INTRODUCTION

Known world-over for the breadth of his talents, Henrik Ibsen is regarded as the grand-old-doyen of modern drama. All over the world, his name and fame have often been equated with that of William Shakespeare. Italian dramatist Luigi Pirandello, without hesitation puts Ibsen first after Shakespeare. However, unlike Shakespeare, Ibsen though a numero-uno and a guiding principle in a number of ways in terms of his dramatic artistry, yet stands singled out as one of the most controversial authors of the world. The labels, employed to describe him, range between two extremes. The world of literary criticism seems to be divided into two camps—those who adulate him uncritically and those who condemn him venomously. His adulators call him a social philosopher, social mathematician, stern monitor of his age, vehement individualist, pioneer of modern drama and his castigators condemn him as a public poisoner, propagandist, mere feminist, anarchist and even anti-Christ. With the advancement of culture and civilisation, his work, in the present times, is being increasingly translated, read, interpreted, staged, commented and even filmed across the continents. Today, he stands as a towering dramatist who shook the conscience not only of Scandinavia or Europe but of entire mankind.

Ibsen was born on March 20, 1828 in Skien, a small coastal town east of Norway. He was the eldest of five children of an affluent shipper named Knud Ibsen. His early childhood was scarred by the financial bankruptcy of his father during 1834-36 and the family had to shift to the outskirts, utterly neglected by the high-ups and creamy layer of society at Skien. After a few years, this “brooding child of a ruined discordant family”1 was sent to Grimstad, about 100 miles away to work as an assistant in a chemist shop. Despite his bilious face, as if charged with electricity, he won the heart of a servant and produced a child whom he had to support for 14 years. While still at apothecary’s shop, he started writing poetry in 1849. Battling with trolls within, he composed his first poetic drama Catiline on the theme of moral conflict within the psyche of the
protagonist. Although the play was not a success yet, with it, he was able to make his presence felt in the literary circles. After six years of hardships at Grimstad, he shifted to Christiania, (now Oslo), the capital of Norway where he could not qualify for the University degree. However, his attempts to write poetry and historical plays helped him to find a job (of course a low-paid one), first as a theatre assistant and then as a dramatic author at a newly created Norwegian national theatre at Bergen. While this job helped him to acquire knowledge about technical aspects of stage craft, in 1857 he came back to Christiania as artistic manager of Norse theatre and wrote a number of plays in verse. In 1858, he had the fortune of marrying Susanna Thoreson, who was an immensely decent, cordial and supportive lady. She turned out to be a source of immense love and strength and the two gave birth to a son whom they named Sigurd. Despite frustrations of his earlier career, she continued to encourage him in all possible ways and protect his interests. It was she who dissuaded him from spending too much time on painting. Between 1858 and 1864, Ibsen wrote plays like *The Vikings in Helgeland, On the Uplands, Love’s Comedy* and *The Pretenders*, but could not go beyond moderate success. In 1864, with a feeling of disappointment, he left his country to live in a self-imposed exile at Germany and Italy. In his own words, “It is often evident to me that there is nothing left in our country for any one gifted with mind and heart to do, but to retreat like the wounded deer into thicket, to die in solitude and silence.” In 1866, his *Brand* was the first play to make him internationally famous, followed by its direct opposite *The Peer Gynt* (1867). In 1869, he finished *The League of Youth* and became important enough to represent his country as a cultural ambassador in the opening of Suez Canal. His famous historical play *Emperor and Galilean*, came in 1873. In 1877, his first dramatic triumph came in the form of *Pillars of Society*. In 1879, he shook the entire Europe with his *A Doll’s House*. This began his journey as an earth shaker with such plays as *Ghosts* (1881), *An Enemy of the People* (1882), *The Wild Duck* (1884), *Rosmersholm* (1886), *The Lady from the Sea* (1888) and *The Master Builder* (1892). Notwithstanding his growing age, he continued wielding
his pen to produce plays like *Little Eyolf* (1894), *John Gabriel Borkman* (1896) and *When We Dead Awaken* (1899). In 1901, he suffered a heavy paralytic stroke which snatched away his power to hold the pen even and finally Ibsen breathed his last in 1906.

Poet, Painter and dramatist interested in folklore, Norse sagas and history, Ibsen covered countless miles in his dramatic journey spanning more than 50 years. While he became an international celebrity with a number of medals glittering on his chest, his work came out to be widely translated, read, staged and commented upon across the world. In England William Archer’s innumerable articles full of uncritical adulation made Ibsen a house-hold name. In Germany Georg Brandes, and in America literary giants like Henry James and Arthur Miller dwelt abundantly on Ibsenic methods and contents. In whole of Scandinavia, as also in England and Germany, his ideas were so indigestible and unintelligible in the beginning that theatre-lovers went to the extent of pelting stones at his performances. Ibsen was too bold and unconventional for the closed society both in Europe and Scandinavia. But such odium against him could not continue for a long time.

Initial attempts to understand Ibsen were made in the narrow confines of Marxism, Socialism and Fabianism. Eleanor Marx, daughter of Karl Marx, best known as one of the early translators of Ibsen’s plays, read Nora’s domestic predicament as a metaphor for exploitation and expression of labour where women are the creatures of the unorganised tyranny of men. But, her attempt could not go beyond propaganda because she failed to see and note Ibsen’s belief that spiritual revolution was prior to social change. Similarly, critics over the last 100 years or so have been making attempts to compartmentalise Ibsen’s work such as studying him in historical perspective and fixing his place in British, European or Modern Drama etc.
To begin with a few illustrations, Martin Lamm attempts to study Ibsen's work in the broad spectrums of Modern drama. While he finds Eugene Scribe and Heiberg as his first teachers of technique, he also finds Shakespearean and Kierkegaardian influence on his work. Labelling *Lady Inger of Ostrat, The Feast at Solhaug, Emperor and Galilean* as plays about Norwegian history and folklore, Martin Lamm states that *Brand* is the climacteric of Ibsen's fortunes, with Peer Gynt as direct anti thesis of *Brand*. With his first social play, *Pillars of society*, Ibsen started making use of stage as a pulpit to preach sermons and in that he follows the younger Dumas and Augier. Though influenced by the French, yet he took pains to avoid their grossest errors and misconceptions. "In stating a problem, working out a plot, drawing a character or writing dialogue Ibsen was developing the technique of French drama." In his opinion *Ghosts* is a realistic drama, *The Wild Duck* is a psychological accuracy and *Rosmersholm* is a political composition about human beings. In *Lady from the Sea* and *Hedda Gabler*, Ibsen was unsure of his way and with *The Master Builder*, he entered into autobiographical phase. Talking about the technical aspects, Lamm opines that Ibsen succeeded in reducing the number of characters and followed the methods of retrospective analysis as in Greeks. His tendency to deal in symbols is from neoclassical and romantic schools as emphasised in the following lines.

Ibsen was the starting-point from which dramatists set out at the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries, and his influence is still felt to-day. He did not wish himself to be associated with any particular literary group, and in this he was right. He was affected by ideas and tendencies current in his day, but his work is an artistic whole in itself... He has become the great classic of modern drama.

G.B. Shaw, no doubt, made a significant mark in his assessment of Ibsen in *The Quintessence of Ibsenism*. Although he states that Ibsenism cannot be reduced to a formula yet his Ibsenism lies in anti-idealistic bias, technical revolution which generates discussion and debate through unsettled and conflicting ideas, his innovation of a new genre of a tragedy without tears to
salvage theatre that had deluged the stages of melodrama and the piece bien
faite. His Ibsen is a superb technician, an intellectual didactician and modern
realist whose meaningful credibility challenges the sufficiency of Shakespeare.
His Ibsen is not a social reformer but a practical Shavian realist. Allardyce
Nicoll, in his historical survey, attempts to see Ibsen's place and influence on
British drama vis-à-vis other continental dramatists. In his opinion, Ibsen's
leadership lies in his becoming the stern monitor of his times:

Ibsen wove together the tragedy of the individual soul with the
tremendous forces which move in social life like some blind
destiny searing and destroying, mankind in their disastrous path
seeming no more than an insect fluttering ineffectually against
the mighty barriers which loom up against it. In Ibsen we have
not merely domestic tragedy, but social tragedy, the forces of
life forming dominating  \textit{dramatis personae} who move unseen
across the stage and raise the whole work to the level of the
greatest tragic passion.\textsuperscript{5}

Instead of charming the audience by a set of exciting incidents, Ibsen added a
new frankness and subtlety in showing to his contemporaries many methods of
securing inwardness. Although his influence up to 1890 was by no means far
reaching, yet in comparison to German Frederic Hebbel, Norwegian
Bjornstjerne, Swedish August Strindberg and Russian Anton Chekov, Ibsen
remains the chief and the most important figure, Nicoll opines. Michael Mayer's
exhaustive presentation of Ibsen essentially as a man of theatre than as a man
of print is a monumental work on the dramatist. It is a thorough account of
obstacles that made Ibsen such a late developer. Meyer rejects the narrow
nationalistic standpoint taken by Halvdan Koht in his biography of Ibsen and
takes him to task for missing a number of vital and interesting factual details
about Ibsen. Meyer reconsiders Ibsen's development as a man and as a writer
both intrinsically and historically to portray the changing theatrical world of his
time and to show his impact on various countries. In his opinion, Ibsen is, “as
explosive an international force in his field as Darwin, Marx or Freud in theirs.”\textsuperscript{6}

Besides making chronological study of his plays, concentrating on minute
details, Meyer collects facts that lie widely scattered in memoirs, letters, theses and newspapers. His Ibsen is an explorer, who went on undeterred in revolutionising the business of stage craft. Desmond Mac Carthy's study of Ibsen remains focussed on tracing the history of Ibsen's development as a dramatist, who in his opinion, makes his prodigious impression in England as a moral and social rebel. He does not agree with those who think Ibsen first and foremost as a writer of problem plays which contributed to the political and moral agitations of his times. Instead, "His real subject matter was something deeper and more permanent: the soul." Thomas E. Sanders, in his book *The Discovery of drama* views Ibsen's work in the larger context of modern tragedy. Equating his work with modern psychologists Sanders opines, "Sigmund Freud, Soren Kierkegaard and Henrik Ibsen saw each man as a distinct individual toiling in the mutual vineyard but heir to his own unique harvest." F.L. Lucas, while making an in depth analysis of Ibsen's plays from their origins to final performances ultimately limits his focus on comparing and contrasting Ibsen with Strindberg. In his opinion, the two are alike in that both began as unhappy children, both had a flair for painting, both of them veered between romanticism and realism, in their love of dream and love of past, both were vigorously stoned by their countrymen and both spent much of their times in lonely exiles. But the contrasts and clashes between them went far deeper. "Not only was Strindberg, for Ibsen one of the younger generation aggressively knocking at the door. By temperament also the two remained fundamental antagonists." Strindberg was infuriated at Nora's desertion of her children. While Ibsen read little of his contemporaries in general, except for some special purpose, Strindberg read voraciously in the most varied fields. The critical Ibsen would write draft after draft with abundant time for brooding and incubation, Strindberg often flung himself on a subject like a tiger, executed it and passed on. While Ibsen did draw from personal experiences, Strindberg wrote little that was not autobiography. While Ibsen "was self possessed, Strindberg was possessed." G. Wilson Knight attempts to study the playwright in the light of Ibsen's own foreword to the 1898 edition of his works in which Ibsen states that only by
comprehending his entire production as a related continuous whole that one can receive the intended striking impression of various parts. Therefore, he finds a continuous development of Ibsen's mind beginning with 'trials of strength', 'poetic quests', 'the third empire' culminating into the 'imprisoned souls', 'sea and death' and the 'ascent'. G.Wilson Knight sums up as, "Despite his social interests, Ibsen's dramas concentrate primarily on individuals and the cosmos." Hans Heiberg in his biography of Ibsen gives us a more personal picture of Ibsen both as an artist and as a human being before he became a mask. In his detailed study of Ibsen's life, Hans Heiberg dwells at length on his native place, childhood, formative years, early struggles, his inner clarity, successful years at Italy, the great scandal, women who influenced him and finally the evening of his life. Although, his book does not offer any additional material for research into Ibsen's literary worth, yet it offers valuable insights into Ibsen's tender heart beneath grim exterior. Ronald Gaskell examines Ibsen's acumen in the broad frame-work of European theatre. Although he compartmentalises Ibsen's work into categories like 'naturalistic drama' and 'subjective drama', besides analysing his single plays like Peer Gynt and Rosmersholm yet thematically he finds no break in Ibsen's work. However, the break can be felt at once between Peer Gynt and prose plays of modern life. Gaskell, while comparing Ibsen with Chekov concludes, "Ibsen's vision is doubtless more intense than Chekov's." Francis Ferguson, a modern critic on drama, seeks to explore Ibsen's place in the art of drama in the changing perspectives. In his richly suggestive book The Idea of Theatre, Ibsen is compared with Chekov as the pioneer of modern drama. He states that Ibsen and Chekov do not enjoy the perspective of myth or of ritual whereby action is both placed and defined in the traditional theatre but, "they are able to define the action they wish to imitate by means of their plots and actions of their plays, having a shape and rhythm of their own, a beginning, middle and end, dictate a dramatic form." Harold Clurman, one of the great directors in the history of American theatre turns the spotlight on Ibsen and finds him as a man of hundred contradictions, whose dilemmas of conscience illuminate the moral
issues that continue to plague mankind today. His recent book titled *Ibsen* gives concise summary of his twenty plays from *A Doll's House* to paint a colourful portrait of the playwright in all his complexity. His study reveals that Ibsen's plays are deeply autobiographical in the sense that they are dramatisations of the emotional, spiritual, social and intellectual life. In his opinion, "His plays reveal the processes of his self-anatomising. The severe discipline of his turbulent subjectivity guides his craft." Errol Durbach disagrees with E.M. Forster in that the latter failed to see that Ibsen had habitually an ironic attitude towards the elements of romanticism. In his opinion, Ibsen's romanticism lies in the protagonists' refusal to affirm external criteria of social reality and the strenuous search after a moral order within to counter the cosmic emptiness and chaos around him. Durbach finds both romantic and counter romantic impulses in Ibsen. He opines that there is, "paradoxical simultaneity of romantic and counter romantic attitudes which make him romantic of extra-ordinary individuality; both celebrant and critic of a vision potentially redemptive and potentially ruinous." The people in Ibsen are possessed by a desperation to restore meaning and style of life, for ever yearning for a miracle. An Indian scholar J.D. Dhingra has seen a very detailed and illuminating relationship between Ibsen and Shaw based on their comparative and contrastive merits. He concludes that Shaw concurred with Ibsen in principle that a complete individual is a law unto itself and that what places such an individual into conflict with stationary established order is the fact of his being the vehicle of a new evolving truth. In his opinion, "Both Ibsen and Shaw were chiefly concerned with the arraignment and trial of the established order for its intrusion into the psyche of the individual." James Walter McFarlane stands out as the most towering critic on Ibsen and his complete oeuvre. McFarlane in his book *Ibsen and meaning: Studies, Essays and Prefaces 1953-87* (1989) gathers the eight introductions from his eight volume *The Oxford Ibsen* series together with six other essays to make a volume which provides Ibsen's career as a whole and for each of his plays, an immensely rich and detailed analysis and series of interpretations. McFarlane's
latest contribution to Ibsen's criticism comes in the form of *The Cambridge companion to Ibsen* which is an exhaustive attempt to view Ibsen from various perspectives namely Ibsen's dramatic apprenticeship, historical drama, dramatic and non dramatic poetry, comedy, realistic problem drama, feminism and so on.

In the recent years, there is a resurgence of Ibsen's critics with various allegiances to external codes. Critics are using mythological, phenomenological, psycho-analytic, structural and semiotic approaches to analyse Ibsen's plays. For instance, Errol Durbach's recent book *A Doll's House: Ibsen's Myth of Transformation* (1991) elaborates the literary and historical context of the play and then develops a sustained and compelling interpretation by considering translation, visual metaphors, performance, form and genre, dramatic structure and techniques and thematic issues related to redefinition and transformation of the self. While present day critics find interpolation of comedy and tragedy in his work, Robin Young states that, "... no Ibsen play however grim is without moments of humour." Thus critical evaluations of Ibsen over the last 100 years have been done in the light of broad historical, mythological, theatrical and social contexts. It is on the basis of these approaches that different critics have divided Ibsen's work in to three, four and even five categories. It is worth while to quote, for instance, M.C. Bradbrook who has categorised Ibsen's plays in to four different periods:

His work falls, therefore, into four main groups: First, the 'prentice work, the making of the artist which grew out of Norway: then the early work of his exile, poetry and satire, still closely connected with his former experiences. Then the great series of plays from *A Doll's House* to *Hedda Gabler*, in which the poet and the Norwegian, suppressed but intensely active worked underground like Ibsen's miner but are clearly discernible none the less. These plays, it may be said, were written at the Norwegians. Finally, come the visionary plays. ^\(^{18}\)

But merely categorising Ibsen's work into periods, without having a peep into Ibsen's mind as well as the times in which he was born and grew up will be to
do an injustice to his appreciation both as a man and as a dramatic seeker of freedom. To my mind, the richest storehouse of information lies in Ibsen's own letters and pronouncements made from time to time and they are the most authentic sources to throw light on Ibsenism, if it is to be taken as a creed. As for the times in which he grew up, it must be stated at the outset that there was no dearth of new ideas in his times. While the entire Europe was undergoing political revolutions, Norway was still struggling to come out of its long slumber. Norwegian people were still very backward and they lived like mules and asses. However, the times during which Ibsen wrote were the most fertile for sprouting the seeds already sown in respect of aiming at developing a new dignity of mankind. While in the 1860s, the whole of Europe was stirred by intellectual revolutions, the political ideology of Karl Marx, the religious theories of Soren Kierkegaard, the social writings of August Comte and John Stuart Mill and above all Charles Darwin's The Origin of Species gave powerful tremors to the age old Christian tenets and beliefs in respect of religion and morality. Ibsen's creative years coincided with all these disturbing processes as it is but natural for a sensitive mind like that of Ibsen to 'wander from romanticism to naturalism and from naturalism to symbolistic experiments.' Although Ibsen was never a voracious reader yet he could not help assimilating the impact of turbulent times and as such the turbulence of times finds its fullest expression in his plays. But this is not to state that Ibsen is like Chaucer who satisfies himself by painting a photographic and realistic picture of his society. He is also not like Addison, the vocal and moral monitor of his age. No doubt, Ibsen grapples with themes such as the impact of heredity, social conventions, dead past working as living present recurrently yet throughout his dramatic career, his focus has always been on the individual struggling, of course heroically, against all those forces which block his freedom and path to self-realisation. In Ibsen's view, there is something wrong with the entire social and moral system because each of his individuals turns out to be a victim of one institution or the other, against which he has to wage a relentless battle to come out free. It is in this context that he writes in one of his letters, "There is no better way in which you can
benefit the society you belong to than by coining the metal you have in
yourself." Therefore, almost all of Ibsen’s characters reach the precipice in
the journey of their life wherein they decide to coin the metal they have in
themselves. They become rebels not in the sense that they indulge in
bloodshed or violence but in that they shake the very foundations of the
institutions which have so far shaped their destinies. They stand with new
ideological cudgels to face the suffocating, stifling, nerve-breaking hindrances
which have been blocking their freedom. Each of Ibsen’s characters then
comes out before us on toes in his or her search from freedom. And the
freedom sought is not political, moral, social or economic. Instead, it is
psychological freedom, freedom of the spirit which feels crumpled and crushed
under the heavy burden of external codes. Each of his characters seeks a sort
of release from the bondage to fly free to realise him or herself.

While critics both in the past as well as in the recent times tend to study
Ibsen in parts, finding a recurrence of certain themes to state that the entire
work of Ibsen is a dramatic whole yet the ideal very dear to Ibsen’s psyche i.e.
spiritual revolution in the heart of man has not been adequately focussed upon.
In my view one theme upon which the edifice of whole dramatic empire stands
is the search for freedom on the part of Ibsen’s characters. Each character
continues to sing the song of freedom, howsoever difficult it may be to give it a
lyrical shape. Since the theme of freedom is related directly to the psyche of
the characters, no single perspective study can adequately bring out the pain
and pathos, the struggle and the grit and search and acquisition of much
sought-after freedom. Ibsen’s world is thickly populated with persons like
Brand, Julian, Dr. Stockman, Nora, Helmer, Pastor Manders, Mrs. Alving, Dr.
Rank, Oswald, Dr. Wangel, Ellida, Bolette, Rosmer, Beata, Rebecca, Solness,
Ragnar and Aline, who feel suffocated, stifled and constricted in their
suppressive environment. Keeping in view the gigantic size of Ibsen’s world, a
multi-perspective study is more yielding to understand and define the contours
of the search for freedom, with which Ibsen’s characters are inextricably related.
Since Ibsen is not a seeker of political freedom which he finds very limiting, the present thesis analyses the search for freedom in the light of principles culled out of humanistic psychology. The perspectives and paradigms used in the analysis of freedom quest have been taken from, thinkers, psychologists, philosophers and visionaries like Pascal, Sigmund Freud, Alfred Adler, Carl Gustav Jung, Jean Paul Sartre, Abraham Maslow, Erich Fromm, George Alexander Kelly, Rollo May, Eric Berne, Fritz Perle and Sri Aurobindo.

Although, the theme of freedom is recurrent in his entire work, yet from his mammoth oeuvre comprising 26 plays and a number of poems, I have taken five plays in which this theme is ubiquitous and pervasive. To show his seminality through these five plays, I have gone in for analysis to the hilt, which may seem to some readers a detailed overkill but it is deliberate because threads and filaments of freedom and the obstacles that come in the way are so enmeshed together that they can only be sorted out through indepth cartography of the major characters in action in the dynamics of their complicated relationships. Therefore, I have attempted to go in for psychological revisioning (Italics for emphasis) of the major characters in the five plays with sustained focus on the textual analysis. Sometimes I have twined the perspectives, other times I have meshed three perspectives in a triple twine to reach at the inner most psychological processes to have a better and fuller glimpse of the search for freedom. Moreover, the seeds sown in respect of the freedom theme in other plays find their fullest flowering in these five plays and hence the focus on this selection.

Chapter II examines the search for freedom in respect of two major characters namely Nora and Torvald Helmer who appear before us in marital relationship. The pre-freedom personality of Nora has been dissected using scalpels of phony, phobic, impasse, implosive and explosive layers of personality as postulated by Fritz Perle, one of the significant pioneers of Gestalt therapy. It is on the basis of these layers that Nora develops child-
parent or parent child and child-child relationships with her husband and family. In order to expand these modes of relationships, transactional psychology of human relationships as enunciated by Eric Berne has been pressed into service. Nora’s relationship with her husband has been analysed as born out of her ego-state of childhood which Eric Berne terms as 'Archaeopsychic'. She manages everything out of this ego-state, which is synonymous with fears and hopes. Nora, therefore, looks forward for some magic help at the time of crisis, if ever it befalls. In this hope, she even takes several risky steps, without understanding their real implications and fits herself in the role model which her father has created for her. Eating macaroons stealthily, playing child-child games like hide and seek with children, looking forward with joy to a hike in husband’s salary are all expressions of Archeopsychic ego-state. Her acceptance of the phony layer of her husband’s personality throws her in to the phobic layer of her personality and therefore, she prefers to live and act according to pre-fabricated notions and ideas. In this phobic layer, she has to sacrifice her happy spirits because she has to pass through a number of difficult phases. But when her phobias assume the shape of real anxieties, she begins to view things in different perspective, which is entirely at variance with her earlier perceptions. And yet, she continues to pin hopes on Helmer. But while writhing under the pressure of Krogstad from whom she had borrowed money to save her husband’s life, she owns full existential responsibility for her actions. It is here that she inches towards adult behaviour which in Berne’s terminology is ‘neopsychic ego-state’. But when Helmer behaves exactly opposite to what she had been dreaming all along, she stands almost benumbed and therefore, enters into an impasse layer. The moment Helmer attacks her parentage i.e. her father’s influence on her, she comes out of this impasse to enter into her implosive layer. Already a number of implosions have entered her psyche when during her conversation with Krogstad and Mrs. Linde, she asks many sensible questions about the duties and privileges of a daughter and a wife in respect of father and husband. She finds inadequacies in law, religion, ethics and social conventions. Finally, when Helmer challenges her right to
motherhood in that he will not permit her to go near children lest they should acquire the evil influence of forgery and withdraws the challenge the moment Krogstad offers to take back the letter, she finds an unbridgeable gap between her aspirations and stark realities of life. The gap naturally brings her to what Fritz Perle describes as the explosive layer. She at once removes her fancy dress and comes to her real self to develop an adult-adult relationship. She feels that she has been wronged. She is no more the 'contained' in Jungian sense of the term. She seeks to review and redefine her relationship with Helmer and comes to the conclusion that slamming the door of her husband is the best course of action open for her as Helmer is not the sort of person who can allow full flowering of the adult-adult relationship or neopsychic ego-state. It is by crossing the phony, phobic, the impasse and the implosive layers and by transcending the ego-state of childhood that Nora fights against the stumbling blocks which come before her in the shape of male dominated society with all its rotten social conventions and double code of morality. Only then, she is able to stand alone to take her first step on road to freedom which is certainly existential in nature and scope.

As for Helmer's search for freedom is concerned, his attempt to see himself as a free man has been analysed using Jungian archetypes of 'Persona', 'Shadow', 'Anima' and 'Self' along with Sri Aurobindoian concept of the frontal self. Since Helmer remains glued to his shadow traits, persona and fictitious self, he can not connect with his anima and develop 'Synpados'. He cannot experience self-affirmation, self-assertion and self-enlargement. In terms of family dynamics, his vision remains blurred. He attempts to apply the laws and codes which are entirely irrelevant and alien to the family situation. He fails to feel the warmth of human relationships born out of primary bonds and therefore, he has to blubber like a helpless maniac and writhe at Nora's feet in a prostrate manner. For such a man, freedom remains a far cry.
Since a fairly good number of psychological concepts have been applied, it will be in the fitness of things to briefly explain their meanings in the introduction itself although their connotations have been discussed in depth and detail during the development of the argument propre in the chapter itself.

Anima: The feminine archetype in men. It includes both positive and negative characteristics of the transpersonal female. In a positive sense, the anima involves a sense of warmth and intuitive understanding. In a negative sense, it involves moodiness and irritability.

Archaeopsychic ego-state: Colloquially speaking, it is that ego-state which corresponds to the thinking behaviour and actions of a child who is always looking forward to some magic helper.

Archetype: It is universal theme or symbol that can be activated by forces operating in the psyche, thereby generating visions that are projected on to current experiences.

Ego-state: In technical language, an ego-state is described as phenomenologically as a coherent system of feelings and operationally as a set of coherent behaviour patterns. In practical terms, it is a system of feelings accompanied by a related set of behaviour patterns. An ego-state is a psychological reality.

Explosive layer: This layer is exhibited when one is in a position to give fullest expression to one's joys, sorrows or pain. In this layer, one explodes like a bomb.

Impasse: It stands for a state of mind when an individual stands bamboozled, benumbed, confused and does not understand how to confront the crisis.

Implosive layer: When one feels vulnerable to feelings and is unable to express them, one a said to be in implosive layer of neurosis.

Neopsychic ego-state: It is exhibited as an expression fully rational, processed and responsible adult behaviour.
Persona: It is an archetype consisting of the role human beings play in order to meet the demands of others. The persona also allows them to express their innermost feelings in ways acceptable to other people.

Phobic layer: This layer refers to obsessive thinking about fear both real and imaginary.

Phony layer: It is a neurotic tendency of phantasy enactment because this layer gives birth to lot of game playing to avoid reality.

Psyche: For Jung, it is a construct that represents all of the interacting systems within human personality that are needed to account for the mental life and behaviour of the person.

Psychic ego-state: Refers to the parental mode of critical thinking. It corresponds to Freudian concept of super ego. It enables the individual to act effectively and it makes many responses automatic which conserve a great deal of time and energy.

Self: It refers to an archetype that leads people to search for ways in which to maximise the development of their potential.

Shadow: It refers to the inferior, evil and repulsive side of human nature.

Chapter III dwells upon the search for freedom in respect of Mrs. Alving (formerly Helen) and Pastor Manders, who are the two central characters. For analysis of their search for freedom, Kelly's theory of personal constructs and prominent concepts of existentialism as propounded by Jean Paul Sartre, Albert Camus, Heidegger along with Vedantic postulates have been harnessed. Abraham Maslow's 'psychology of being' has been applied to reach at the warp and woof of the search for freedom. As for Mrs. Alving, she can't develop her 'Proprium' due to the conditioning and programming at the hands of Pastor Manders, under whose patronage she has been sent to by her mother and aunts. So rigorous, austere and puritanical is Pastor's world that she is unable to give an expression to her imaginative cravings which require an expression during formative years of life as naturally as leaves come to a tree. Therefore,
she develops a number of personal constructs which are either pre-emptive or constellatory. Unfortunately, her constructs remain impermeable due to strict discipline and ethos of Pastor’s religion. When married to Captain Alving, her constructs come into conflict with those of the Captain. It is because Captain’s constructs are based on that mode of life which aims at enjoyment through sexual bouts. The clash between the two is natural because Mrs. Alving’s constructs have the foundational bricks made of ‘duty’ ‘divine will’ ‘order’ and ‘perfection’ with focus on negation of biological urges. For full one year, she remains dizzy, unable to understand and find some rallying point within the two worlds—one, of the Pastor and the other, of the Captain. Feeling suffocated and stifled, she quits Captain’s house and runs away to the Pastor to take shelter in her old construct system. In existential parlance, it is an act of bad faith because instead of reaching the palpitating core of reality, she turns to authority figures. In Kelly’s perspective, going back to old constructs, which have become invalid and outdated is a sign of sick person. It is an inauthentic decision, therefore bound to result in despair. In her flight to him, she becomes an extension and continuation of Pastor’s being and even becomes a pastiche. When Pastor refuses to accept her, instead of making some existential choice, she falls for Pastor’s advice which again is an act of bad faith. No doubt, Pastor is her super-ordinate construct yet she has the option of going in for what Kelly calls ‘constructive alternativism’, which she does not take advantage of. Instead of elaborating her construct system, she comes back to the Captain and surrenders before him without leaving her old constructs. She attempts to follow Captain’s constructs by offering herself in a world of make-believe and even becomes Captain’s parody there. By going in for constellatory constructs while retaining the pre-emptive ones, she bows down to convention and gives birth to a male child Oswald. However, now the mother in her comes to the fore and she begins to have a vision of new future, thereby attempts to enter into realm of ‘propositional constructs’. Some movement towards her freedom takes place. She comes to confront the worst of her life’s crisis when her husband produces an illegitimate child through the family servant Joanna and that too
within the four walls of the house. Unable to bear the stigma and agony, she begins to assert and take decisions. As long as her constructs remain impermeable due to the conditioning of the Pastor, she remains chained to custom and society, therefore, can not be on road to freedom. Elaboration of her construct system through reading of advanced books helps her in encountering the worst of crises of her life and thereby, prepares her to enter the realm of existential choices and conscious decisions. Confronted with absurdity of life and consequent anguish, she opts for existential revolt and throws away all the Pastor’s constructs and frees herself.

Pastor’s search for freedom has been viewed in the light of existential concepts like ‘inauthentic living’, ‘clogging of consciousness’, ‘personal constructs’ and Vedanta. Pastor’s life centres on the existential dictum, ‘essence precedes existence’ and his consciousness is clogged under the heavy weight of Christian principles. All his personal constructs have developed out of his orthodox indoctrination in Christianity. He loses his pure consciousness due to his conditioning and as such his life is lost in fear of public opinion. He takes decisions, bases his judgement on rumours, on what others say and without verifying facts. He represses his instincts and therefore, cannot listen to his inner calls which Abraham Maslow calls ‘impulse voices’. Therefore, his entire life becomes inauthentic. He avoids existential choices and becomes a split personality and can not hide his persona which loves body and senses. He himself is responsible for not choosing like a freeman, thereby denying himself the freedom to develop his own culture. He does not understand that there are no absolutes in the world and remains glued to the ‘non productive orientation of life’. Therefore, there can be no question of his freedom. In Vedantic terminology, Pastor’s Chitta (consciousness) has been tainted due to Vrittis (particular inclination) of the mind and as such he cannot realise his ever free soul and surrenders before wily Engstrand. He is sure to become a priest of sexuality in Engstrand’s Seaman’s home. He will have to
open himself up a little, to the reality of life based on human warmth if he wants to be on road to freedom.

Since my analysis of the chapter and the theme of search for freedom have been based on perspectives taken out from humanistic psychology of George Alexander Kelly, Existentialism as propounded by eminent thinkers in the field, it will be appropriate to give in a simple form the meaning of different terms for ready reference for the benefit of a lay reader.

**Absurd:** The dialectic between the being of man and the objective world is termed as the absurd by Albert Camus. It a state which manifests itself in the individual’s realisation, who though attempts to exist as a subject in the world replete with objects. To amplify, it is the cleavage between man’s aspirations to unity and the insurmountable multiplicity of the world. However, Jean Paul Sartre sees the absurd in the meaninglessness of man’s existence in which the perpetual drive toward an unattainable goal is bound to be a failure.

**Bad Faith:** Bad faith is a lie to oneself in the attempt of escaping the anguish of freedom and responsibility. Bad faith comes about in many ways, while this flight from freedom or reality takes place:

**Being-for-itself:** Being-for-itself is human consciousness conceived as a lack of Being, a desire for Being, a relation to Being. In fact, it has numerous characteristics, though in itself at the core is only Nothingness or Freedom. In *Being and Nothingness*, Sartre shows the various ways in which the Being-for-itself expresses itself manifesting itself as lack or desire, seeking satisfaction through ‘possession’, bestowed additionally with the capacity to transcend itself or to a ‘project’ in a manner which is other than the existing states of affairs or situations, most importantly within it is the drive to express itself as a free agent. It is Nothingness (Being-for-itself) out of which all that is of interest and of value in this world is created,
made possible on account of the specific activity of the Being-for-itself, termed as 'negation' or 'nihilation' or 'annihilation'. Such a negating capacity is expressed in interrogation, destruction, negative judgement and in every act of knowledge whatsoever. Being-for-itself is the negation of a massive, dull, inert and full being which is termed as the Being-in-itself.

*Being-in-itself:* Being-in-itself is Non-conscious Being. It is massive, dull, inert full being, with dumb 'packed-togetherness'. In fact, Sartre divides the world into two sorts of beings in his analysis-Being-in-itself and Being-for-itself.

*Constellatory Construct:* It is a type of construct that allows its elements to belong to other constructs concurrently, but once identified in a particular way, these elements are fixed.

*Construct:* It is an abstraction defined in terms of the similarity and contrast of its elements. It corresponds to Allport's 'trait' or ruling passion. Constructs are created when people tend to have symptoms they have read about or seen in other people.

*Freedom:* Freedom is the very being of the Being-for-itself. We are all 'condemned to be free' and 'condemned to choose'. Freedom lies in our making choices. Thus, man is free to liberate or bind himself through individual choices.

*Pre-emptive construct:* It is a type of construct which includes only its elements and maintains that these elements cannot apply to other constructs.

*Propositional Construct:* It is a type of construct that leaves its elements open to alternative constructions thereby allowing the individuals to go in for expansive thinking.

*Superordinate construct:* It refers to the construct that generally controls or subordinates many different constructs. It is the light house, the guiding principle and the chief motivation.
Chapter-IV focuses on search for freedom in respect of Rebecca West and Rosmer, the two central characters in the play *Rosmersholm*. Alfred Adler’s individual psychology, his theory of neurosis and concepts like ‘Birth order effects’, ‘social interest’, ‘inferiority and superiority complex’, ‘individual subjectivity’, ‘will to power’, ‘fictional finalism’, ‘compensation’, ‘masculine protest’, ‘creative self’ and ‘style of life’ have been employed to delve deep into the intricate aspects of Rebecca’s search for freedom. Rosmer’s attempts and search have been analysed in the light of Jungian, Adlerian and Freudian conceptualisations about hampering impact of suppression and repression on an individual’s psyche. To begin with, Rebecca’s journey on road to freedom starts when she comes to Rosmersholm with Dr. West, her foster father. Since her socialisation has been lopsided due to amoral relationship between her mother & Dr. West, she can’t develop ‘social interest’. However, in order to hide her ‘inferiority complex’, she develops a ‘fictional finalism’, the contours of which remain undefined. Making a survey of all factors that can help her in realising her goals, she sets her eyes on the numero-uno of Rosmersholm, who is no other than Rosmer. Like a vamp, she employs a number of strategies to come close to Rosmer. In her obsessive infatuation for him, she sees to it that all obstacles in her way are removed. The biggest barrier turns out to be Rosmer’s wife, Beata. She brings Beata to such a state of mind where in the latter is left with no option but to commit suicide. She creates such a wedge between Rosmer and Beata’s brother Rector Kroll that the two become bitter enemies. In order to gather more support and strength, she makes Rosmer sit with his earlier foes like Mortensgaard and Brendel so that she is able to face the wrath of Rector Kroll. Finally when Rector Kroll strips her naked by revealing her dubious parentage, she stands totally immobilised. An overwhelming sense of guilt engirds her will and therefore she makes a series of confessions about her modus-operandi. Her confession about driving Beata to the mill race produces in her heart a desire to do justice upon herself and therefore, she goes in for drowning herself exactly in the manner Beata did. Such are the results of senseless pursuit of freedom without any value system.
Freedom is certainly not synonymous with ruthless elimination of others for selfish gains.

As for Rosmer's search is concerned, his inability to realize himself has been seen and dissected in the light of Freudian, Adlerian and Jungian enunciations about the impact of restrictive, harsh and suffocating environment on an individual psyche. Rosmer, having grown under rigid strict and puritanical monitoring of his martinet father and stiffening ethos of Rosmersholm turns out to be a neurotic individual. His repressed psyche finds a natural refuge in the person of a seductively enchanting lady Rebecca West. So dazed and hypnotised does he stand before her emancipating ideals and ever-widening contours of future that he breaks off from his past and primary bonds in a quick and abject surrender before her. In order to breathe freely, away from the suffocating environment of Rosmersholm, he too, develops a 'fictional finalism' but instead of testing the credentials of his new found companion, he simply says a good bye to his sense of judgement and becomes responsible for his wife Beata's suicide. Far from reaching anywhere due to his lack of social interest, he becomes psychologically mal-adoptive and ultimately when his eyes are opened to the outcome of his enchantment, he stands guilt-ridden. In order to atone for his sins, he chooses to drown himself to join Beata. Both Rebecca and Rosmer attain sado-masochistic freedom in the end in the sense that they must reap what they have sowed. There can be no question of real freedom if one loses the luxury of the soul with which one is born.

Since the analysis of the chapter has been done using the broad framework of Adlerian psychology, terminological connotations of various Adlerian concepts are being given here for the benefit of the lay reader.

*Birth Order Effects:* Adler believed that each child was treated uniquely by the parents depending upon order of birth within the family. As
a result, order of birth was considered to be an important personality determinant of behaviour.

Creative Self: It is a term used by Adler to reflect his belief that people have the ability actively to create their own destinies and personalities.

Fictional Finalism: This seminal concept refers to the imagined goal that guides the person's behavior.

Individual Psychology: The name for a psychology advocated by Adler that seeks to understand human behavior by recognizing its complexity and organization.

Masculine Protest: It is an attempt by an individual, male or female, to compensate for feelings of inferiority by acting superior.

Overcompensation: It refers to exaggerated attempts by individuals to overcome their feelings of inferiority by acting as though they were superior to others.

Social Interest: It is an innate tendency in human beings to help and cooperate with one another as a means of establishing a harmonious and productive society.

Style of Life: It stands for the distinctive personality pattern of the individual that is clearly established by the end of early childhood.

Superiority: It refers to the individual's striving to attain perfection. For Adler, superiority is categorized into two types, personal superiority and superiority in a perfection sense. Personal superiority is considered harmful because it implies attempts to achieve satisfaction at the expense of others, whereas superiority strivings in the perfection sense are considered healthy because they imply the fulfillment of the individual's potential as a result of helping others.

Teleology: It is Adlerian belief that goals determine behavior. More generally, the doctrine that behavior is directed and shaped by a designing force.
Chapter-V focuses upon Ellida Wangel's search for freedom in the light of existential-analytic perspectives and principles of humanistic psychology as enunciated by Rollo May, Abraham Maslow and Erich Fromm besides Freudian Schema. Ellida's basic conflict between her desire for enlarged awareness and psychological dependence on her environment has been analysed in terms of 'dependency struggle'. In order to established autonomy and identity in her relationship with powerful people, she passes to several stages of consciousness namely 'simple innocence', 'rebellion', 'ordinary consciousness of self' and creative consciousness of the self'. In the first stage of simple innocence is her childhood, as light-house keeper's daughter, in close communion with waters, mountains, ebbs and tides, whale, gulls, carps, dolphins and ships etc. Her formative years of life revolve around physical as well as psychological dependence on everything that is wide, broad, vast and big. As she grows up amidst such environment, her physical dependence on sea decreases and to fill the voids created out of her loss of physical dependence, she develops infatuation for a blue-eyed sailor and begins to spend time in his company talking about the glitter of the sea on sunny days, storms, calms, and feeling that he is of the same kith and kin as the sea creatures. So greatly does she stand enchanted by him that she even marries him by the testimony of the sea. In his company, she feels transported to some different world, a world of innocence, in which she has no will of her own. In fact the presence of the stranger feeds her tendency to remain a child and to cling to the protection of parents or parental substitutes and he stands before her as a power principle and when she meets him it is, what Rollo May calls 'power confrontation'. The second stage of her consciousness develops when the stranger runs miles away from her due to his own compulsions and when alone, she realises the need for satisfaction of her 'basic needs' in the sense Abraham Maslow talks about. Her childhood friend Arnholm does offer to marry her but she rejects his proposal because he is too familiar a person and therefore, does not appeal to her love for the mystery. However, she accepts
the proposal of widower Dr. Wangel, out of 'rebellion' against her own nature. Since there is no guarantee for the stranger to come back to provide for her, she at once agrees with Dr. Wangel's proposal out of security blanket. This decision remains far from authentic because it is born out of her compulsions. But when she comes to live with Dr. Wangel as his wife, she finds a yawning gap between what she had expected and what it has come to be in reality. He turns out to be a man torn between two worlds-the world of responsibility in respect of his two daughters and his personal needs. In Dr. Wangel's house, she feels like a fish out of water or like a carp in a small pond. She can neither relate to Bolette and Hilde (Dr. Wangel's two daughters) nor to Dr. Wangel. As such, she becomes obsessive about the stranger with whom she had gone in for mystic marriage. And when she learns that the stranger is coming to take her along, she compares and contrasts her relationship with the stranger and Dr. Wangel and thereby enters the third stage i.e. 'ordinary consciousness of the self'. Realising that she has to confront reality and make a decision once and for all, she opts for the solution offered by Bolette and out of 'creative consciousness of the self' offers to mother Dr. Wangel's daughters especially Hilde.

Since Bolette and Arnholm are the other two central characters in the play, their search for freedom has also been dwelt upon. As long as Bolette remains glued to her pre-emptive personal constructs, she remains chained to her carp-like existence. But the moment she expands and elaborates her personal constructs to the propositional ones in the light of her desire to become herself, to realise her potentials, she at once agrees with Arnholm's proposal for marriage. This is how, both Arnholm and Bolette come out of their cocoonish shells to realise their freedom. Thus, the search for freedom in respect of Ellida and Bolette is seen in terms of the trajectory from 'innocence' to 'creative consciousness' and from 'pre-emptive constructs' to 'propositional' ones. Finally, their search enters into fruition when Ellida and Bolette embrace
the values of relatedness, rootedness, reason, devotion and imagination as propagated by Erich Fromm.

Since a number of psychological terms has been used in the analysis of the chapter, it will not be out of place to briefly explain their connotations in the introduction itself, although their detailed connotative meanings have been given in the text itself.

**Basic Needs**: According to Abraham Maslow, each one of us has certain basic needs which he enumerates as physiological drives, safety needs, belongingness and esteem needs. Satisfaction of these needs is very necessary for us to move towards authenticity.

**Dasein**: It is a term which existentialists use to describe the unique character of human existence. Each of us can become aware of the fact that we exist in a particular place of a particular time. We can then make our own decisions in a responsible way.

**Existential-analytic perspectives**: Theoretical positions that combine elements of existential philosophy with Freudian concepts as a means of furthering understanding of human personality. Both positions, for example, focus on the ways in which human beings try to cope with the anxieties that result from the inability to love others and from the inevitability of death.

**Humanistic Psychology**: It is a type of psychology primarily concerned with helping individuals to reach their maximum. It is also a psychology that emphasizes and tries to foster the dignity and worth of each human being.

**Meta Needs**: Meta needs are those needs which spring up after one's basic needs have been sufficiently gratified. Maslow describes such needs as the need for self-actualisation and cognitive understanding of reality. These needs refer to a person's curiosity about himself and the working of environment.
Ontology. It is a branch of philosophy which examines the nature of being or reality.

Chapter-VI deals with the theme of search for freedom in the light of two perspectives namely the moral and the occult. Master Builder's personality has been analysed using Erich Fromm's concepts like 'Having mode', 'Being-mode' 'relatedness', 'productive orientation' and 'perspective on reality'. Master Builder's inability to attain autonomy and freedom is seen in the light of his over-dependence on the 'having mode' of life which is exploitative in nature. Cut off from the primary bonds and enmeshed in the non-productive orientation of 'having mode', Master Builder can not come to his authenticity and meets a tragic end.

So lost does he become in this mode that he views all his bonds and relationships in terms of their usefulness to him and to the promotion of his status as Master Builder. So much so, that he severs himself from the primary bonds which are elementary sources of strength for an individual. He exploits his wife and becomes responsible for the death of his small breast feeding children. He becomes not only physically alone but morally alone also. As for his secondary and tertiary bonds are concerned, he concentrates on developing symbiotic relationship with them with a view to have a complete domination over them. In the process, he becomes totally devoid of what Adler calls 'Sub Specie Aeternitais'. As such, since all his energies are focussed on the non-productive orientation of life, he fails to develop his 'self' in terms of productively mental, emotional and sensory responses. There can be no question of his freedom because one can not be free by enslaving others, who be tied to one in family, profession or otherwise.

The moral perspective has been augmented with the occult perspective employing seminal ideas and formulations of Sri Aurobindo. Hilde's connection with the occult is explored. The occult dimension of Master Builder's
personality has been illustrated with the help of Sri Aurobindo’s conceptualisations about Asuras, Rakshasas and Pishachas, as found in his Letters on Yoga.

Since Master builder’s search for freedom has been seen in the light of humanistic psychology of Erich Fromm, it will not be out of place to explain at the very outset the connotations of the terminological expressions as employed in the analysis, although their detailed meanings have been discussed in the text itself.

**Being mode:** Having and being are two fundamental modes of existence, the respective strengths of which determines the differences between the character of individuals and various types of social characters. By being mode, we refer to the mode of existence in which one neither has anything nor craves to have something, but one is joyous. In this mode one employs one’s faculties productively to be one with the world. This mode is associated with to be, to share, to give and to sacrifice. The anxiety and insecurity engendered by the danger of losing what one has are absent in this mode. While ‘having’ is based on something that is diminished by use, ‘being’ grows by practice. It is the glow which lights others. It is the mode which sees essential oneness in every thing.

**Having Mode:** Having mode excludes others. In this mode of existence, there is an unlimited desire to acquire and possess things. Buddha describes it as ‘craving’, the Jewish and the Christians religions define it as ‘coveting’, the Hindus associate it with ‘Moha’. This mode of existence transforms everybody and everything into something dead and subject to another’s power. It means confining, imprisoning or controlling, strangling, deadening, suffocating, killing and not life-giving.
Moral Aloneness: The relatedness to others is not identical with physical contact. An individual may be alone in a physical sense for many years and yet may be related to ideas, values or at least social patterns that give him a feeling of communion and belonging. On the other hand, he may live among people and yet be overcome with an utter feeling of isolation, the outcome of which, if it transcends a certain limit, is the state of insanity. This lack of relatedness to values, symbols, patterns, we may call moral aloneness. Physical aloneness becomes unbearable if it accompanies moral aloneness.

Productive Orientation: In a very broad sense, it has connection with Freud’s ‘genital character’ with type of production common to men and animals. While the capacity for material production is specific for man, in Fromm’s terminology, productive orientation of personality refers to a fundamental attitude, a mode of relatedness in all realms of human experience. It covers mental, emotional and sensory responses to others, to oneself and to things. Productiveness is man’s ability to use his powers and to realise the potentials inherent in him. A mentally and emotionally crippled man can’t have productive orientation.

Sub Specie Aeternitatis: This term refers to Adlerian concept of social interest. In Adler’s opinion, human beings are not merely motivated by selfish gain in respect of Darwin’s doctrine of the survival of the fittest. Instead, he feels that human beings are motivated by an innate social instinct which causes them to relinquish selfish gain for community gain. The desire to shed selfish motives for larger community gain is Sub Specie Aeternitatis.

Symbiotic Relatedness: Symbiotic Relatedness exists between the master and the slave. The dominated person is perceived and
treated as a thing to be used and exploited, not as a human being who is an end in himself. In this relatedness, there is a sadistic drive and impulse to have a complete mastery over the other person to 'swallow him'. It is also characterised by the principle 'eat the orange and throw the peal away'.

Chapter VII i.e. the conclusion collates the findings and attempts a final comprehensive statement on Ibsen's discourse on freedom. Notwithstanding the noxious obstacles which stand as stumbling blocks in the road to freedom, Ibsen's vision of the world is presented in its totality in so far as the interaction of its Inhabitants is concerned. In the search for freedom, several paradigms are highlighted with a view to state that Ibsenic search for freedom is like the Kaisen tradition of Japanese Weltanarchuang, which is synonymous with continuous improvement. Ibsen's view point on freedom is compared and contrasted with that of other eminent freedom thinkers to state that Ibsen emerges as an ardent advocate of freedom. Finally, the conclusion deduces certain principles in respect of Ibsenic ethos of freedom, which can be encapsulated as: Be authentic to awaken the giant within because that is the only road to freedom.

It is with these introductory observations that the textual analysis of the five major plays is taken up.
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