

УНИВЕРЗИТЕТ У БАЊОЈ ЛУЦИ
ФИЛОЛОШКИ ФАКУЛТЕТ

ФИЛОЛОГ

ЧАСОПИС ЗА ЈЕЗИК, КЊИЖЕВНОСТ И КУЛТУРУ

PHILOLOGIST

JOURNAL OF LANGUAGE, LITERARY AND CULTURAL STUDIES



УНИВЕРЗИТЕТ У БАЊОЈ ЛУЦИ
ФИЛОЛОШКИ ФАКУЛТЕТ

V/2012

CRITICISM OF COLONIALISM IN GEORGE BERNARD SHAW'S PLAY *JOHN BULL'S OTHER ISLAND*

Abstract: Conveniently titled after a cartoon character, George Bernard Shaw's play *John Bull's Other Island* sneers at the legacy of colonialism, intolerance, and paternalism. This paper analyzes Mr. Shaw's attempt to 'reconcile' England and Ireland in order to achieve synthesis between the colonizer and the colonized. It also answers whether it is possible to overcome the hostility caused by colonialism, and whether humanity can avoid and disregard the most important feature of colonial discourse Homi Bhabha wrote about: namely, "its dependence on the concept of 'fixity' in the ideological construction of otherness". Finally, the reading of *John Bull's Other Island* as the sovereign critique of colonialism exposes G. B. Shaw's practical artistic solutions to stifling the symbolic and cultural violence, which continues long after the colonizers have granted the colony the right to Home Rule.

Key words: George Bernard Shaw, colonialism, England, Ireland, Home Rule, *John Bull's Other Island*.

1. Introduction

In his *Quintessence of Ibsenism*, George Bernard Shaw imagined a society consisting of seven hundred Philistines, two hundred and ninety-nine Idealists, and one Realist (1915: 24–25). Among the three types of people in Shaw's imagined community, only one constitutes the all-powerful ideological group, which rules the world with its mechanisms of power. The so-called Philistines accept things as they are, never question the state they are in and are under the illusion of being happy while living the lives they have been coerced into living. The Realist is the only one who is able and ready to face the truth. The remaining two hundred and ninety-nine persons, the Idealists, who control the world by putting masks on reality and creating ideals worth dying for, represent the most dangerous group of people in Shaw's psychology because of their shirking of

reality. This paper examines the legacy of colonialism as described in the play *John Bull's Other Island* (written in 1904), in which Shaw employs these psychological types in order to create fully human characters and, through them, criticizes the practice of British imperialism.

The idea for a "frightfully modern" Irish play, "no banshees or leprechauns" (Holroyd 1998: 302) fascinated Shaw for quite some time before he found the right opportunity to write it. The opportunity came with the opening of the Abbey Theatre, the National Theatre of Ireland, in Dublin (1904), for which occasion Shaw was invited by William Butler Yeats to write an Irish play. Two years earlier, Yeats and Lady Gregory had written a nationalistic one-act play, *Cathleen Ni Houlihan* (1902), in which the heroine symbolically stands for the martyred Irish people, who will be granted immortality if they fight for

Ireland's independence. It goes without saying that the play proved to be an enormous success in Ireland. Contrary to that, Shaw chose to represent the 'real' state of affairs: not only the English oppressive regime, but also the Irish inactivity and consent to foreign domination. Yeats congratulated Shaw on having said things in this play "which are entirely true about Ireland, things which nobody has ever said before" (*Ibid*: 306), but ultimately rejected the play, allegedly for its length. Shaw, however, knew that the play was rejected because "it was uncongenial to the whole spirit of the neo-Gaelic movement, which is bent on creating a new Ireland after its own ideal, whereas my play is a very uncompromising presentment of the real old Ireland" (1908: v). With the mentioning of the new and the old Ireland, Shaw alludes to Yeats' play, in which Cathleen Ni Houlihan, an old wrinkled woman, eventually transforms into a young beautiful maiden, i.e. New Ireland, with the help of the young Irish people who are willing to fight for her cause. To Shaw, this depiction must have seemed to be merely the idealistic employment of the traditional literary motif of transformation from ugly to beautiful, old to young, dead to alive, found in many myths, fairy tales, and literary works. As opposed to Yeats, Shaw was never an Idealist. As Holroyd said, "Yeats wrote poetry where Shaw laughed" (1998: 306), and he used this laughter to represent the problems, which were of immediate interest to the public benefit.

In *John Bull's Other Island*, Larry Doyle, an Irishman, and Thomas Broadbent, an Englishman, are both civil engineers and run a firm in London. But when they decide to go to Roscullen, a small Irish village where Doyle was born, but had deliberately forgotten about because he wanted to blend in with the English, Broadbent unravels his marvelous plan: he wants to invest large sums of money in Roscullen in order to turn it into a 'civiliza-

tion'. From that moment on, the civilizing process turns into a startling Shavian comedy. Broadbent is "a devout idealist and by that token the archetype of Shavian villainy", Eric Bentley says (1947: 166). Furthermore, he is not only 'a political radical', but 'a capitalistic radical' as well. In Shavian criticism of colonialism there exist two kinds of Idealists: one as represented in the character of Broadbent, and the other as portrayed in the character of Peter Keegan, an unfrocked Irish priest who, from the beginning, sees through Broadbent's real intentions. Broadbent is depicted in the play as an all-powerful capitalistic persona, close to becoming a persona non grata, but having ways and means of ultimately satisfying his aspirations. Keegan also invents masks for reality, but without enough power and will to use them for some higher end. For him, the masks are not means of achieving a goal, but precisely what Shaw meant by 'Ideals': a fancy picture depicting reality, "which in its nakedness is intolerable to them [Idealists]" (1915: 25). Broadbent and Keegan become England and Ireland, the metaphors for differing philosophies, politics, and national histories. The paper will analyze Mr. Shaw's attempt to reconcile England, as the thesis, and Ireland, as the antithesis, through the third character – Larry Doyle, a Realist in Shavian terms, struggling to achieve the synthesis between the colonizer and the colonized.

2. Anti-colonial struggles

Damning indictments of colonial techniques for 'civilizing' indigenous peoples came as early as the beginning of the XVI century, when the possibilities offered by the New World, discovered by Christopher Columbus in 1492, dazzled the Europeans. A fervent advocate of the native peoples' human rights was Bartolomé de Las Casas (1484–1566), who spoke on their behalf in works such as the *Very Brief Account of the Destruction of the Indies* (c.

1542) and *The History of the Indies* (c. 1564). The latter contains a phrase which was part of the sermon made by Fray Antonio Montesinos, a Dominican friar, who protested the cruel treatment of the natives:

Are they not men? Do they not have rational souls? Are you not bound to love them as you love yourselves? How can you lie in such profound and lethargic slumber? Be sure that in your present state you can no more be saved than the Moors or Turks who do not have and do not want the faith of Jesus Christ (Montesinos, Internet).

Las Casas, on his part, won the debate, held in Valladolid (Spain) in 1550, about whether natives had souls, by refuting the argument of his opponent, Juan Ginés de Sepulveda, that natives were “slaves by nature” (MacNutt 1909: 277–294). In *The Destruction of the Indies*, Las Casas writes:

Among these gentle sheep ... the Spaniards entered ... like wolves, tigers, and lions which had been starving for many days, and since forty years they have done nothing else; nor do they otherwise at the present day, than outrage, slay, afflict, torment, and destroy them with strange and new, and divers kinds of cruelty, never before seen, nor heard of, nor read of (Las Casas, Internet).

Las Casas’s writings influenced the famous French essayist Montaigne, who in his essay “On Coaches” accused the European conquerors of having “greatly hastened the decline and ruin of this new world by our contagion” and of having “sold it our opinions and our arts very dear” (Montaigne 1958: 693), whereas in “On Cannibals” he concluded that “there is more barbarity in eating a man alive than in eating him dead” (*Ibid*: 155), alluding to the native warriors’ notorious practice of roasting and eating their prisoners and proclaiming it less cruel than the practices of the European colonizers. These and similar indictments of colonialism pose many questions: Is it possible to ever overcome the hostility caused by colonialism?

How is humanity to avoid and disregard the most important feature of colonial discourse that Homi Bhabha wrote about: namely, “its dependence on the concept of ‘fixity’ in the ideological construction of otherness” (Bhabha 1994: 94)? Or, to use Pierre Bourdieu’s terms (2003), how is one to stifle the symbolic and cultural violence which continues long after the colonizers have given the colony the right to Home Rule?

Irish struggle for independence in the late 19th and early 20th centuries in many ways resembled the anti-colonial struggles described by Las Casas and Montaigne. The proclamation of the Irish Republic that was signed on Easter Monday, April 24, 1916, by leaders of the Easter Rebellion in Dublin, led to the execution of most of the signers for treason by the British Government (*Ireland*, DVD). Prior to the Easter Rebellion, “a movement for Home Rule ... gathered force” (*Ibid*), and neither the Protestant unionists nor the Catholic nationalists were satisfied with it. The former opposed Home Rule because they wanted to preserve the union with the United Kingdom, whereas the latter wanted greater independence for Ireland than that provided by the Home Rule Bill, since Ireland had to remain part of the United Kingdom regardless of its self-government. Although the Third Home Rule Bill was passed in 1914, the First World War prevented it from coming into force. However, the Easter Rising of 1916 led to the enactment of the Fourth Home Rule Bill in 1920, which divided the country into Northern Ireland, comprised of six north-eastern counties, and Southern Ireland, to which the larger part of the country belonged. Yet, since both Northern and Southern Ireland were still part of the United Kingdom, “Home Rule never took effect in Southern Ireland due to the Irish War of Independence, which resulted instead in the establishment in 1922 of the Irish Free State”

Criticism of Colonialism in George Bernard Shaw's play John Bull's Other Island

("Government of Ireland Act 1920", Internet).

All these circumstances, together with the fact that George Bernard Shaw was a Protestant expatriate who moved to London when he was twenty years old, provide a suitable context for the atmosphere of his play, written in the midst of troubles concerning the Home Rule Bill. Shaw's own sentiment towards his mother country was ambivalent. "He is bound to England by ties of the head, not of the heart", Ernest Boyd said of Shaw (1917: 107), since he was very much aware that it was the London audience that made him famous. However, Shaw was also known for his "unlimited capacity for abusing England" (McCabe 1914: 202), so that it was expected of him to be particularly harsh towards the colonizers in dealing with the affairs between England and Ireland. Yet, many people thought he had failed to do so:

Instead of this he represented the co-operation of the two nations as mutually useful. Most certainly English people were more pleased with his typical Englishman than the Irish were pleased with his "real Ireland". Possibly this was because he wrote the play for the Irish Literary Theatre. It is Shaw's custom to hit the man who is present, not the man who is absent (*Ibid*).

McCabe further finds Shaw's play "so surprisingly moderate in its satire of England that people almost hailed Shaw as a Pro-Saxon" (*Ibid*). But this argument can be refuted with regard to Shaw's own opinion of his play. As Kathleen Ochshorn notices, "if *John Bull's Other Island* is ever seen as treating British imperialism too gently, the preface should make it clear that Shaw intended the play as an indictment of the British" (2006: 186). Nor was it accidental that Shaw titled it "Preface for Politicians". Indeed, the author himself believed that he had given a fair presentation of both nationalities, insisting, with many other Irish writers, that the Irish mind was the product of the specific climate and po-

litical and economic conditions. Naturally, Irish audiences did not like Shaw's description of them as dreamy, passive, and melancholy, but Shaw tried to give a realistic description of his native country:

Whether he has to judge England's domestic or her foreign affairs, Shaw invariably shows traces of his Irish Protestantism. He is unmoved by appeals to patriotic sentiment, but will flatter or antagonize according as his reason dictates ... [In *John Bull's Other Island*] he demonstrates the unemotional purely rationalistic devotion of the Irish loyalist to England (Boyd 1917: 106-7).

Furthermore, Eric Bentley states that "when Shaw feels the importance of a human situation, he presents it truthfully – that is to say, in its manysidedness" (1947: 218). Another interesting remark concerning Shaw's criticism of colonialism comes from Julian Kaye. "Shaw is generally thought to be anti-imperialist", says Kaye, "but he attacked not the imperialism, but the frequent stupidity and arrogance of British colonial policy" (1958: 16). Shaw unequivocally identifies himself as the two Irishmen in his play, Larry Doyle, the realist, and Father Keegan, the 'mad' idealist, for his own vision of the future was both realistic and mad at the same time, as he proclaims near the end of the play. However, it will be noticed that this is not the only play in which he "engages the colonial metaphor", since it does not concern the Irish people exclusively. In *Caesar and Cleopatra* (1898), and in *Saint Joan* (1923), he examines the legacy of colonialism as well, so that

the call of "Egypt for the Egyptians" is echoed by "Ireland for the Irish" and "France for the French", utilizing anachronism to draw parallels to contemporary British politics of the most high-blown sort and foregrounding his own identification as an Irishman within debates about Home Rule (Davis 1998: 218).

Many of Shaw's plays can be read as his attempt at "the world's decolonization and prospective transition into postcolo-

nialism” (*Ibid*: 231), but *John Bull’s Other Island* is of particular interest in so much as it documents not only Shaw’s anti-colonialism, but also his political solutions and his ambivalent feelings towards both England and Ireland.

3. Colonialism and/or democracy: Who benefits?

Conveniently titled after a cartoon character, *John Bull’s Other Island* is a play which sneers at the legacy of colonialism, intolerance, and paternalism. Ernest Boyd said that Shaw “was able to assume the air of impartiality” since he was “under no necessity of declaring himself for or against England, as would have been necessary in Ireland” (1917: 106). But the postmodern age has been marked with ‘hermeneutics of suspicion’, or ‘demystification’, first practiced by Marx, Nietzsche, and Freud, who were “masters of suspicion” and who looked “upon the contents of consciousness as in some sense ‘false’”, with the aim of transcending “this falsity through a reductive interpretation and critique” (Josselson 2004: 3). In view of this, objectivity does not exist. Hence, Michael Parenti accurately describes objectivity as “conformity of bias” (Parenti, Internet). G. B. Shaw was not concerned with objectivity, but with presenting his own view of the political situation of the time, and the pertinence of the eternal Irish question obliged him to ask impertinent questions in his distinctively satirical way. But even though his character Keegan says: “My way of joking is to tell the truth. It’s the funniest joke in the world” (Shaw 1908: 38), Shaw felt uneasy about King Edward VII’s statement, made after watching the performance of *John Bull*, that G.B.S. was the funniest of Irishmen. Readings of *John Bull* as a play with “characteristic impartiality” in which the author “gives all sides a fair hearing” (Mencken 1905: 78), implicitly lead one to assume that Shaw was the judge, and Ireland and England the accused. Rather,

Shaw indicts the whole age by exposing human follies in the process of Empire, or imperialism. As Parenti suggests, the main question of imperialism, and incidentally Shaw’s play, is *Cui bono?* (*Who benefits?*) (Parenti, Internet). The play suggests that both the Irish and the English would profit from mutual cooperation, while at the same time Irish bodies and minds are broken down, used, and abused under capitalism. Shaw once again wants to disrupt the lie and speak the truth in the form of a joke. No author before or since has used the genre of comedy so wittingly for the purposes of satirizing different sections of society. Accordingly, the John Bull of the play, i.e. the national personification of England, Tom Broadbent, is described as credulous, but shrewd; jolly, but solemn; likable, but enormously absurd – the description which is cruder than Washington Irving’s description of John Bull as absolutely common and agreeable¹. Although identified as likable, it is evident from the beginning of the play that Broadbent is a colonizer who hides under the mask of democracy in order to get what he wants, and that is to exploit the treasures of Ireland: “...now that South Africa has been enslaved and destroyed”, he says, “there is no country left to me to take an interest in but Ireland” (Shaw 1908: 8). His democracy is described in the preface to the play as not being “for the good of the people, but for the satisfaction of the people” (*Ibid*: xxxvii). Hence the play serves as the perfect example of Antonio Gramsci’s term ‘cultural hegemony’, by which he explains how a dominant group achieves control and exerts power over other social groups not through force, but through consensus (Gramsci 2008). Encountered with this situation, it becomes less clear whether one should blame the colonizers, as a dominant group, or the people who willingly ac-

1 The whole essay on John Bull, written by Washington Irving, is available from: <http://www.bartleby.com/109/5.html>

Criticism of Colonialism in George Bernard Shaw's play John Bull's Other Island

cept such a rule. Shaw was more critical of the latter, providing as an example the passivity and acceptance of the Irish people, who must, in Shaw's opinion, "take dreams and give them a reality" (Jones, Internet).

Not only does Broadbent possess capital for investment, he also holds symbolic capital (education, honor, prestige, etc.) and uses it against those who hold less, seeking thereby to alter their actions, lives, and tradition. But Broadbent is able to exercise this symbolic violence only because the villagers of Rosscullen perceive it as something legitimate. Cornelius Doyle, Matt Haffigan and Barney Doran think that they will profit if Broadbent goes into Parliament, and the hilarious political campaign begins. Although taking place a century ago, it is alarmingly similar to the present political campaigns, and here one can see social realism at its best: the political candidate grinning and shaking hands with every man who has the right to vote; his lovely wife-to-be smiling and serving as a canvasser – all for a momentary satisfaction of the people, since political candidates, says Broadbent, "must be thoroughly democratic, and patronize everybody without distinction of class" (Shaw 1908: 112). His use of political language corresponds to the shrewd observation made by Harold Pinter, that the "majority of politicians ... are interested not in truth but in power and in the maintenance of that power", and "to maintain that power it is essential that people remain in ignorance ... of the truth, even the truth of their own lives" (Pinter, Internet).

There are other techniques of colonialism to be recognized in Broadbent's character, one of them being paternalism: a fake desire to help, protect, and advise a nation that most likely does not need, nor want that kind of protection and help. More interestingly, there is an implicit justification of colonialism in everything Broadbent does: his reasoning is that he wants to place the two civilizations in con-

tact. Here another important question comes to mind: *Colonization and civilization?* Aimé Césaire answers thus:

Between *colonization* and *civilization* there is an infinite distance ... First we must study how colonization works to decivilize the colonizer, to brutalize him in the true sense of the word, to degrade him, to awaken him to buried instincts, to covetousness, violence, race hatred, and moral relativism ... (Césaire 1972: 2).

But Broadbent wants to shrink the distance between the two nations by turning the small village of Rosscullen into a 'civilization'. To achieve this, he has to camouflage his true intentions by means of colonial mimicry, which is, as Lacan explains, "not a question of harmonizing with the background, but against a mottled background, of becoming mottled" (Bhabha, Internet). We further learn from Bhabha that "colonial mimicry is the desire for a reformed, recognizable Other, as a subject of a difference that is almost the same, but not quite" (*Ibid*). 'The Other' of the play is explicitly named in the title of the play: Ireland is John Bull's *Other* island. But as the action of the play progresses, it becomes more obvious that Broadbent becomes 'the Other' instead: by employing the technique of defamiliarization, Shaw inverts the common notion of mimicry, which is reserved solely for the colonized people: in *John Bull*, it is the colonizer who needs to become mottled against the mottled background in order to achieve his goal. And here comedy plays its most distinguished part as it shows us the power of laughter, for there is a certain point in Shaw's comedies when one suddenly stops laughing and in that terrible silence of the after-laugh realizes the amount of human folly. Because Shaw recognized that words are the most powerful drug used by mankind, as Rudyard Kipling once said, he was able to draw people's attention to a social problem or a certain idea by employing irony, paradox, and overstatements – all

parts of the 'Shavian Newspeak', which consists of familiar words used in a shockingly laughable way, as is the case with Broadbent's political speeches.

When does the laughter cease in *John Bull's Other Island*? After all the colonial techniques described above, Broadbent's final statement: "Come along and help me to choose the site for the hotel" (Shaw 1908: 126), leaves a silence which resembles a speech quoted by Aimé Césaire:

We aspire not to equality but to domination. The country of a foreign race must become once again a country of serfs, of agricultural laborers, or industrial workers. It is not a question of eliminating the inequalities among men but of widening them and making them into a law (Césaire 1972: 3).

It is a statement made by Hitler, "that rings clear, haughty, and brutal and plants us squarely in the middle of howling savagery" (*Ibid.*).

From a postmodern point of view, the first step towards the elimination of inequalities is the acknowledgement of differences, the leaping out of ignorance. To make that step, Shaw first admits that there is an ideology behind every text, and then uses his own texts to make the readers question their dogmatic beliefs. This typically postmodern characteristic, and one that anticipates Brecht's epic theatre, is best seen in Shaw's ridicule of stereotypes: in *John Bull*, stereotypes are verbally established and then actively undermined (Ochshorn 2006: 180). Characters in this play are either *rather Irish, thorough Irishmen, just like an Irishman, only an Irishman, or so English, the conquering Englishmen, with an English plan, offering English guidance*, etc. Shaw insists on this dichotomy even in the Preface: "Personally I like Englishmen more than Irishmen (no doubt because they make more of me)", he says, "but I never think of an Englishman as my countryman" (Shaw 1908: xx), and yet Larry Doyle maintains that "Ireland was peopled just as England was, and its breed was

crossed by just the same invaders" (*Ibid.*: 17). These paradoxes are characteristic of Shaw, and they point to the fact that truth is elusive and that history needs to be re-examined in order to determine the point in history when these peoples were established as two separate stereotypes.

Furthermore, the fact that Tom Broadbent and Larry Doyle are civil engineers is not accidental. But where the first wants to build both literal and symbolic roads and bridges to 'connect' Ireland and England, the latter is more eager to design a dam between them. As an Irishman who lives and works in England, Larry is a possible link, an imaginary bridge between the two countries, as Shaw was. According to Michael Holroyd, "Broadbent embodies action, Keegan speaks for the emotions, and Larry Doyle represents the intellect" (Holroyd 1998: 304), and as such, Doyle is the only possible means of achieving the synthesis between facts and dreams. That he himself will never find a country where the facts are not brutal and dreams not unreal² is a sufficient enough evidence that the synthesis cannot be achieved and that such a country remains a utopian wish, or "the dream of a madman" (Shaw 1908: 125).

As a counterpart to Broadbent stands another type of Idealist, Peter Keegan, who penetrates the enigma few villagers were able to penetrate. The unfrocked priest poses as a madman and hides behind the mask of his religion, because reality is unbearable to him. Shrouded in dreams, he is the embodiment of what Larry despises most about Ireland: an Irishman's imagination, which "never lets him alone, never convinces him, never satisfies him; but it makes him that he can't face reality nor deal with it nor handle it nor conquer it: he can only sneer at them that do, and be 'agreeable to strangers'" (Shaw 1908: 19). Shaw clearly reprimands the Irish people

² "DOYLE: I wish I could find a country to live in where the facts were not brutal and the dreams not unreal" (Shaw 1908: 28).

for not using their imagination as “a practical vector from the soul” which “can be called on to solve all our problems” (Jones, Internet). The possibilities which imagination offers should be used creatively, and not kept hidden behind the veil of Catholicism.

The characterization, the Irish setting, and the idea conveyed in the play make it intellectually appealing inasmuch as it brings to focus the questions of power, tradition versus modernization, and national prerogatives. In the end one has to agree that Shaw was bound to England by ties of the head, not of the heart, as shown in the character of Larry Doyle. Broadbent, the symbol of England, takes victory in the end because he does not allow his dreams to interfere with his business, as opposed to Keegan, whose business has everything to do with his dreams. The one realist, Larry, is torn asunder: as an Irishman, he is left disheartened, but the ties of the head lead him inevitably to Broadbent and his business of a lifetime. Eric Bentley summarizes this “queer three-sided contest” thus: “Keegan, who knows what is right ... does nothing, Doyle, who knows what is right ... does what is wrong, and Broadbent, who does what is wrong ... is quite convinced that he is doing right” (1947: 165). The whole text stands as an important document of the gradual, but persistent, advancement of imperialism and the techniques of colonialism. Although the play itself “does not solve the Irish problem”, and does not “send the audience rushing out to take action” (*Ibid*), it records Shaw's social beliefs, particularly his firm belief that poverty is the root of all evil, including colonialism, and exposes some of the main ideas of his theatrical art. Read as a condemnation of British imperialism³, the

play becomes part of the Shavian anti-war and anti-colonial campaign, and proves that George Bernard Shaw was “on the side of the good old cause; the oldest and the best of all causes, the cause of creation against destruction, the cause of yes against no” (Chesterton 1909: 103).

References

1. Bentley, Eric (1947), *Bernard Shaw*, New York: Vail-Ballou Press.
2. Bhabha, Homi (1994), *The Location of Culture*, New York: Routledge.
3. Bhabha, Homi, (1994), “Of mimicry and man: The ambivalence of colonial discourse”, Internet, Available from: <http://prelectur.stanford.edu/lecturers/bhabha/mimicry.html> (Retrieved on March 29, 2012).
4. Boyd, A. Ernest (1917), *Appreciations and Depreciations, Irish Literary Studies*, Dublin: The Talbot Press Ltd.
5. Burdije, Pjer (2003), *Pravila umetnosti, Geneza i struktura polja književnosti*, Novi Sad: Svetovi.
6. Césaire, Aime (1972), “Discourse on Colonialism”, New York and London: Monthly Review Press.
7. Chesterton, K. Gilbert (1909), *George Bernard Shaw*, New York: John Lane Company.
8. Davis, C. Tracy (1998) “Shaw's interstices of empire: decolonizing at home and abroad”, *Cambridge Companion to George Bernard Shaw*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 218-239.
9. “Government of Ireland Act 1920”, Internet, Available from: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Government_of_Ireland_Act_1920 (Retrieved on March 27, 2012).
10. Gramši, Antonio (2008), „Hegemonija, intelektualci i država”, *Studije kulture, zbornik*, Beograd: Službeni glasnik: 148-154.
11. Holroyd, Michael (1998), *Bernard Shaw*, London: Vintage.

3 In his play *Man and Superman*, Shaw gave his ‘definition’ of an Imperialist: “Excess of insularity makes a Briton an Imperialist. Excess of local self-assertion makes a colonist an Imperialist” (1903: 252).

12. Ireland, Microsoft® Encarta® (2009), DVD, © 1993–2008 Microsoft Corporation.
13. Irving, Washington (1914), "John Bull", *The Oxford Book of American Essays*, Internet, Available from: <http://www.bartleby.com/109/5.html> (Retrieved on March 28, 2012).
14. Jones, Leroi (1965), *The Revolutionary Theatre*, Internet, Available from: <http://www.nathanielturner.com/revolutionarytheatre.htm> (Retrieved on March 27, 2012).
15. Josselson, Ruthellen (2004), "The Hermeneutics of Faith and the Hermeneutics of Suspicion", *Narrative Inquiry* 14 (1): 1–28.
16. Kaye, B. Julian (1958), *Bernard Shaw and the Nineteenth-Century Tradition*, Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
17. Las Casas, Bartolomé, *The Destruction of the Indies*, Internet, Available from: [http://www.hillsdalesites.org/personal/hstewart/Documents/\(1550\)%20The%20Destruction%20of%20the%20Indies%20\(las%20Casas\).pdf](http://www.hillsdalesites.org/personal/hstewart/Documents/(1550)%20The%20Destruction%20of%20the%20Indies%20(las%20Casas).pdf) (Retrieved on March 25, 2012).
18. MacNutt, Francis Augustus (1909), *Bartholomew de Las Casas, His Life, His Apostolates, His Writings*, New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons.
19. McCabe, Joseph (1914), *George Bernard Shaw, A Critical Study*, New York: Mitchell Kennerley.
20. Mencken, L. Henry (1905), *George Bernard Shaw, His Plays*, Boston and London: John W. Luce & Co.
21. Montaigne, de Michel (1958), *The Complete Essays of Montaigne*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
22. Montesinos, de Antonio, *Sermon (1511)*, Internet, Available from: http://www.digitalhistory.uh.edu/learning_history/spain/spain_montesinos.cfm (Retrieved on March 26, 2012).
23. Ochshorn, Kathleen (2006), "Colonialism, Postcolonialism, and the Shadow of a New Empire: *John Bull's Other Island*", *Shaw* 26: 180–193.
24. Parenti, Michael (2007), *Lies, War, and Empire*, Internet, Available from: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CZTrY3TQpzw> (Retrieved on March 27, 2012).
25. Pinter, Harold (2005), *Art, Truth, and Politics*, Internet, Available from: <http://nobelprize.org/mediaplayer/index.php?id=620> (Retrieved on March 25, 2012).
26. Shaw, George Bernard (1903), *Man and Superman*, Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd.
27. Shaw, George Bernard (1908), *John Bull's Other Island, How He Lied To Her Husband, and Major Barbara*, New York: Brentano's.
28. Shaw, George Bernard (1915), *The Quintessence of Ibsenism*, New York: Brentano's.

KRITIKA KOLONIJALIZMA U DRUGOM OSTRVU DŽONA BULA DŽORDŽA BERNARDA ŠOA

Rezime

Komad Džordža Bernarda Šoa *Drugo ostrvo Džona Bula* u skladu sa svojim naslovom, koji je aluzija na istoimeni čuveni lik iz stripa, satirično obrađuje teme kolonijalizma, netolerancije i patronata. Rad analizira način na koji je Šo pokušao da izmiri Englesku i Irsku, kako bi postigao sintezu između kolonizatora i kolonizovanog. Takođe se odgovara na pitanje da li je moguće prevazići netrpeljivost koja se javlja kao posledica kolonizacije,

Criticism of Colonialism in George Bernard Shaw's play John Bull's Other Island

kao i da li čovečanstvo može izbeći i zanemariti najvažniju odliku kolonijalnog diskursa o kojoj je pisao Homi Baba – „njegovu zavisnost od ideje 'fiksiranosti' u procesu ideološke konstrukcije drugosti“. Najzad, čitanje drame *Drugo ostrvo Džona Bula* kao delotvorne kritike kolonijalizma otkriva Šoova praktična umetnička rešenja pomoću kojih se može ugušiti simboličko i kulturno nasilje, koje nastavlja da živi mnogo godina nakon što kolonizatori daju koloniji pravo na samoupravljanje.

biljanavlaskovic@gmail.com