George Bernard Shaw seems to correct the wrong ways of any institutional organization which does not run by institutional disciplines and on the other hand, as a Fabian and socialist thinker, he puts forth his views of capitalism which was a barrier to implement norms and values of socialism as a practice. Influenced by Henry George's views based on Marxist's capitalism, which was engulfing socialist's norms and values, Shaw has shown the dominance of economic or corporate power. Despite Gassner's comment on Shaw's drama as "Patches", an addition of new pieces of cloth into patches, Shaw exposes different social problems such as tides and ebbs of political as well as economic zones.

It is shown that different kinds of power form a mechanism of power, hence the play or interplay of power, includes some factors like personality, property and organization as sources of power. Behind these powers, three characters personality, property and organization are equally responsible for the manifestation of power.

The Apple Cart is a power spectrum into which King Magnus, the power character, after Breakages Limited including other major and minor characters, exercise their power to fulfill their own interest. The talk in *The Apple Cart* centers upon a situation in which one man is pitted against many, and this is always a sympathetic situation.

Many critics who believe themselves to be ardent democrats should take the entirely personal triumph of the hereditary king over the elected minister to and its dramatization an act of political apostasy on the part of the author, convinces to professed devotion to political principles is only a mask for our idolatry of eminent person. Again

Shaw himself says, *The Apple Cart* exposes the unreality of both democracy and monarchy as our idealists conceive them. Marx's theory of development of capitalism is found upon the nature of capitalist expropriation as set out in the theory of surplus value. The general tenor of Marx argument is that, while capitalism is originally structured around a free market system in which commodities are allowed to find their own values. On the basis of individual entrepreneurial initiative, the tendency of capitalist production undermines the empirical conditions upon which the capitalist economy is based. Breakage Limited is an emergence of capitalism in England through, *The Apple Cart* and capitalism is an economic system in which a country's trade and industry is controlled by private owners for profits rather than by the state.

Capitalism has its primary source of power in property, although this was no longer land but capital, notably goods for sale and the silver and gold for producing them. There was limited but interesting exercise of conditional power with bad omen for the future. It is one of the legitimate claims of capitalism that it substitutes more compensatory rewards for condign punishment. This was certainly true of merchant capitalism, at least as compared with feudal exercise of power.

Politics can be understood in terms of interaction between various groups of theory of politics. It is pointed out satisfactorily that explains the functioning of the state and society. Power motivates the political elite group as they can be described to play an active role in politics. Power theorists point out that politics is the game in which power is born and spreads through its exercise, especially individuals are responsible and accountable in socialization and cultivation of rules, to find the expression for the urge to power. Politics forces individuals to form groups and assert themselves through groups. Basically, power

configuration is the configuration of competing of struggling groups for their own interests.

A constitutional monarch is a sort of punch puppet who can not move on his own until his prime minister's finger is in his sleeve. Similarly, he is actuated by the million fingers of electorate. Unless king possesses a very exceptional share of dominating ability or relevant knowledge, he is helpless in the hands of his officials. Very clever men who have come into contact with monarchs have been so impressed by them.

Shaw has favoured neither democracy nor monarchy but focused on the problem resulting from a conflict between the two. The victory of the monarch is not the victory of monarch but of a better man. In conflicts between monarchs and others, the monarchs win every time when personal ability and good sense are equally divided. It is also masked by a strong contrast of character and methods which had led Shaw's less considerate critics to complain that he had packed the cards by making the king a wise man and the prime minister a fool.

Shaw makes that a clever minister, not having had a royal training must be careful not to choose the weapons at which the king can beat him. In this light, the style of fighting adopted by the antagonists in the dispute between the King Magnus and Proteus is seen to be a plain deduction from their relative positions and antecedents,

Democracy as a form of government is likely to be considerate towards petty transient gains. It can sacrifice higher principles for the sake of votes. It can also corrupt itself in various ways, if there is not a watchdog to direct its misdoings. A constitutional monarch is the vigilant of democracy that stands for check and balances in a system of popularly elected government. This convinces that Shaw is not against democracy. He

employs another aspect of democracy, which is not as a form of government but as a form of a society. And that is an economic aspect; Shaw insists not only on political equality but also an economic equality.

The Apple Cart presents a great conflict between monarchy and elected cabinet. The main issue lies on the political aspect in two faculties who try to prove themselves more powerful. The king wants to overtake the cabinet forgetting a constitutional monarch's position and delivers a speech. Since he can not do any functions without consent provided by the prime minister corrupting the power of the cabinet, he is seen to practise his absolute power. On contrary, the cabinet frequently fails to show it capable enough to convince the general public that it has got more responsibilities to the civil. They turn feeble in nature, go after Breakage Limited without considering what they should have done and become corrupted. Their interest is only focused on the rights and show to others rather than the welfare of the country and people. In this sense, they are also found guilty to misuse the power.

The play is neither anti-democratic nor pro-monarchy but an exposition how a better and clever man always wins in such a conflict. The king wins not because he is a king, but because he is abler, more determined and more cultured. The threats, the king has used in the drama, has got victory but at the cost of defeat. This is the victory of better man of capitalism but not of the kingship. In trying to examine the triangular conflict in *The Apple Cart*, the curiosity arises whether the king is a victorious or a vanquished. It's clear that the monarchs have reserved power indeed not for application but for display. In fact, the king has won but he has used threat of abdicating his throne and forming a rival party to go to electorate poll.

In short, it can rightly be said that, as its best the play dramatizes the war of power between democracy and monarchy and the power is shown corrupted from both angles so far as possible. Socialist's ministers in the face of corporate power like Breakage Limited are helpless and can do nothing. In this case *The Apple Cart* is showcase of power that appears under the veil of different forms.

Works Cited

Anthony, Clarke. *Capitalism and Modern Social Theory*. London: CUP, 1971.

Berle, Adolf A. *Power*. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1969.

Chesterton, G.K. *George Bernard Shaw*. London: The Bodley Head, 1909.

Clarke, Ian. *The Twentieth Century Dramas to 1950*. Ed. Martin Doosworth, London: Penguin Books, 1994.

Cleath, Brooks and Robert Heilman. *Understanding Drama*. New York: Henry and Company, 1953..

Colophon, Harper. *Power: It's Forms, Bases and Uses*. New York: CUP, 1938.

Ed. Hazard, Adams. *Critical Theory Since Plato*. 'Triumph and Power' Michael.. Foucult. London: OUP, 1998. (1135-1145)

Galbraith, John Kenneth. *The Anatomy of Power*. London: Hamilton, 1984.

Gassner, John. *Master of the Drama*: Dover Publication inc. USA, Giddens, 1965.

Harper and Row. *The Wheels of Commerce*: New York: Anchor, 1983.

Harris, Frank. *Bernard Shaw*: New York, CUP, 1931.

Henderson, Archibald. *George Bernard Shaw: Man of the Century*. New York: Appleton and Company, 1932.

Kaufmann, R. J. *G. B. Shaw: A Collection of Critical Essays*. New York: Prentice Hall, 1965.

Kenneth, John and Braith, Gal. *The Anatomy of the Power*. London: Hamish Hamilton, 1984.

MacCarthy, Desmond. *Shaw's The Apple Cart*. London: MacGibbon and Kee, 1957.

Marx, Karl and Engels, Friedrich. *Socialism and Capitalism*. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1959.

Miffin, Houghton. *Power*. New York: Anchor, 1938.

Norton. *Will and Power: A New Social Analysis*. New York: Anchor, 1938.

Papworth, John. *New Politics*. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd., 1982.

Russell, Bertrand. *Power: A New Social Analysis*. George Alhen and Unwin Ltd, 1972.

Safubm, George H & Thomas, L. Thomas. *Political Theory*. Asirvanthan Eddy and K. K. Mishra, New Delhi: VPP, 1982.

Shaw, George Bernard. *The Apple Cart*. London: Orient Longman, 1957.

--- . *My Way with Play*. British Thought, New York: CUP, 1975.

--- . *The Apple Cart*. London: PHL, 1933.

--- . *Selected Plays*. New York: Dodd. Mead & Company, 1930.

--- . *The Complete Plays of Bernard Shaw*. London: Paul Hamlyn, 1961.

Simon, Gyln and Schuster, Toril. *The Organization Man*. New York: Anchor, 1956.

Verma, S. P. *Modern Political Theory*. Pune: Vikas Publishing House Ltd., 1975.

Wallas, Graham. *Human Nature of Politics*. London: Constable and Company Ltd. 1948.

Weber, Max. *An Intellectual Portrait*. New York: Doubleday Press, 1960.

Wehmeir, Sally. *OALD of Current English*. London: Oxford University Press, 1948.

William, Raymond. *Drama from Ibsen to Elliot*. London: OUP, 1961.