

Gendered Knowledge and Patriarchal Failure in Shaw's *Augustus Does His Bit*

Churamoni Kandel, PhD

Associate Professor, Shree Vinduwasini Sanskrit Vidyapeeth (Campus), Pokhara

Article History : Received : 11th Jan. 2026; Reviewed: 4th March 2026; Accepted: 26th June, 2026

Corresponding Author : Churamoni Kandel, PhD; **E-mail :** churamoni39@gmail.com

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.3126/kp.v4i1.97022>; **ORCID:** <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-5002-2354>

Abstract

*This study examines George Bernard Shaw's *Augustus Does His Bit* through the lens of feminist epistemology. This feminist epistemology also acts as a theoretical paradigm. Numerous previous studies emphasize on nationalism, patriotism, and war satire in the play. They pay comparatively less attention to the relation between gender and knowledge. However, this study introduces gender that shapes knowledge and patriarchal authority that produces epistemic failure during wartime. It examines the operation of gendered knowledge and analyzes the masculine authority that collapses in the play. Shaw portrays war not only as a political crisis but also as an epistemic one. This study adopts a qualitative approach and an interpretive research design. It employs close textual analysis as the principal method. This analysis focuses on language, silence, authority, and power. *Augustus Highcastle* represents authority-driven knowledge in the play. His speech relies on certainty and discourages inquiry. He equates obedience with intelligence and treats emotion as evidence. Doubt appears as weakness and questioning appears as a threat. In contrast, the female spy in the play demonstrates silence, observation, and restraint as strategies of her knowledge. Her actions challenge masculine authority and expose the limitations of patriarchal certainty. This play presents war as an epistemic crisis that extends beyond politics and morality to the foundations of knowledge itself. Thus, this study concludes that Shaw critiques patriarchal modes of*

knowing and foregrounds alternative forms of knowledge that emerge from marginalized positions.

Keywords: Authority, epistemology, gender, patriarchy, wartime

Introduction

This research examines George Bernard Shaw's *Augustus Does His Bit* (ADB) to explore the patriarchal authority in the play that fails at the level of knowing. The failure is not merely moral or ideological; it is also epistemic. Researchers often explore Shaw's plays to examine satire on patriotic hysteria and ideological excess during the First World War. Critical discussions frequently emphasize on Shaw's exposure of blind nationalism, moral absolutism, and sentimental heroism. Shaw's such exposures rightly situate the play within his broader anti-war vision. However, they tend to privilege ideology as thematic content rather than as a mode of knowing. As a result, the play's engagement with the gendered production of knowledge receives limited critical attention. The present study attempts to shift attention from what characters believe to how belief forms itself, authorizes, and defends. It examines knowledge in the play that does not emerge through verification or reflection rather it circulates through confidence, repetition, and social approval. Such knowledge does not remain neutral. It genders deeply.

Patriarchal authority legitimizes masculine certainty while rendering alternative modes of knowing invisible or suspect (Harding 138). Harding explores how dominant knowledge systems privilege the standpoint of those in power and marginalize other forms of knowledge. Feminist epistemology provides a productive framework for exposing this imbalance. Augustus Highcastle occupies a position of unquestioned patriarchal power in the play. He speaks with certainty. He asserts without hesitation. His authority appears natural rather than earned. Masculine norms that equate loudness with leadership and conviction with truth protect his confidence socially. Yet Shaw repeatedly exposes the fragility of this authority. Augustus Highcastle relies on assumption rather than evidence. His speech circulates belief as fact. Michel Foucault postulates "power produces forms of knowledge that serve authority rather than accuracy is directly applicable" (27). Augustus's failure,

therefore, stands not merely ideological or moral but equally epistemic. Shaw further intensifies this critique by dramatizing how Augustus's certainty actively disables his capacity to know. He does not listen. He does not observe. He mistakes emotional intensity for understanding. His ignorance remains protected precisely because patriarchal confidence supports it. Feminist scholars examine it for a long how such systems "reward assertion while discouraging doubt, especially when doubt emerges from marginalized positions" (Butler 34). The play anticipates this insight through dramatic irony.

In contrast, the female spy in the play operates through observation, patience, and restraint. She gathers information quietly. She speaks selectively. She maintains her silence deliberately. All these seem strategic rather than submissive. Thus, Shaw reverses dominant wartime epistemologies in which masculine speech signifies authority and feminine silence signifies weakness. The woman's marginal position enables her to see what Augustus cannot. Her success depends on attentiveness rather than dominance. Knowledge, in the play, emerges from listening rather than proclaiming. This contrast between 'listening and proclaiming' portrays a deeper epistemic conflict. Masculine authority assumes it already knows. Feminine intelligence proceeds by learning. Shaw does not idealize femininity. Instead, he critiques a system in which patriarchal knowledge fails because it refuses uncertainty. Effective knowledge, the play introduces, often emerges from positions that denied authority. Such a representation aligns with feminist epistemological arguments that challenge the neutrality of dominant knowledge systems and expose their dependence on exclusion.

By applying feminist epistemology to (*ADB*) this article analyzes how Shaw exposes the failure of patriarchal knowledge under wartime pressure. War appears not only as a political or moral catastrophe, but as a crisis of knowing. Augustus mistakes belief as truth. Authority shields ignorance from scrutiny. Reading the play through this theoretical lens repositions gender as an epistemic category rather than a thematic concern. It also extends Shaw scholarship by moving beyond satire toward a sustained critique of how power determines what counts as knowledge.

Research Questions

- a. How does (*ADB*) represent knowledge as a gendered construct within a wartime patriarchal framework?
- b. In what ways does Shaw dramatize the epistemic failure of patriarchal authority through the contrast between masculine assertion and feminine observation?

Objectives

- a. To examine how Shaw constructs knowledge production in the play as gendered, privileging masculine certainty while marginalizing alternative epistemic practices.
- b. To analyze how the play exposes the failure of patriarchal authority by foregrounding the limitations of assumption-based masculine knowledge and the effectiveness of observational, feminine intelligence.

Review of Literature

George Bernard Shaw's (*ADB*) attracts sustained critical attention as a wartime satire. Early critics situate the play within Shaw's broader opposition to militarism and patriotic excess. Eric Bentley explores Shaw's war plays as portraying "the moral emptiness behind public enthusiasm for war" (214). This view establishes the play as a critique of ideological blindness rather than individual failure. Numerous scholars analyze the play's satirical treatment of nationalism. For instance, Stanley Weintraub asserts how Shaw depicts patriotism as "a form of emotional intoxication that disables reason" (97). According to this reading, Augustus represents the irrational citizen whose loyalty grounds in sentiment rather than thought. While persuasive, such interpretations tend to treat irrationality as a general human weakness, without addressing how authority legitimizes certain forms of knowing over others.

Some critics explore Shaw's use of irony and dramatic contrast in his plays. For instance, Margery M. Morgan postulates how Shaw often exposes "the distance

between what characters think they know and what they actually understand” (62). This insight gestures toward epistemic concerns, yet it remains underdeveloped in relation to gender. It analyzes knowledge as error or illusion, not as a socially produced and gendered construct.

Feminist readings of Shaw acknowledge his strong female characters but often prioritize themes of independence and resistance. Sally Peters explores how Shaw's women “frequently act as agents of disruption within male-dominated systems” (141). However, such studies tend to emphasize action rather than cognition. The question of how women ‘know’ differently in Shaw's plays remains largely unexplored. (*ADB*) usually treats the figure of the female spy as a narrative device. Critics mention her deception but rarely theorize its epistemological implications. Weintraub finds that she succeeds because “no one imagines her capable of strategic intelligence” (102). This remark remains suggestive, yet a sustained theoretical framework does not pursue it.

The absence of epistemological analysis in Shaw's (*ADB*) becomes more apparent when viewed alongside feminist theory. Judith Butler examines how dominant systems privilege “assertion and visibility as signs of legitimacy,” (33) while marginalizing alternative modes of understanding. Shaw's wartime drama rarely applies such insights. As a result, masculine certainty continues to be read as authority rather than as a constructed form of ignorance.

Michel Foucault's concept of power / knowledge further illuminates this gap. Foucault examines how power “produces and circulates knowledge that reinforces its own authority” (27). Although literary studies widely employs it, (*ADB*) does not systematically employ this framework. Without this lens, *Augustus's* failure often reduces to comic exaggeration instead of being understood as a structural epistemic collapse. More recent scholarship on war and knowledge emphasizes how crises intensify epistemic hierarchies. Elaine Scarry adduces, “war simplifies perception by discouraging doubt and rewarding conviction” (68). This observation resonates strongly with Shaw's portrayal of *Augustus*. Yet Shaw criticism does not sufficiently connect wartime certainty with patriarchal knowledge systems.

Researchers introduce Shaw's war plays, like *O'Flaherty V.C.*, *The Inca of Perusalem*, (*ADB*), *Heartbreak House*, etc. as extensions of his broader critique of militarism, patriotism, and moral absolutism. For instance, Holroyd makes a study of Shaw who consistently exposes how "moral certainty becomes a substitute for moral thought during war" (214). This observation aligns with readings that emphasize ideological rigidity. However, such studies tend to treat certainty as a moral flaw rather than an epistemic one. The question of how wartime discourse structures knowledge remains largely unaddressed. Several critics explore (*ADB*) primarily as political satire. For instance, Dukore analyzes how the play "reduces patriotism to mechanical obedience" (97). While persuasive, this interpretation focuses on behavior rather than cognition. It explains what characters do. It does not explain how they know. Thus, the epistemological basis of obedience remains unexplored in this critical frame.

Numerous feminist critics often concentrate on Shaw's progressive portrayal of women. For instance, Innes explores how Shaw's female characters frequently "outthink the men who dominate public discourse" (156). Her insight relates to the female spy's role in (*ADB*). Yet Innes does not frame this difference as epistemic. It explores intelligence as character trait, not as an alternative mode of knowing. The systemic nature of gendered knowledge remains under-theorized. Work in feminist epistemology offers useful tools for filling this gap. Harding analyzes the dominant knowledge systems that "define objectivity through the standpoint of power" (138). This claim helps illuminate why Augustus's certainty carries authority despite its inaccuracy. His position legitimizes his knowledge. The female spy's marginality, by contrast, enables perception without recognition. Studies of war discourse further support this approach. Fussell explores that wartime language favors abstraction and slogans, which "replace complexity with emotional certainty" (21). This observation clarifies Shaw's repeated use of patriotic phrases. Such language functions epistemically. It discourages inquiry. It rewards conviction.

Intellectual arrogance denotes excessive confidence in one's own knowledge and judgment. For instance, Meisel explores how Shaw repeatedly exposes characters who "mistake rhetorical confidence for intellectual depth" (82). This insight relates to Augustus's speech patterns. His confidence generates authority. It

does not generate understanding. However, Meisel finds this flaw as personal irony rather than as a gendered epistemic structure. The collective logic that sustains such confidence during war remains underexplored.

Studies of silence in drama illuminate the female spy's role. Aston analyzes how silence in modern drama often functions as "a site of resistance rather than absence" (64). This perspective helps reframe the woman's limited speech. Her silence does not signal passivity. It signals control. Yet Aston does not engage directly with wartime texts. The intersection of silence, gender, and war epistemology therefore remains an open field for analysis. Critical discussions of masculinity and war also inform this study. Tosh examines how wartime masculinity demands "decisiveness, emotional certainty, and suppression of doubt" (119). These traits closely align with Augustus's behavior. His refusal to question reflects masculine discipline rather than ignorance alone. However, Tosh's work remains historical rather than literary. It does not address how drama exposes the epistemic costs of such masculinity. From a discourse-oriented perspective, Fairclough explores the authoritative discourse that often naturalizes ideology by presenting it as common sense (76). This insight clarifies Shaw's use of slogans in the play. Augustus presents belief as obvious truth. Language performs epistemic control. Despite this relevance, discourse analysis does not apply to Shaw's short war plays. This absence strengthens the need for the present study.

The above critics thus, explore satire, nationalism, gender roles, character, masculinity, language in isolation, etc. in (*ADB*). Some of them address how gender and power regulate knowledge itself in wartime drama. Despite these insights, they rarely examine the play as a dramatization of gendered knowledge and epistemic failure. They rarely explore Shaw's criticism, feminist epistemology, and war discourse in a focused reading of (*ADB*). This study intervenes by treating gender as an epistemic category. It reads the play as a dramatization of how power determines what counts as knowledge during war. Therefore, the existing scholarship portrays a clear critical gap. This study addresses that gap by applying feminist epistemology to portray how Shaw critiques patriarchal authority not only as ideological excess but as a flawed mode of knowing sustained by gendered power.

Significance of the Research

While critics examine Shaw's engagement with nationalism, militarism, female agency, etc., fewer studies investigate how gender shapes the production and legitimacy of knowledge in his plays. However, this research examines the failure of patriarchal authority at the level of knowing. This failure not only becomes moral or ideological, it also becomes epistemic. Masculine certainty appears as socially protected ignorance. Feminine silence and observation emerge as effective modes of knowing. Here lies the significance of the research. This study moves the discussion beyond familiar anti-war satire. It foregrounds knowledge as a gendered and power-driven construct. It contributes to literary and cultural studies broadly. It demonstrates how wartime contexts intensify epistemic hierarchies. It portrays how assumption privileges over inquiry.

Methodology

This article employs feminist epistemology as its theoretical tool to read George Bernard Shaw's (*ADB*). This epistemology examines the play that produces and authorizes the knowledge. It questions whose knowledge to trust and who's to dismiss. It also interrogates how authority often disguises belief as truth. In wartime contexts, this framework becomes especially significant, as "emotional conviction frequently replaces evidence and critical inquiry" (Butler 33). Shaw's (*ADB*) offers a compressed dramatic space in which such epistemic tensions become sharply visible.

This study adopts a qualitative textual analysis as its primary research method. This analysis focuses on George Bernard Shaw's (*ADB*) as the sole primary text. It reads the play closely, paying attention to dialogue, silence, gesture, and dramatic irony. Concepts like gendered knowing, epistemic authority, and marginal knowledge guide the interpretation. The study also draws on power-knowledge theory to clarify how patriarchal authority legitimizes assumption as truth. This research employs secondary sources to contextualize and support the analysis. These include critical studies on Shaw, feminist theory, epistemology, etc. The study relies on peer-reviewed books and articles to ensure academic rigour. All interpretations ground in textual evidence from the play. The methodology remains interpretive rather than empirical. It aims to generate critical insight rather than generalization.

Limitations of the Study

This study faces certain limitations. The analysis depends largely on textual interpretation. Different readers may arrive at different conclusions from the same text. The study cannot fully recover Shaw's authorial intention or the historical responses of contemporary audiences. The limited availability of critical studies on epistemology in relation to Shaw also restricts broader scholarly comparison. Feminist epistemology provides the principal theoretical framework, and its assumptions may influence the interpretation of the text. Historical distance from the First World War further limits direct access to the social conditions surrounding the play. These limitations do not invalidate the findings, but they indicate the interpretive nature of the present research. The following analyses help to draw the gist of the research.

Patriarchal Certainty as a Mode of Knowing

The conflict between masculine authority and alternative ways of knowing becomes visible in the character of Augustus. His language analyzes how patriarchal certainty operates as a mode of knowledge. Augustus speaks with absolute confidence. He does not hesitate. He does not question. He declares. Assertions fill his language. He repeatedly portrays his opinions as unquestionable truths. He postulates, "Our statesmen are the greatest known to history. Our generals are invincible. Our army is the admiration of the world. [*Furiously*]. How dare you tell me that the country is going to the dogs?" (Shaw 35). His arguments with the clerk expresses what he believes remain the truth and others accept them. He insists that every citizen must fulfill his / her duty, treating obedience as moral clarity rather than political choice. He enquires to the clerk, who at his age of fifty-seven, "but you can still do your bit. Many an older man is in the G.R.'s or volunteering for home defense" (Shaw 34). His statement reflects not the reasoned judgment but the inherited belief. Augustus expresses that loyalty requires no verification. Shaw explores how such certainty functions as a patriarchal mode of knowing. Knowledge, for Augustus, does not emerge from inquiry. It emerges from repetition. Volume and emotional intensity sustains his authority. He speaks as though conviction itself acts as evidence. Feminist epistemology identifies this pattern as a form of epistemic

dominance, where assertion replaces understanding (Butler 33). Augustus exemplifies this dominance. His confidence shields him from doubt. It also blinds him to reality.

Patriarchal Authority and Assumed Knowledge

Augustus earns his authority through social grants, not through evidence. He adduces, “after sitting on thirty-seven Royal Commissions, mostly as chairman” (Shaw 44). He never asks questions. He never investigates. He assumes as if he already knows. When the female spy speaks, he listens only to confirm his expectations. He trusts on the appearances. He fails to read her carefully as he accepts his failure at the later part of this play. He postulates, “Madam, I consider your conduct most unpatriotic. You make bets and abuse the confidence of the hard worked officials who are doing their bit for their country” (Shaw 56). This failure does not remain an individual mistake. It reflects a patriarchal epistemic system that privileges masculine certainty and suppresses alternative forms of knowledge. At one point, he confidently assures the female spy that he knows all about the enemy and their methods. He asserts “all that is perfectly well known to this department, madam” (Shaw 45). Thus, his claim becomes ironic in the play. The audience knows it as his false claim. Patriarchal knowledge often assumes transparency, especially when confronting those it considers powerless. Shaw dramatizes this flaw through irony. He expresses how patriarchal authority produces the illusion of knowledge. His belief in his own insight becomes comic in the play. His assumptions allow deception to succeed. Foucault examines how power produces knowledge that “serves authority rather than truth” (27). Augustus’s speech illustrates this claim. His authority produces false knowledge.

The Female Spy and Strategic Silence

The female spy speaks less. She listens more. She maintains her silence deliberately. She makes it as her strategy. She allows Augustus to speak freely. She gathers information without revealing to herself. She simply enquires if people know him as “Lord Augustus Highcastle?” (Shaw 43). At this point Augustus elaborates to himself more than she required. She listens to him passively. At moments, she

responds minimally. At one point, she agrees with him, "Of course not" (Shaw 49), without offering details. This agreement appears deceptive. Shaw finds her silence as a form of intelligence rather than absence. He reverses the traditional gender expectations. This challenges the traditional gender binaries. Her silence turns into a tool of knowledge for her. She avoids direct confrontation. She lets Augustus expose himself through speech. Knowledge flows toward her, not from her. Feminist epistemology recognizes silence as "a marginalized but powerful mode of knowing" (Butler 34). Shaw anticipates this insight. The female spy's silence protects her. It also empowers her.

Gendered Visibility and Epistemic Invisibility

Augustus appears visible. He dominates the space as well the speech. His visibility signals his authority. The female spy remains socially invisible. It becomes her power. Her marginal position enables her success. Initially, Augustus does not imagine her as intelligent and a thinker. He finds her harmless, so he discloses the confidentiality of the war even on his first meeting with her, as he adduces, "Madam, the Foreign Office is staffed by my relatives exclusively" (Shaw 45). This misrecognition becomes crucial for him later. Shaw critiques patriarchal epistemology through this misrecognition. He critiques a system in which it mistakes the visibility for knowledge. It reads masculine presence as competence. It reads feminine restraint as absence. Yet the play reverses this logic. The visible authority fails. The invisible intelligence prevails. Knowledge emerges from attentiveness, not through dominance.

Wartime Emotion as False Reason

Shaw sets (*ADB*) within a wartime context. Augustus Highcastle repeatedly appeals to emotion. He speaks of honour. He speaks of sacrifice. He expresses his emotions with the clerk, how one should remain loyal to his country. He postulates, "If we were not at war, I should discharge you on the spot for disrespectful behavior. But England is in danger; and I cannot think of my personal dignity at such a moment" (Shaw 35). Doubt often becomes suspect for him. Shaw dramatizes this condition. He equates emotional intensity to the truth. He treats questioning as

betrayal. He equates doubt to the betrayal. He insists that feeling strongly proves of being right. Elaine Scarry analyzes that war rewards conviction and suppresses doubt because certainty serves political and military power (68). Shaw dramatizes this process through Augustus, whose confidence replaces reflection and whose authority depends upon unquestioned belief. Augustus's emotional reasoning disables him. He cannot imagine deception as well as the complexity. Emotion replaces the reasoning. This emotional certainty disables the critical thought. Augustus relies on patriotic assumptions instead of careful observation. He trusts his own authority even when evidence contradicts him. Shaw employs this epistemic failure to show that war intensifies patriarchal certainty and exposes the fragility of authoritative knowledge.

Epistemic Failure and Dramatic Irony

Shaw introduces epistemic failure through his (*ADB*). The audience knows the truth what Augustus does. He believes he protects the nation. In reality, he enables espionage. The female spy webs a story of a lady, who manages to obtain a list of guns emplacements from him. She asserts:

Blueloo is simply infatuated with my sister-in-law; and he has rashly let out to her that this list is in your possession. He forgot himself because he was in a towering rage at its being entrusted to you: his language was terrible. He ordered all the guns to be shifted at once. Augustus: What on earth did he do that for? (Shaw 47)

Augustus believes in the female spy's story, readily. He assures her how his brother makes errors. Here, Augustus does not realize what he speaks before her. However, its consequences become serious later on. His failure enables the enemy's intelligence. Shaw portrays ironically, how ignorance can be loud. This irony transforms comedy into a critique. The play also portrays how epistemic failure cannot remain harmless. Patriarchal authority collapses because it refuses the uncertainty. Augustus repeatedly trusts his own judgment and fails to recognize the female spy, which ultimately leads to his humiliation (Shaw 52–54). Meisel examines how Shaw often exposes characters who mistake confidence for intellectual authority (82). Similarly, Code finds that patriarchal knowledge systems privilege authority and certainty over alternative forms of knowing (10). Augustus

embodies this epistemic arrogance by dismissing the woman's intelligence and relying on his own assumptions. Shaw therefore satirizes not intelligence itself but masculine certainty without knowledge.

Patriarchal Knowledge under Collapse

By the end of the play, Shaw portrays the collapse of patriarchal knowledge. Augustus fails because he mistakes belief for truth. He trusts his authority more than the evidences. His masculinity protects his ignorance. The conversation below between the female spy and Augustus introduces the failure of patriarchy:

THE LADY. Look I have found you a beautiful envelope for the list, an unmistakable lady's envelope. [*She puts the sham list into her envelope and hands it to him.*]

AUGUSTUS. Excellent. Really very clever of you. [*Slyly*] Come: would you like to have a peep at the list [*beginning to take the blank paper from the envelope*]? (Shaw 52)

During Augustus's absence, the female spy replaces the original list with a sham list. She acts innocently for all the happenings in his office. Thus, she succeeds because she knows how to wait, listen, and observe. She understands how power blinds Augustus High castle. Shaw's critique does not limit to war. It extends to a crisis of knowing. War does not merely destroy lives. It distorts knowledge too. Feminist epistemology helps reveal this collapse. Patriarchal knowledge collapses when it refuses to listen. The play becomes a study of epistemic failure rather than a mere satire.

Conclusion

This study finds (*ADB*) as a failure of patriarchal knowledge in wartime. It answers the research questions by demonstrating how gender shapes the production and legitimacy of knowledge in the play. It explores how patriarchal authority relies on certainty, obedience, and assumption rather than inquiry and understanding. The analysis also demonstrates how Augustus's epistemic failure emerges from his unquestioned confidence and his dismissal of alternative forms of knowing. Thus, the

study fulfills its first objective by examining the operation of gendered knowledge in the play. It fulfills its second objective by analyzing the collapse of masculine authority through the lens of feminist epistemology. The female spy challenges patriarchal certainty through silence, observation, and attentiveness. Her success exposes the limitations of authority-based knowledge. Shaw therefore portrays war as an epistemic crisis as well as a political one. The study finally concludes that (*ADB*) critiques patriarchal modes of knowing and foregrounds alternative forms of knowledge that emerge from marginalized positions. This research encourages future scholars to pursue epistemological readings of Shaw's drama. They may make comparative analysis across wartime texts. This research also opens pathways toward interdisciplinary approaches that connect gender, power, and knowledge. Such directions promise to deepen critical engagement with Shaw's dramatic vision.

Works Cited

- Aston, Elaine. *An Introduction to Feminism and Theatre*. Routledge, 1995.
- Bentley, Eric. *Bernard Shaw: A Reconsideration*. New Directions, 1947.
- Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. Routledge, 1990.
- Code, Lorraine. *What Can She Know? Feminist Theory and the Construction of Knowledge*. Cornell UP, 1991.
- Dukore, Bernard F. *Bernard Shaw, Director*. University of Missouri Press, 1971.
- Fairclough, Norman. *Language and Power*. Longman, 1989.
- Foucault, Michel. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972–1977*. Edited by Colin Gordon, Pantheon Books, 1980.
- Fussell, Paul. *The Great War and Modern Memory*. Oxford UP, 1975.
- Harding, Sandra. *Whose Science? Whose Knowledge? Thinking from Women's Lives*. Cornell UP, 1991.
- Holroyd, Michael. *Bernard Shaw*. Vol. 2, Penguin, 1997.
- Innes, Christopher. *Modern British Drama*. Cambridge UP, 2002.

Meisel, Martin. *Shaw and the Nineteenth-Century Theater*. Princeton UP, 1963.

Morgan, Margery M. *The Shavian Playground*. Methuen, 1972.

Peters, Sally. *Bernard Shaw: The Ascent of the Superman*. Yale UP, 1996.

Scarry, Elaine. *The Body in Pain: The Making and Unmaking of the World*. Oxford UP, 1985.

Shaw, George Bernard. *Augustus Does His Bit. Plays: Unpleasant and Pleasant*, Constable, 1911.

Shaw, George Bernard. "Augustus Does His Bit." *Visions*, edited by Shreedhar Lohani, Vidyarthi Pustak Bhandar, 2021, pp. 34–56.

Tosh, John. *A Man's Place: Masculinity and the Middle-Class Home in Victorian England*. Yale UP, 1999.

Weintraub, Stanley. *Journey to Heartbreak: The Crucible Years of Bernard Shaw*. Weybright and Talley, 1971.

