

**STATEMENT OF THE EVIDENCE IN
CHIEF OF GEORGE BERNARD SHAW
BEFORE THE JOINT-COMMITTEE
ON STAGE PLAYS (CENSORSHIP
AND THEATRE LICENSING)**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649763559

Statement of the evidence in chief of George Bernard Shaw before the Joint-Committee on Stage Plays (Censorship and Theatre Licensing) by Bernard Shaw

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.


www.triestepublishing.com

BERNARD SHAW

**STATEMENT OF THE EVIDENCE IN
CHIEF OF GEORGE BERNARD SHAW
BEFORE THE JOINT-COMMITTEE
ON STAGE PLAYS (CENSORSHIP
AND THEATRE LICENSING)**

Statement of the evidence in chief
of George Bernard Shaw before
the Joint-Committee on Stage
Plays (Censorship and Theatre
Licensing).

Printed privately. Confidential.
All rights reserved. July 1909.



The Witness's Qualifications . . .	7
The Definition of Immorality . . .	9
What Toleration means . . .	12
The Case for Toleration . . .	14
The Limits to Toleration . . .	15
The Difference between Law and Censorship . . .	18
Why the Lord Chamberlain? . . .	23
The Diplomatic Objection to the Lord Chamberlain . . .	25
The Objection of Court Etiquet . . .	26
Why not an Enlightened Censorship? . . .	27
The Weakness of the Lord Chamberlain's Department . . .	31
An Enlightened Censorship still worse than the Lord Chamberlain's . . .	33
The Practical Impossibilities of Censorship . . .	36
The Arbitration Proposal . . .	39
The Licensing of Theatres . . .	42
The Distinction between Licensing and Censorship . . .	42
Prostitution and Drink in Theatres . . .	43
Why the Managers dread Local Control . . .	45
Desirable Limitations of Local Control . . .	47
Summary . . .	52

Statement of the evidence
in chief of George Bernard
Shaw before the Joint-
Committee on the Censor-
ship of Theatres.

THE POLITICAL PRINCIPLE AT STAKE

The Witness's Qualifications

I AM by profession a playwright. I have been in practice since 1892. I am a member of the Managing Committee of the Society of Authors and of the Dramatic Sub-Committee of that body. I have written nineteen plays, some of which have been translated and performed in all European countries except Turkey, Greece and Portugal. They have been performed extensively in America. Three of them have been refused licenses by the Lord Chamberlain. In one case a license has since been granted. The other two are still unlicensed. I have suffered both in pocket and reputation by the action of the Lord Chamberlain. In other countries I have not come into conflict with the Censorship except in Austria, where the production of a comedy of mine was postponed for a year because it alluded to the part taken by Austria in the Servo-Bulgarian war. This comedy was not one of the plays suppressed in England by the Lord Chamberlain. One of the plays so suppressed was

prosecuted in America by the police in consequence of an immense crowd of disorderly persons having been attracted to the first performance by the Lord Chamberlain's condemnation of it ; but on appeal to a higher court it was decided that the representation was lawful and the intention innocent, since when it has been repeatedly performed.

I am not an ordinary playwright in general practice. I am a specialist in immoral and heretical plays. My reputation has been gained by my persistent struggle to force the public to reconsider its moralities. In particular, I regard much current morality as to economic and sexual relations as disastrously wrong ; and I regard certain doctrines of the Christian religions as understood in England to-day with abhorrence. I write plays with the deliberate object of converting the nation to my opinions in these matters. I have no other effectual incentive to write plays, as I am not dependent on the theatre for my livelihood. If I were prevented from producing immoral and heretical plays, I should cease to write for the theatre, and propagate my views from the platform and through books. I mention these facts to shew that I have a special interest in the achievement by my profession of those rights of liberty of speech and conscience which are matters of course in other professions. I object to censorship not merely because the existing form of it grievously injures and hinders me individually, but on public grounds.

The Political Principle at Stake 9

The Definition of Immorality

In dealing with the question of the censorship, everything depends on the correct use of the word immorality, and a careful discrimination between the powers of a magistrate or judge to administer a code, and those of a censor to please himself.

Whatever is contrary to established manners and customs is immoral. An immoral act or doctrine is not necessarily a sinful one : on the contrary, every advance in thought and conduct is by definition immoral until it has converted the majority. For this reason it is of the most enormous importance that immorality should be protected jealously against the attacks of those who have no standard except the standard of custom, and who regard any attack on custom—that is, on morals—as an attack on society, on religion, and on virtue.

A Censor is never intentionally a protector of immorality. He always aims at the protection of morality. Now morality is extremely valuable to society. It imposes conventional conduct on the great mass of persons who are incapable of original ethical judgment, and would be quite lost if they were not in leading-strings devised by lawgivers, philosophers, prophets and poets for their guidance. But morality is not dependent on censorship for protection. It is already powerfully fortified by the magistracy and the whole body of law. Blasphemy, indecency, libel, treason, sedition, obscenity, profanity, and all the

other evils which a censorship is supposed to avert, are punishable by the civil magistrate with all the severity of vehement prejudice. Morality has not only every engine that lawgivers can devise in full operation for its protection, but also that enormous weight of public opinion enforced by social ostracism which is stronger than all the statutes. A censor pretending to protect morality is like a child pushing the cushions of a railway carriage to give itself the sensation of making the train travel at sixty miles an hour. It is immorality, not morality, that needs protection : it is morality, not immorality, that needs restraint ; for morality, with all the dead weight of human inertia and superstition to hang on the back of the pioneer, and all the malice of vulgarity and prejudice to threaten him, is responsible for many persecutions and many martyrdoms.

Persecutions and martyrdoms, however, are trifles compared to the mischief done by censorships in delaying the general march of enlightenment. This can be brought home to us by imagining what would have been the effect of applying to all literature the censorship we still apply to the stage. The works of Linnaeus and the evolutionists of 1790-1830, of Darwin, Wallace, Huxley, Helmholtz, Tyndall, Spencer, Carlyle, Ruskin and Samuel Butler, would not have been published, as they were all immoral and heretical in the very highest degree, and gave pain to many worthy and pious people. They are at present condemned by the Greek and Roman Catholic censorships as unfit for general reading. A