

Chapter-III

Ghost (1881) and An Enemy of People (1882)

Henrik Ibsen pioneered both dramatic idioms of Modern Europe and strongly initiated the sense of rebellion in the European Society. He is therefore rightly regarded as the social thinker and visionary dramatist. He skillfully used theatre as a medium of the expression of his social philosophy and his artistic vision. Drama, for him, emerged as an instrument that could effectively bring modern values, ideas to people. He made progress as an artist from the first phase of his playwriting, when he had written *Catiline*. In this phase, Ibsen focused on the inner motives, on the individual concerns, and on self-realization.

In the second phase, he turned to social issues where he attempted to show the struggle between an individual and society, between an individual with his/her own set of values and society with its own imposing and conventional set of values. However, in the last phase, Ibsen concentrated on the issues of universal significance. He enlarged the compass of his theatre to include universal issues like a man as pawn at the hands of destiny, his struggle against the worldly affairs and quest for identity. During this great span of development as a dramatist, Ibsen remained consistently unsettled with his environment.

To put it mildly, Ibsen was a rebel throughout his life. From *Catiline* to *When We Dead Awaken*, he portrayed characters that rebelled against the society, the state, against the dominating rules and restricting social norms. He projected the characters with their individual set of ideas, values, plan of action and autonomous style living. And interestingly enough, Ibsen appeared to doubt his own convictions. Both his statements, made from time to time and his plays evidently show that he moved between his strong sense of rebellion, his self-assertion and his suspicion of his own ideas, their usefulness. He was full of self-contradictions both as a man and an artist. Almost every play that he wrote seems to be a correction or a rebuttal of the one or several which preceded it. But such contradictions are inevitable because Ibsen was a great and visionary artist.

He was in quest of a binding unity, a dominant truth. His plays reveal the self-realization processes. His rigorous discipline of turbulent subjectivity guides his craft.

It masters the contentions of his spirit and gives his plays a good part of their staying power. The one word that heavily weighed on Ibsen's mind throughout his career as a dramatist was freedom. He counted it more important than anything else to remain true and faithful to oneself. For him, freedom was not a question of willing this or that, but of willing what one must do because one was oneself and could not do otherwise. We can perceive this broad idea of freedom variously expressed in his plays.

I had to bear it for my little boy's sake but when the last insult was added, when my own servant-maid - Then I swore to myself; This shall come to an end. And so I took the reins into my own hand- the whole control over him and everything. For now I had a weapon against him, you see; he dared not oppose me. It was then I sent Oswald from home.

He engaged his characters in perpetual dialectic with themselves, with others, with the society or the world at large. His rebellious spirit and his uncompromising idea of freedom provided the necessary essence and impetus to his plays such reflection could be more easily and effectively perceived in his portrayal of woman characters. He looked upon women as life-force as the embodiment of all the original energy, vitality and devotion.

The counter women, for Ibsen, emerged as the bearers of the strong hatred and rebellious attitude that he had for the traditional world, the conventional society, "the trolls". He looked upon like that section of humanity which had been suffering for ages from neglect, dominance, imposition of severe norms and deprivation of respectable life. This crisis of identity that he was experiencing from within as an artist discovered its outward counterpart in women. The women characters, therefore, in Ibsen's plays represent opposition to tradition, to social norms, to all types of tyranny and dominance.

typical figure of the experienced, intelligent woman who is passing from the first to the last quarter of the hour of history called the nineteenth century has discovered how appallingly opportunities were wasted, morals perverted, and instincts corrupted, not only- sometimes not at all - by the vices she was taught to abhor in her youth, but by the virtues it was her pride and up-rightness to maintain.

Even though we find some sort of variation in the women characters as some of them endure the suffering/hardships and some of them acquiesce to surroundings, yet in the ultimate analysis they function as the willful and strong counterparts to their opponents. They become the conductors of Ibsen's sense of rebellion, of freedom and of unmanageable life. It does not mean that they do not have their independent, separate existence/identity beyond their creator's sphere. They are very much independent, willing to venture, taking initiative into new modes of existence. The only thing is that they are motivated by their creator's vision of life, and it is that one should be bold and true to yourself and that you can find your own way of life.

In the present study on Ibsen's women, the researcher has attempted to examine the different faces of women in the selected plays from this perspective. The present study makes it evident that Ibsen's women characters emerge in different forms and with different motivations but the real energy of endurance, opposition, submission or self-assertion is drowned from Ibsen's Idea of rebel and freedom. All these different women, with their different appearances and motives, struggle very hard to realize their aim, their dream and their destination. Some of them go to the extent of abandoning their familiar environment and plunge into the insecure world and some of them continue to stay with their familiar world and cope with the changing situations.

But in both these cases of breaking away from the world and coping with the world, these women try to rediscover their freedom, their identity, and their space which can establish them on the firm footing of the truth rather than an illusion. These are the apparently different and opposite modes that Ibsen creates in his plays through the women characters try to rediscover their independence, their endeavors to find their space. Some women characters add to their strength. It is very remarkable to note that Ibsen succeeds in showing how the women characters add to their own burdens in their endeavors to find their space. Some women characters prove hurdles in the road to self-realization. In short, Ibsen's women characters emerge from the base of freedom, rebellion, uncompromising nature and quest for self-identity.

Ghosts (1881)

Ghosts happens to be an important play and one of the most scrutinized plays in literature ever in the sense that it orients us towards a new direction of self-

realization. It not only comments on the inheritance of family diseases and the history of family evil but also comments on the endurance power of an individual who submits to the pressures and yet endeavors to regain her-self-esteem. In the play Ibsen lay great stress upon the standards of genetic blame between father and son. He truly considers the cluttered human psychology and examinations tenaciously the regular connection between the two siblings and a couple.

That has been my ceaseless struggle, day after day. After Oswalds birth I thought Alving seemed to be a little better. But it didn't last long. And then I had to struggle twice as hard, fighting for life or death, so that nobody should know what sort of a man my child's father was - I had gone on bearing with him, although I knew very well the secrets of his life out of doors.

We do not have the new and modern woman here like Nora who breaks away from constraining conditions but a wife and a mother who cares more about the image of her dead husband and the future of her diseased son. It is not that Mrs. Alving is tied completely with the family tradition and social norms. She has her own set ideas, and she dares to break away from certain norms of behavior. In other words, she is a unique combination of conventions and convictions. Ibsen presents a very different face of a woman in this play. The play is an advance over *A Doll's House* because it shows a different face of woman and at the same time reveals the multiple layers of humanity. The play covers and focuses the filial duties of Mrs. Alving, her relation to her husband and her diseased son.

Ibsen must cultivate the segregation of sexual orientation by delineating the male and female characters in the light of the Norwegian bourgeois traditions and values of the nineteenth century. As a self-serving critic cum-social reformer of his age, the dramatist reveals the terrible picture of the filth atmosphere. In his play, he must uncover the emptiness and the lie of conventional quality, in particular the void of regular marriage and family life in the middle class. Ibsen demonstrates contemporary social problems: the fraud of family life, the subordinate and subordinate status of women and corruption in family, social and common enterprises are regarded as irregular at the time. The fundamental opponents who are looked with traditions, hypocrisy, and sexual energy, and power, the marriage of convenience, corrupted press, and personal stake are included with hereditary guilt

In *Ghosts*, the main female character is Mrs. Helene Alving who functions in the role of wife. She discovers that her husband was unfaithful to her. He occupied a high position at court- that of Chamberlain, a title which entails certain duties and privileges at the court. However, in reality, he was nothing but a rogue. When she discovered his cheating initially, she was in despair and decided to escape. If *A Doll's House* ends with Nora walking out the door, Mrs. Alving's story in *Ghosts* begins precisely with such 'leave-taking'. Her escape from the abusive relationship becomes not only a protest against her husband but also a remonstrance against the social environment and its patriarchal code, which shuts its eyes to woman's mistreatment in the family. In this respect, Mrs. Alving's character gains strong features. She takes a step against the patriarchal order by trying to run away. However, the escape never takes place. Ibsen does not give his heroine enough courage to fulfill her plan. Having left her home, Mrs. Alving goes to no one else but Pastor Manders for counseling, who tells her to perform her duty as a wife and return to her husband. Thus, as events later demonstrate, Mrs. Alving succumbs to the authority of the patriarchal order by following Manders instructions on all issues. Hence, her strength becomes only an illusion.

A Doll's House and in *Ghosts* the subject is the lie in domestic life; the first shows the destruction of a marriage by an unreal and insincere relationship between husband and wife, and the second the destruction of the lives and souls of the characters by the oppressive tyranny of convention. There is a ray of hope still in *A Doll's House*; in *Ghosts* there is no consolation but the integrity of mind to which Mrs. Alving has won her way through the wreckage of her life.

Bound by society's norms and principles, Mrs. Alving returns home to her husband and tries everything possible to conceal the vile nature of their marriage, at least on the surface. The only way for her to survive is to overcome her husband, to occupy his place in the house, that is, to become the man of the house. To explain her actions, Ibsen develops the fate of runaway wives. A conversation between Pastor Manders and Mrs. Alving reveals Pastor's sudden estrangement from the house of the Alving's after Mrs. Alving made an attempt to escape. The heroine herself understands the reason for this estrangement. Mrs. Alving has realized that the only

way to achieve something in society is to work in the shadow of her husband, who, despite his debauchery and drinking habits, still occupied a high social position.

It is also important to note that in *Ghosts*, Ibsen further develops the theme of hereditary transmission of the predecessors' sins to subsequent generations. Mrs. Alving attempts to keep her child away from his father so that he inherits neither his father's disease nor his dissolute behavior. She is even determined that her son inherits none of his father's money. Mrs. Alving calculates the exact sum of her husband's estate and puts it into an orphanage, intending to have Oswald benefit it only from her account. Therefore, Mrs. Alving consents to live in the shadow of her husband in order to earn money and provide for her son. Hence, her motivation for becoming a strong woman, theoretically capable of living on her own, is conditioned by feminine motives, i.e., the maternal instinct to protect her child. Ibsen uses Mrs. Alving to show that woman has the potential to lead and occupy traditional masculine positions; however, due to the deeply noted ghosts of patriarchal ideology in society, she might not have a chance to prove herself or fully develop her potential without risk of becoming an outcast.

Observing the play *Ghosts* supports Belsey's belief that man-controlled society forced control over female sexuality and prevented women from state control and "inconsistent" their situation in the family. The other fundamental subject of the play is the silencing of female sexual independence in order to guarantee the power it desperately seeks in a man-centric society. Power and sexuality are inseparably linked in the play. *Ghosts* has a female character in which Johanna does not appear on stage. It is expressed in a dramatic dialogue between Pastor Manders and Mrs. Alving. Mrs. Alving, the protagonist, describes Johanna while revealing to Pastor Manders her better half of the indecent exercises. Mrs. Alving says she had a strong physical fascination with women in the general public. Johanna, who worked as a housekeeper of the Alving Heritage, succumbed to sexual subjugation and came to Captain Alving's attention. She tells Pastor Manders about the unsocial behavior of her husband that she would live with Captain Alving despite his masochism. Mrs. Alving saw that he was pulled substantially towards Johanna. She watched illegal sexual enterprises from the lounge area one day. She worked practically around then. She heard her very own servant whisper at the door: "Stop it, Mr. Alving! Alving! Alving! She felt a lot of pain hearing their discussion. In this way, their physical

relationship progressively began to grow. In one stage his physical relationship with Johanna evolved. Johanna could not challenge her master, where she was subjected to sexual abuse. She did not dispose of his wrongdoing. In fact, Johanna appeared to be a disappointed woman of her age and was not helped by society, where she was restricted to the cover. She was an absolute victim of Captain Alving 's strong idea and was brutally abused and tormented by sexual violence and assault. We can understand Captain Alving 's sexual behavior and indecent actions by Johanna 's voice: "Let me go, Engstrand! Stop it! Stop it! I've been in service with Chamberlain Alving at Rosenvold for three years, and you don't overlook it! "

"I almost think we are all of us ghosts, Pastor Manders. It's not only what we have inherited from our father and mother that "walks" in us. It's all sorts of dead ideas, and lifeless old beliefs, and so forth. They have no vitality, but they cling to us all the same, and we can't get rid of them. Whenever I take up a newspaper, I seem to see ghosts gliding between the lines. There must be ghosts all the country over, as thick as the sand of the sea. And then we are, one and all, so pitifully afraid of the light.

It is clear that Johanna was both a mistress and a servant in the house of Alving. When she got pregnant, Mrs. Alving forced Engstrand to marry Johanna by giving him three hundred dollars to fend off social humiliation, and Engstrand also accepted the chance, although from a social perspective it was a revolting crime. However, Mrs. Alving disguises her husband's wicked demonstrations with the aim that her only child Oswald does not fall victim to the shocking conditions. Johanna was referred to in this play as a 'degenerate' character.

Catharine Mackinnon 's accompanying speeches are also very appropriate for this study. Mackinnon argues that sexuality lays down sex. There is therefore no distinction between sex and sexual ideas; men and women do not exist outside the eroticisation of strength and subordination. As Mackinnon (1982) points out:

Therefore, sexuality is a type of intensity. Gender, as it is socially constructed, does not turn around. Women and men are isolated by gender, as we know them, by the social conditions of heterosexuality that govern male sexual strength and female sexual accommodation. If so, sexuality is the cornerstone of gender disparity. (Michel F (1978) *Sexuality History*, Vol.1, 104-105).

If we consider poor Johanna's deadly conditions, we can see that this is a powerful argument. Sexuality is seen as a key type of oppression of women, or only one type of oppression. In this way, Captain Alving's sexual strength and Johanna's sexual accommodation could be linked to Mackinnon's decisions. In any event, many feminists agree that women need much greater power over their own bodies and sexuality. Ibsen also spread the argument and the struggle for the presence of the rights of his contemporary wife. In the field of writing, these types of characters have played an important role in his important compositional plays, in which the playwright emphasized female oppression and trapped the connections of different strings by affecting a personality of genuflected employment. We don't see Captain Alving on the stage in the play *Ghosts*. We can understand his inclination and conduct from Mrs Alving conversation with Pastor Manders about his indecent and evil character. Mrs. Alving's view of her husband can also be clarified by Belsey's belief that the appearance of female sexuality is a threat to manly social demand.

Certainly, Ibsen intends to show Captain Alving as a careless person having no love for his family. He showed no concern for his wife. Though "society would think of him as one of his columns" in reality he is "a dissolute person", "a drunkard," a profligate and a fool. He had no qualms in seducing his servant. He was a social predator, morally corrupt. He had no family disgrace. He was a masochistic type of person. From a social perspective Captain Alving depraved indulgences and rakish behavior cannot be validated in any civilized society. And therefore, to put in a perspective for a better understanding, Ibsen foregrounds it in the social substances of the custom and manner of the day. In the delineation of Mr. Alving, Ibsen uncovered the Scandinavian structure of life, culture, network and society in the nineteenth century. If anyone takes care of the deeper thoughts and thoughts of his filth\identity, he would undoubtedly understand the inner truth why Captain Alving had been involved in sexual exercises with the maid. The puzzle can be conceived in the inner psychology at this point. The physical interest anticipated by Captain Alving from Ms. Alving was not good enough. His wife, however, could not satisfy her husband's physical and mental fascination. In this way, we can detect that such shocking frequencies can occur in every human culture. Although Captain Alving has been denounced from a social and religious point of view, still Mrs. Alving can in no more be held responsible for the sexual relationship between Captain Alving and Johanna.

According to the parity of justice a couple could be equally punished. Concerning Captain Alving's character, Mrs. Alving communicates also to Pastor Manders:

I had to fight, day after day, to keep it mystery. After Oswald was conceived, I thought, things turned into little better with Alving. Be that as it may, it didn't keep going long. What's more, presently I had to fight a twofold fight, fight with all my strength to avoid anybody recognizing what sort of a man my child's father was. What's more, you realize what a triumphant identity Alving had. Nobody could think anything besides great of him. He was one of those individuals whose reputations stay clean by the manner in which they live. (Vigdis Y (1997) *Women's Utopia in Ibsen's Writings in Ibsen*: 50-55)

Along these lines, the dirty identity of Captain Alving is uncovered by Mrs. Alving. We can accept that Captain Alving is the encapsulation of the Norwegian male-controlled society in the nineteenth century through which Ibsen uncovered the infected parts of hereditary disease, syphilis. Actually, Captain Alving is suffering from a venereal disease, syphilis because he has a sexual relationship with his servant, Johanna, for whom he must lose his life quickly.

In the play, *Ghosts* Ibsen linked the theme of "the joy of life" to the prohibited connection between people of his age. In fact, the playwright involved the male control and female servitude of society and an unlawful birth through hereditary guilt. He attacks not mankind, but the behavior of man needs reason and ethical quality. In any case, when he surrenders that cloth, he is only a savage, he regularly wears the material of reason and profound quality. The specialist subsequently reveals another insight into brutality, immorality, irrationality, hypocrisy or more, sexual oppression and subjugation in view of innate hereditary properties.

This present study sheds light on the physical glamor of Regina as an important sexual connection between the sibling and the sibling. In *Ghosts* Regina is a minor female character in the play. Despite the fact that it appears trivial in relation to the primary woman character, Mrs. Alving, but according to many critics and researchers, Regina is not at all inconsequential. This is amply manifested the treatment of complex sexual relationship in the play including the one pertaining to Oswald and Regina.

In the initial segment of Act I, we observe Regina around 23 years old, presented as a young woman who is physically and mentally strong, determined and idealistic, highly goal-oriented, and firmly believes her place to stay in Paris with Oswald, the son of the Alving Heritage where she was raised. As a matter of fact, she's is the ill-begotten conceived child of Captain Alving. Captain had a sexual relationship with his wife's maid servant. However, she is not privy to this truth. She consider herself to be the daughter of apathetic, idle, mediocre disapproved woodworker Engstrand, and for whom she has nothing but disregard : " Alright, now, get out of here. I'm not going to stand around, having rendezvous with you ". In the initial stage of the Act 1, Mrs. Alving perceives Regina attraction towards Oswald and quickly moves in to plot at him. Mrs. Alving sees the presence of the two in the lounge area. Oswald attempts to grasp Regina. From the lounge area, she hears the crash of a chair being thumped over. Meanwhile, Regina in strong but still keeping her voice low say: "Oswald! You're mad? Let me go!" Regina stands perplexed at the half-open door. Oswald clears his throat and begins to smoke. Mrs. Alving experiences dreadful thrills in this flirtation. Because in that moment she was suddenly able to reconstruct the relationship between husband and Regina 's mother. In endorsing the physical attraction of the young couple, Mrs. Alving had dismantled wide range of customary, stereotypical reconstruction. Besides, Oswald strongly feels that his salvation rests in the physicality of Regina, which is full of vitality and sensuality. He must leave home to take Regina with him. He might want to work with a new lease of life, filled with vigour and energy: "Light and sunshine and vacation— and bright, happy faces. " He fears staying at home with his mother where his impulses would be circumvented. Subsequently when Regina comprehends her actual relationship with Oswald, she chooses to leave the Alving Heritage. She clearly, proclaims that there can never be anything genuine and sincere between them. She would not stay at the Alving's home and destroy herself taking care of invalids. Regina feels the invigorating, pulsating joy life in her. But at the same time realizes that it is the delight of her mother's lot, a sullied happiness. The qualities that have been profoundly tightened in her delicate heart for so long are now crushed like a fierce storm of heredity. Regina says, "If Oswald takes his father, I shouldn't be surprised, but what I'm going to take after my mother. " She chooses to go to the "Sailor's Home" an euphemism for a "brothel". (Petra B (2007) *Nature Women's Inexpressible*: 399-403)

Clearly, Ibsen seems to recommend that Regina does not yet have any alternative to surrender to the consolidated powers of hypocritical, moral codes and heredity that are her fate: "What must be, must be" as she sums it. We see that Regina's struggle for opportunities from sexual subjugation in no clear sense prevails. Ibsen must refer to the sparkling and existing unsubstantial false hampers, social qualities and together the effect of heredity on which the destiny of Regina is controlled. The physical relationship between Regina and Oswald could be maintained because they did not know their secret siblings. Actually, through Regina's adoration and mental fulfillment, Oswald must dispose of his venereal assault in her affection, love and physical connection. Be that as it may, Oswald does not spare himself innate blame over the long haul. Regina is a pitiless fate victim. For her vocation, she is forced to pursue the facts of her mother. Consequently, the specialist focuses on the sexual connection between Oswald and Regina by applying the natural hypothesis of previously expressed hereditary qualities.

The theme in *Ghosts* is not a new one in Ibsen. The reduction of Oswald to a state of death-in-life, calling for the sun, is closely related to the last cry of Brand – "Blood of children must be spilt, to atone for parent's guilt and the last cry of Julian: oh, Helios, Helios, why has thou betrayed me?" The real action in the *Ghosts* occurs in the scene where Oswald is struck by madness. Otherwise the plot consists entirely of the gradual piecemeal revelation of the past. The technique of *Oedipus Rex* has never been used so whole-heartedly as has been applied here. What is characteristic of Ibsen is that he makes the tragic revelation at the very moment when everything has been put right.

Mrs. Alving is the leader in the game. With this character, Ibsen unravels the truth of the middle-class society of his epoch. Mrs. Alving is the circular character. It is largely due to Mrs. Alving, that it is possible to investigate the mystery of hereditary guilt attending both father and son imposed by a venereal disease "syphilis".

Waking up to harsh realities, Mrs. Alving smothers all conflicting mental agonies. Rather than attempting to exorcise she prefers to listen to Pastor Manders who himself is personification of falsehood and deceit. She sends her child Oswald far away from him lest any shadow of debauchery fall on him and tirelessly sustains her

husband's fantasy as a respectable and praiseworthy figure, possibly enduring at the same time peacefully severe disgrace and disappointment. At present, however, when her husband passes, she definitely needs to free herself from hereditary guilt. She needs to set up a shelter with the money of the Captain, from one point of view to pacify, rather mollify any rumors that the wrong, the accursed life of her husband might have sparked. Mrs. Alving sees her "dissolved" spouse's stranglehold on himself even after his death in Oswald's inclination and indulgence for life's fleeting pleasures. In any case, she disposes of her superstitions regarding obligation and goodness and prepares herself to start anew just to be smashed by the terrible end result that her child suffer from syphilis as a legacy from her father. The development and progress of Mrs Alving is one of the most basic interests of innate blame. We know her character when she is a moderately old lady; her heart is battered and cut, and she urgently tries to face reality without falsifying obstacles. Very early in her marital life, she is confronted with the truth of her husband, that he was a rake and a profligate, incorrigible man. Unable to stand up to the reality she fled from him, and took refuge with Pastor Manders, the Minister and mentor confiding to him her compelling desire for freedom. However, after listening to her the Pastor sermonizes her and convinces her to return to Captain. After all: "... A wife is not to be the judge of her husband. It is your duty to bear with humility the cross which a Higher power has, for your own good, laid upon you". Mrs. Alving returns and for nearly twenty years puts up with "licentious" spouse suffering silently and bearing the burden of the Cross at the insistence of Pastor Manders. All this suffering was inflicted under the guise of duties and obligations. But, twenty years later, she admits to Manders that her whole soul has defied this every moment as something "outrageous" and would now need to come out of her "awe for Duty and Decency".

Mrs. Alving 's journey in search of fulfillment and joy imparts an additional perspective to her character and thereby saves her from being only an agent for exposing and dismantling conventional values and rituals. Furthermore, it seems that Captain Alving had exercised power and control over Johanna and marginalized her from social right and responsibility. Deprived of alternatives, Johanna perforce to embrace prostitution. Ibsen has shed light on sexual servitude and subordination of his age through these two minor characters, Johanna and Regina among them.

Ibsen now interfaces the topic of "the joy of life "with the perverted male and female relationship here. Mrs. Alving perceive that Oswald is physically attracted towards Regina, who happens to be his stepsister, though oblivious of this truth. She is of the firm belief that happiness and joy forms the crux, the inextricable intrinsic component of life. Perceiving the joy of her child she is suddenly seized with the impulse to tell him: "Marry her, or make what arrangement you please, only let us have nothing about it". (7) Though Mrs. Alving has come a long way, from subservient, shackled to the pretentious codes of morality to desire for freedom, still finds it difficult to vocalize it to her son. She remains a "pityful coward" and analyzes the purpose of her cowardliness unequivocally. She is timid because she finds difficult to shed hereditary guilt that frequents and scars her psyche. And in one of the most moving compelling speech Mrs. Alving in response to Pastor Manders unconsciously divulges:

Ghosts! Ghosts! When I hear Regina and Oswald, I seem to see ghosts in front of me. I nearly believe we are all Ghosts of us, Pastor Manders. It's not just what we got from our dad and mother who 'walks' in us. It is a wide range of dead thoughts and sleeping old convictions, but they are equivalent to each one of us; and we can not dispose of them. At whatever point I take up a paper, I appear to see Ghosts coasting between the lines. There must be Ghosts entire the nation over, as thick as the sand of the ocean. Furthermore, at that point, we are one and all, so sadly terrified of the light. (*Ibsen* 1989: p. 29).

Mrs. Alving sees the hereditary guilt too clearly when she realizes that though Oswald does not need a single penny from the purchase money that Captain Alving had paid for her, still her sacrifices could not save Oswald from inheriting his father's disease. To her utter shock she also has to absorb the fact that the inherited disease prevents her beloved boy from work too. She discovers that she has remained in the grip of hereditary guilt because despite her abhorrence for her husband, she has indirectly encouraged in building in Oswald's mind the image of a perfect father. She realizes her fatal error. Of course, a crime on which the sacred institution is built and for which a large number of innocent children have to pay with their happiness and their lives, while their mothers go to the simple end without knowing how terribly criminal their lives are. Mrs. Alving who works out of reality even to the height of understanding the dissolved life of her child's father lives in a cramped provincial

environment and finds no reason for his extravagance throughout everyday life. It is through Oswald, who moves toward illumination. Mrs. Alving struggles and travails enhances her affirmation in the human spirit. Northam's observation of Mrs. Alving is very apt:

Ms. Alving was finally liberated from the desperation of traditional ignorance. She sees with appalling lucidity the results of her subservience to general assumption. Her opportunity is unhappy; but, finally, she is aware of the obvious reality, although her awareness is achieved through disaster... Mrs. Alving imagines herself to be sufficiently enlightened to exorcize the spirits of past activities; however she may, she finally knows the entire unchanging quality of the deeds she did a long time ago. (*Ibsen*1989)

To Mrs. Alving, typical of genuine tragic protagonist, truth dawns only in the ruins of her present life. When her reality breaks down, she remembers the express triviality of her previous view that she could live some time or another just like the past had never been before. It is by giving up all expectations that she deals with life. When she first notifies Oswald of the physical change, she shrieks, but soon she controls her shrieks and looks completely quietly at the terrible scene. She recognizes the inevitable. Furthermore, the intercourse between Pastor Manders and Mrs. Alving is also shown through exchange before her marriage. Mrs. Alving had a sexual relationship with Pastor Manders, which we can understand by exchanging:

Mrs. Alving: Oh, how could you tell? Oswald takes me from D tser. Manders: Yes, but there's an articulation on his mouth, something about his lips, which helps me to remember Alving so strikingly at any rate now that he's smoking. Mrs. Alving: How could you say that? Oswald has a pastor's mouth much more, I think. Manders: true, true, true, true. A portion of my colleagues have a comparable structure. Ibsen: p.26, 1989)

Ibsen with his dramatic method must reveal another insight into the physical fascination of Mrs. Alving and Pastor Manders as far as their physical appearance is concerned, especially Pastor Manders and Oswald's mouth and lips. I have subsequently tried to apply the natural hypothesis of hereditary qualities by examining character of Mrs. Alving.

An Enemy of People (1882)

Ibsen is conscious of the effect of society on individuals, for this reason the social rules exist within his literary works. The authors reflect different social aspects according to their evaluation of the environment by presenting actual facts and evidences in a challenging manner. In social exploration some factors have essential roles, such as culture, education, religious background, economics, politics, justice, superstition, and conventions. These elements are the social conditions, and they have a direct relation with individual's consciousness. Having briefly examined the tension between sociality and individuality in the nineteenth century, the present study goes on to consider the conflicts between the individual versus society by analyzing the selected play of Ibsen in its cultural context to show how this play reflects the conflicting ideas of that particular time.

Ibsen's play is the tragedy of the nineteenth century Europe and European mass community. For Ibsen the essential tragedy of the human situation is when human beings are trapped and unable to go forward or backward. He challenges Sophocles' notion of defeat of the heroes in the hands of mythological gods and assigns modern man's defeat to the inhumanity of generation after generation. Ibsen has an anti-authority stance and defends of individualistic principles. The major problem facing individuals is the social conventions and majority interests which mislead men in distinguishing the differences between reality and appearance that limit individuals' potentiality and souls. Human beings are depicted as the victims of outside forces as social conventions and majority's rules. The individual is seen as an irrational and dangerous creature in the society that, at any moment, may get out of hand and bring about destruction to the community unless kept under strict surveillance. Therefore, majority forces are trying to impose conformity on individuals and bring them into submission.

An Enemy of the People was first staged at the Comedie Francaise. In his essay, "Ibsen and the Theatre," Simon Williams asserted

"[n]evertheless, by the turn of the century Ibsen was widely recognized as a playwright who had returned to the theatre a sense of truth and had first explored the potential of the medium as a means to diagnose the peculiar quality of modern life" (179).

An Enemy of the People is Ibsen's savage criticism against the stupid compact majority and the corruptible press. Ibsen, in this play, rebels against the conventions, morals, and values of the social organizations. Dr. Thomas Stockmann, the play's individualist rebel hero, is from the middle class. He is familiar with the social laws like the other people, and when his discovery is condemned by compact majority, he feels doubtful about social laws and modern human beings. He, as an individual hero, because of this discovery, is converted from a naïve person to a revolutionary man, superior to all confining social, political, or moral imperatives, who finds his purpose in the pursuit of his own personal truth. He wants to expose the diseased roots of modern life to reveal the clashes of the rebellious character with the democratic community.

“Dr. Stockmann. I have already told you that what I want to speak about is the great discovery I have made lately--the discovery that all the sources of our moral life are poisoned and that the hole fabric of our civic community is founded on the pestiferous soil of falsehood.”

In this social revolt drama, the rebellious character, Dr. Stockmann, suppresses his will to power in order to examine and protest against the institutionalized life of man. In his essay, “Ibsen and Comedy,” Robin Young noted that

“much of the energy of this play derives from the confrontation between Dr. Stockmann—really a larger-than-life comic character—and a social situation which is and remains to the end of the play unregenerately serious and potentially tragic in its implications. It is a conflict of character and world outlook” (65).

Dr. Stockmann believes that in this kind of society, there is no freedom of thought, action and expression for individual, and he cannot decide for his own rights. Ibsen mentions, “[t]he majority of those in control do not permit the individual either freedom of faith or freedom of expression” (Garton 108). He believes that in a modern public life, the government and the press need nobility, because without this there is no real freedom.

“You see, the point is that the strongest man in the world is he who stands most alone.”

Dr. Stockmann has the requisite firmness and undeviating conscientiousness. He illustrates “the unselfish man of science who seeks to be a friend to the community and is howled at as a foe” (Egan 301).

Dr. Stockmann is also somewhat naïve in thinking that the community will be proud of him for discovering that the baths are poisonous. He fails to realize that as important as the discovery is, it is one which will cause an immense amount of expense and inconvenience. Furthermore, there seems to be some ambiguity in his motivations. He was annoyed at the Burgomaster for refusing to lay the pipes where Dr. Stockmann wanted them. The Act ends on a note of irony. Dr. Stockmann thinks that he is going to be honored as a hero and feels good that he serves his town and fellow citizen well. It will be only a short time before he will be declared “an enemy of the people”

Much thanks to you, thank you, my dear colleagues! I feel enormously happy! It is a magnificent thing for a man to have the capacity to feel that he has completed a support of his local town and to his kindred natives. (EP I.21).

Dr. Stockmann makes a revelation that he supposes will encourage the town. He presses for changes to be made to the showers, yet the town turns on him. Not just have his logical examinations been a waste of time, and not exclusively will the townspeople endure, yet his right to speak freely and confidence are being assaulted. He then chooses that the main reason that the pioneers have turned on him is that they fear the general population. He, consequently, lashes out at the people. He is roused both by his displeasure and by obvious acknowledge about the defilement of the town. It very well may be inferred that *An Enemy of the People* has two key messages. In the first place, it is an analysis of popular government. Second, it is the narrative of how small time's courage and sense of pride can endure overpowering chances. Ibsen's critique of democracy is twofold. To begin with, he demonstrates the oppression of the majority. The dominant part is a dictator seeing that the leaders of society are afraid to make the right decision since they are at the people's mercy. Despite the fact that Hovstad needed to print the doctor's report on the baths, he was reluctant to do as such on the grounds that his endorsers would be disturbed. The Mayor cannot propose any progressions to the baths on the grounds that people in general may discover that the Mayor had committed an error in the first designs and,

hence, remove him. The majority is afraid of risk and, according to the specialist; it is not wise enough to make the wisest decision. While Ibsen represents the oppression of the majority, he also demonstrates how leaders can control the larger part. Whenever Aslaksen and the Mayor take control of the town meeting, they are controlling the majority, utilizing the majority to their closures.

It may be the case that Hovstad simply referred to his supporters' conceivable wrath as a reason since he himself did not have any desire to print the article. Almost certain, both he and his supporters would have been against the specialist. The individuals who are in power, as Hovstad and the Mayor automatically think about what the majority will need, and they generally attempt to satisfy the majority. While Aslaksen and the Mayor controlled the gathering of people at the town meeting, they impacted them in the main way that is available. At the end of the day, it would have been practically unthinkable for the Mayor to persuade the group that they should support the specialist's remarks about the ineptitude of the majority. Ibsen's thought is that the greater part does not govern specifically; rather the thought and danger of the majority from acting sincerely. The individual story of Dr. Stockmann is secondary. The key thing to recollect is that he is amazingly hopeful and possibly little native and foolish. His wife, after all, feels constrained to help him to remember him of practicalities.

“What sort of truths are they that the majority usually supports? They are truths that are of such advanced age that they are beginning to break up. And if a truth is as old as that, it is also in a fair way to become a lie, gentlemen”.

In Act One, the scene is Dr. Stockmann's living room; the dining room is visible through a door downstage. Mrs. Stockmann welcomes Billing to her dinner table. He is late, and so the meat is cold. There is a knock at the door; it is her brother-in-law, the Mayor. He says he does not want to indulge in so much food so late at night. Hovstad, the editor, arrives. He and the Mayor greet each other stiffly and begin talking about the baths. They both agree that the new baths are going to be very good for the town. It is mentioned that the baths were originally Dr. Stockmann's idea, a suggestion that upsets the Mayor. Hovstad goes to eat, and soon Dr. Stockmann arrives. With him, he brings his two sons, Eilif and Morten, and Captain Horster, another late guest for dinner. He shows him into the dining room before noticing the

Mayor. The Mayor is surprised to see how much the guests eat. The doctor counters by talking about the excitement of watching young people eat--young people who will eventually grow up and improve society. He contrasts them with "old fossils" like himself and the Mayor, who is slightly perturbed by these notions. He comforts the Mayor by mentioning how happy he is to be living in a city and to have a sturdy income. The Mayor asks Dr. Stockmann about an article he has composed for Hovstad's newspaper.

The doctor quickly says that he hopes the article will not be printed just yet as it may not be appropriate depending on some developments that the doctor is as yet unsure of. The Mayor is aggravated that the doctor will not tell him what he is talking about, and he tells Dr. Stockmann that he should think more of how to function within a society and less as an individual. Angrily, he leaves. Hovstad, Billing, Horster, and Mrs. Stockmann come in for liqueurs and cigarettes. Hovstad discusses of the rough connection between the Mayor and the People's Herald. Horster says that he is cruising for America soon, and the two newspapermen, Billing, and Hovstad, are shocked that he doesn't care that he will miss the upcoming election. Petra enters, tired from teaching her night school classes. She has a letter that Dr. Stockmann has been eagerly looking for. He goes into the study to read it. Meanwhile, Petra and the newspapermen start up a discussion of paganism. Meanwhile, Billing and Hovstad decry the hypocrisy that Petra must go through as a teacher.

Dr. Stockmann comes to fluttering the letter. He says that no one will be able to call this discovery as another one of his delusions. Apparently, the baths, which are viewed as the savior of the town, are polluted. The doctor sent samples from the water to a lab, and now the results are back, in the letter he has received. Milldale, near the source of the baths' water, is full of polluted water that seeps into the baths' pump room.

The contamination originates from tanneries and other industry. Dr. Stockmann assures everyone that the problem can be fixed by replacing the water system. The doctor further notes that if the town had followed his advice about how to build the drains in the first place, they would not have had these problems. The group is extremely enthusiastic and gestures the doctor for saving the town. Many of the characters in *An Enemy of the People* are worried about legislative issues. The mayor

is interested in maintaining his position. He is exceptionally bothered when Dr. Stockmann discusses a more youthful age growing up to change things. He also seems very insecure, which is no uncertainly identified with the somewhat focused soul shared by him and his brother. The popular opinion that the baths were the idea of Dr. Stockmann infuriates the Mayor. The doctor is an extremely entangled character. He is exceptionally satisfied with the material trappings of his living room, accessible to him since he has the position of medical officer at the baths. The doctor lived a very poor existence for a long time, in the countryside. It is unclear why he was poor in the countryside while his brother was rising through the political chain of command of the town.

More than anything, the doctor seems to be a very enthusiastic, idealistic man—a combination of a progressive and an absentminded professor. Petra shares the doctor's intense faith in truth and freethinking, as discovered from her exchange with Hovstad and Billing. Mrs. Stockmann, then again, is substantially more moderate. In spite of fact that she has confidence in these ideals, she realizes that they have their breaking points. As the play advances, she urges her husband to consider his family's prosperity before he stands out on dubious issues.

The expression "freethinking" is utilized often in the play. Practically every one of the characters, except for Aslaksen and the mayor, claim to be freethinkers; it is important to note which of them sticks by their cases and to see precisely what the term "freethinking" means in a closely knit democracy.

In Act Two, the setting is again Dr. Stockmann's living room. Mrs. Stockmann gives him a letter. It is the report on the pollution of the baths that he had sent off to his brother the Mayor. It has been returned, with a note that the Mayor will come by to speak with the doctor. He and Mrs. Stockmann agree that the Mayor is probably jealous that Dr. Stockmann made the discovery. Morten Kiil stops by. He is pleased by the "monkeyshine" that Stockmann has developed and says that he will laugh if the city leaders are sufficiently enough to trust it. He underlines that the "minor creatures" in the water are too little to see.

Hovstad enters, and he and the doctor go to talk in private. Hovstad advises the doctor that he wants to use the data about the contamination of the baths as a beginning point for a hard and fast assault on the city's leadership. He says that the

real contamination comes from them. The doctor agrees that conservatism is bad, however he is reluctant to assault the town's leadership, which is made up of the most qualified men, including his own brother. Aslaksen stops by. He needs to assure Dr. Stockmann that he can rely on the support of the Temperance Society and the powerful Homeowners Association. Aslaksen is the chairman of the latter. He wants to stage a moderate demonstration in favor of fixing the baths. Dr. Stockmann does not think this will be necessary, as he is convinced that the baths' board of directors will see that the repairs are necessary. Aslaksen emphasizes that he does not want to upset the town leaders. Dr. Stockmann is quite moved by Aslaksen's support. After Aslaksen leaves, Hovstad calls him a cowardly, if a decent, man. Dr. Stockmann is confused, however he reveals Hovstad that if the Mayor declines to make changes to the water framework--as inconceivable as this appears to the doctor--Hovstad would print the doctor's whole report in the paper. The editor leaves and Dr. Stockmann goes to talk with his family. He tells them he is very proud to have the "solid majority" behind him.

The Mayor arrives. He is upset that the doctor conducted the investigation without telling him. He is concerned that the report exaggerates the situation. He says that the cost to make the suggested repairs would be very expensive and take two years. He says that he is not convinced that there is a real problem. He goes on to describe how losing the baths would be a catastrophe to the town's economy. He says that the board might be willing to make few changes in a couple of years. Dr. Stockmann is outraged. Throughout his speech, he makes amazed interjections. He says that he will not submit to the fraud that the mayor is suggesting. The Mayor insists that nothing about the pollution must reach the public, but the doctor tells him that the People's Herald will support him and print a story about it. The Mayor responds by talking about what a helpful brother he's been--getting the doctor a job--and he goes on to say that he hoped to gain control of the doctor by employing him. Presently, the doctor will lose his job if he does not cooperate. The Mayor feels that the doctor is out of control, an embarrassment to himself and to the city. The brothers rehash their argument over who is responsible for the baths. Dr. Stockmann reminds his brother that if his original plan had been followed, there would be no problem. The Mayor insists that the doctor merely cannot submit to authority. He demands that the doctor "conduct further studies" and make a public announcement that his findings

were false. He asserts that, when acting as an employee, the doctor has no individual rights. At this moment, Petra, who has been listening at the door, bursts in and reveals her father that he should defend himself. The Mayor urges Mrs. Stockmann to try to have some practical influence over her husband. The Mayor leaves. Mrs. Stockmann endeavors to persuade her husband that he doesn't have the power to take on his brother. She asks him to remember his family, but Petra protests. Dr. Stockmann clarifies that he will never be glad if he bows to the mayor's requests, and when his family is referenced, he clarifies that he will never be able to look his children in the eyes if he doesn't keep attempting.

The plot of this play follows the changing popularity of Dr. Stockmann's proposal. In the first demonstration, everybody appeared to help it. In this demonstration, in any case, the audience sees how the townspeople respond in various approaches to his proposal to fix the baths. Morten Kiil thinks that the proposal is a joke. He notes that the bacteria that are supposedly polluting the water are invisible. Even Hovstad's enthusiastic support foretells risk. He needs to use the answer to topple the neighborhood bureaucracy. He seems to be interested in how valuable the report is to him. In other words, if someone can convince him that publicizing the report is not in his best interests, he probably would not print it. Aslaksen supports the move to fix the baths, but already he shows himself to be reasonable to a fault.

If the Mayor can make the project look risky or perilous to Aslaksen, he may pullback his support. The Mayor raises various strong complaints against Dr. Stockmann's proposal to fix the baths. It is easy to root for the doctor and to see the Mayor as a corrupt politician, however it is not Ibsen's expectation to make a play as good versus evil. The doctor is maybe excessively shocked by the Mayor's obstruction. He wants entire agreement or he is prepared to go to war. Furthermore, it should be recalled that the play was written in the late nineteenth century and that it is not surprising that people are wary when told about bacteria. The doctor also appears to have a long history of coming up with eccentric plans. The doctor, however, sticks to his thought, just as he sticks to his ethical commitment to publicize his findings and to save the people from the results of bathing in polluted water. He is an idealist, but he is also an innocent. He doesn't comprehend Hovstad's interest in controlling the contamination discovery to other purposes, and he was unable to predict the many economic and political consequences of his findings. This play, from numerous points

of view, is about the degree to which individual innocence can survive in modern society.

In Act Three, the set is the editorial office at the People's Herald. Hovstad is composing at the work area. Billing enters with Dr. Stockmann's report. They discuss the doctor's powerful writing and how they hope to use it to attack the government. Aslaksen is in the other room, and they are careful not to let him hear. Hovstad is excited, because if the mayor accepts the doctor's proposal, he will face the fury of the big stockholders, and if he rejects it, he will face the giant Homeowners Association. Dr. Stockmann enters and tells them about his argument with the mayor. The three are excited to "tear down" the current administration. Aslaksen enters, and they assure him that both the radicals and the moderates will want to support the doctor. The doctor asks him to pay special consideration to his report to make sure that is no grammatical mistakes.

The doctor is deeply moved by their support and encouragement. After he leaves, Hovstad and Aslaksen agree that Dr. Stockmann will be very useful to them, although for different reasons. Aslaksen is worried that the doctor is not prudent enough, but Hovstad wants to use him as a political firebrand. Changing the subject, Aslaksen mentions that Governor Stensgard sat in Hovstad's editor's chair before him. Billing says something about mixing radical journalism and politics, and Aslaksen reminds Billing that he himself is running for council secretary. Billing assures them that he is only doing it to annoy the establishment. Aslaksen steps out, and Billing and Hovstad discuss how much they would like to get rid of him. They depend on him because he lets them print on credit. They wonder whether Dr. Stockmann might be able to help finance the paper. He will likely become wealthy since the rich Morten Kiil will probably remember the Stockmanns in his will. Billing leaves and Petra enters. She had consented to translate an English story for the paper, but now she cannot, on the grounds that its substance is against everything for which the paper stands. The article is about a higher purpose guiding people's actions. Hovstad answers that Billing, who Petra is in some way pursuing, thought the piece would be good fodder to keep the paper's simpler readers happy. Petra is shocked to hear that Billing would be so calculating, and Hovstad also mentions Billing's run for secretary. Petra still declines to do the piece, but she expresses gratitude toward Hovstad for his support of her father. He implies that it makes it easier that she is his daughter, and

Petra leaves, disgusted. The Mayor arrives to Hovstad's surprise. The Mayor comments on how nicely the paper is set up. He begins to talk about the doctor's proposal for the baths, but Hovstad plays dumb until the Mayor notices the doctor's report laying on the desk.

The Mayor tells Hovstad and Aslaksen that if the doctor's plan for the baths goes through, it will mean a huge sacrifice for the town. The expenses will have to come out of a municipal loan, and the baths will have to be shut down for two years. Hovstad and Aslaksen begin to change their minds about supporting Dr. Stockmann. The Mayor assures them that the doctor's report is pure fantasy. Suddenly, they see that Dr. Stockmann himself is approaching, and the Mayor hides in a side room. The doctor wants to see the proofs of his article, but they're not yet ready. He expresses to the two men that if any kind of celebration is being planned in his honor, he wants them to put a stop to it. Just as Hovstad is trying to tell the doctor how things really stand, Mrs. Stockmann enters. She has come to tell Dr. Stockmann not to throw away the livelihood of his family by printing his article. The doctor reminds her that he has the solid majority behind him, and she tells him that it's a horrible thing to have behind him. He tells her to go home while he worries about society. Then, he notices the mayor's ceremonial hat and cane lying on a chair. He guesses that the Mayor is nearby, puts on the hat, and begins to parade about the office until the mayor comes out in a fury. The doctor mocks his brother, convinced that he has everyone's support. Aslaksen and Hovstad tell him they won't print the article. Hovstad won't dare, because the subscribers control the paper and the proposal would ruin the town. The mayor gives Hovstad an official statement he can print to quell any rumors. The doctor resolves to hold a public meeting, but Aslaksen tells him that he won't find an organization to give him a hall.

In the second demonstration, we see the Mayor turn on Dr. Stockmann. When that occurred, the doctor still felt certain because he had the People's Herald behind him. In the third demonstration, we see Hovstad and Aslaksen betray him. The Mayor has a simple time persuading them to betray Dr. Stockmann. It is nothing unexpected that financial contentions and the absence of visible evidence can be used to change Hovstad's psyche. But Ibsen goes further and demonstrates us that Hovstad is basically not a solid character. We learn that his help of the doctor is partly inspired by his affection for Petra. He even deceived his companion billing for drawing closer

to Petra. Even before the Mayor arrives and addresses to Hovstad and Aslaksen, they are examining how they can utilize the doctor for their different closures. From the earliest starting point, Hovstad is anxious to utilize the doctor as an approach to animate a type of political revolution. When the Mayor brings his cautiously created contentions to men whose integrity is already compromised, they are easily won over to his side. While the Mayor and the doctor stay predictable in their suppositions throughout the play, the newspapermen's thoughts change.

The Mayor and the doctor have clear inspirations: The mayor needs to remain in power, while the doctor is worried about ethical quality and science but not with financial aspects or politics. The newspapermen, then again, have numerous inspirations, and, thusly, they can't come to a clear conclusion. Hovstad is a liberal radical, but he also needs to keep the paper in business, and he is keen in Petra. Ibsen utilizes these characters to illustrate how difficult it is to have a clear opinion in modern society. Hovstad can't bear to have a perilous supposition and is, in this manner, helpless when the Mayor or the doctor has the upper hand. Mrs. Stockmann is focused on her husband, but she is also committed to her family. When the doctor endangers the remains of his family by discarding his job, she doesn't recognize what to do. She feels that Hovstad is fooling the doctor, and when Hovstad and all the other men turn on her husband, she feels that her husband has been driven into a trap. It appears to her that the doctor has reliably attempted to do what is best and has been somehow led into a extremely risky position by these men. A few miscellaneous things should be clarified. The mention of "Governor Stensgard" by Aslaksen is a mention to Ibsen's initial play, *The League of Youth*, in which Stensgard was a focal character. Aslaksen was also a minor character in that play.

In Act Four, the setting is a vast corridor in Captain Horster's home. It is crowded with townspeople. A number of them are discussing the meeting, and they decide to watch how Aslaksen responds to the issues presented. Charging is there to cover the gathering for the paper. Horster leads in Mrs. Stockmann and the children and sits them close to the door, so they can exit quickly if need be. Hovstad, Aslaksen, and Mayor Stockmann enter and take up different positions around the room. Dr. Stockmann enters to tentative applause and hissing. Aslaksen quickly motions that a chairman is appointed, and he is quickly elected to be chair. The mayor immediately moves that Dr. Stockmann not be allowed to read his report or talk about the baths,

whipping up support from the crowd. He and Aslaksen work together to convince the crowd that the doctor is out to harm the town's best interests. Hovstad joins in and talks about the welfare of the Stockmann family.

The motion passes. Dr. Stockmann is angry. Just as he is going to talk, a drunk wanders in and requests for his entitlement to be heard, but he is immediately ejected. Not permitted to speak about the pollution in the baths, the doctor begins to speak about the pollution in the towns. He talks of how he conceived the idea of the baths because he wanted to work for the people. But then, he says, he realized the "colossal stupidity of the authorities." Aslaksen tries to quiet him, but he continues. He is talking about the failures of his brother the mayor, when the drunk enters again and is quickly thrown out. The doctor continues, saying that the authorities are not the worst enemies. The worst enemy, he says, is the majority. The crowd goes wild with anger. Aslaksen urges the doctor to back his remarks. The doctor says that imbeciles are in the majority and that power should lie in the hands of the minority. He says he does not advocate aristocracy, but for the intelligent, freethinking minority. He says the idea of the common, crass majority being in the right is an outdated truth. He asks Hovstad if, being another freethinker, he doesn't agree with him, but Hovstad merely shouts that nowhere in print can it be proven that he is a freethinker. The doctor continues, comparing the masses to mongrels and the intelligent minority to purebreds. He assaults Hovstad for not concurring with him, and Hovstad shouts out that he is dropped from laborers and puts stock in the people. The doctor sums up by saying that morality and freethinking go hand in hand. He insists that his message will be heard and threatens to write to newspapers in other towns. Hovstad declares that the doctor must be an enemy of the people, and, in his excitement, Dr. Stockmann agrees, urging that the town should be wiped out, that vermin should be destroyed. Aslaksen recommends that the meeting announce the doctor "an enemy of the people." (p. 73 quoted in Chowdhury 1978: p. 12)

While Aslaksen is collecting the votes, Billings explains to several men that the doctor often drinks and that he had recently been denied a raise. Morten Kiil approaches the doctor and says that if his tanneries are embroiled in bad publicity about contamination, the doctor may endure. Aslaksen declares that by a consistent vote Dr. Stockmann has been proclaimed an adversary of the people. He leaves with his family, as the crowd chants "enemy." (Ibsen 1989: p. 39).

This demonstration speaks the climax of the play. We see Dr. Stockmann at his most energetic and the rest of the town at its most moderate and conspiratorial. The men who were having dinner at Dr. Stockmann's house in the primary demonstration are publicly denouncing him, and he is denouncing them. The doctor's point about the oppression of the majority is complex. It is certainly not Ibsen's invention. The English political thinker John Stuart Mill composed along similar lines before in the nineteenth century. It would be hurry to expect that Dr. Stockmann is speaking Ibsen's own thoughts. However, Ibsen was positively anxious to express his frustrations with rule by majority in the wake of the liberal media's judgment of his past play, *Ghosts*. It is ironic that the doctor chooses to talk on the oppression of the majority in front of a crowd of townspeople. The mayor probably also believes in the rule of a keen minority, and he keeps up it by contriving with others that he esteems part of the commendable minority. Dr. Stockmann's vision of guideline by the minority is different from the mayor's.

The doctor sees that although people like the mayor and Hovstad are technically in charge of the town government or the newspaper, they are still subject to the sentiment of the majority. The mayor really must choice but to oppose the doctor's proposal for the baths, since he is the instrument of the majority, and Hovstad could not support the doctor if he wanted to because he is liable to the requests of his less freethinking subscribers. When Dr. Stockmann blames Hovstad of also being a freethinker, Hovstad defends himself on the grounds that he has never claimed to be a freethinker in print. In other words, Hovstad does not deny that he is a freethinker in private, but he simply asserts that he is never a freethinker in the public eye. He is afraid to tell the dominant part that he is a freethinker. By claiming never to be a freethinker in print, Hovstad demonstrates the doctor's point: Intelligent people cannot act on their feelings because of fear of the majority. By arranging the discourse in a very public setting, Ibsen takes an opportunity to illustrate how the traditions of democracy can be manipulated by those in power. The doctor has assembled this public meeting to read his report, but by choosing a chairman and directing the meeting as per vague parliamentary rules, the mayor and the newspapermen are able to shut the doctor up. This shows that the tyranny of the majority is not absolute.

“The majority is never right. Never, I tell you! That's one of these lies in society that no free and intelligent man can help rebelling against. Who are the people that make up the biggest proportion of the population -- the intelligent ones or the fools?”

In Act Five, the setting is Dr. Stockmann's study. The windowpanes are broken. The doctor is picking up stones that have been thrown through the windows. His landlord sends a letter giving the Stockmanns notice that they have to move out. The doctor doesn't care because he is taking his family to the New World on Horster's next boat. Mrs. Stockmann asks him if they should move to another town in Norway, but the doctor answers that the population will be the equivalent wherever he goes and he doesn't need his sons to grow up among the "lapdogs" of Norway. He conceives that in the New World things may be extraordinary. Petra enters. Even though her supervisor at the school is "freethinking," she has been fired because of anonymous threats her supervisor received.

Captain Horster arrives. He has been given notice by Vik, the owner of the ship he sails. He is not worried; he can easily get a job with an out of township owner, and he does not regret helping the Stockmanns. The mayor arrives, and he and the doctor go to talk in private. The mayor has come to give the doctor notice regarding his situation as a medical officer of the baths and to ask the doctor to leave town for some time. If after six months or so, the doctor will publicly retract his statements, he might be hired again. The doctor furiously refuses. Then, the mayor suggests that he has a reason for feeling so secure in his defiance--Morten Kiil's will. The doctor does not understand, and the Mayor explains that Kiil has provided for Mrs. Stockmann and the children in his will. The doctor is jubilant, and when the mayor suggests that Kiil might redraw his will in light of the doctor's recent actions, the doctor exclaims that, on the contrary, Kiil is happy to see the doctor causing trouble for the authorities. The Mayor then accuses the doctor of merely speaking out in order to curry favour with Kiil and secure his family, a part of the inheritance.

The Mayor then leaves, reporting that now that he has a weapon to use against the doctor, he can never recover his activity. The doctor orders his wife to scrub wherever the Mayor has been. Morten Kiil arrives. He brings him a large number of shares in the baths, which he has just bought. He is upset that his name might be

tarnished by rumours started by the doctor that his tanneries are polluting the baths. He wants the doctor to retract his statements; to force him to do as such; he has contributed Mrs. Stockmann's legacy in bath stocks. He could get them extremely shoddy that morning, and if the doctor withdraws his announcements about the baths, their esteem will skyrocket and Morten Kiil will own most of the baths--and begin to make the fixes the doctor proposed. Kiil tells the doctor to come to a decision by that afternoon. As Kiil leaves, Hovstad and Aslaksen enter.

They also have a deal for Stockmann. They know that Kiil has been buying up stocks, and they propose to put the People's Herald at the doctor's disposal once he has control of the baths and let him pretend to fix the baths. They remind him that the press has a great deal of power in a free society. All they need is compensation to keep the paper in business. The doctor sarcastically responds that it would be a shame for a friend of the people like the People's Herald to go out of business, but since he is an enemy of the people, he could care less. He thrusts for his sick and attempts to drive the newspapermen out the window into the gutter. They manage to escape. Mrs. Stockmann, Petra, and Captain Horster want to know what is going on, but before the doctor tells them, he writes "No!" three times on a card and sends it to Morten Kiil. He reports to his family that they are not going to sail for the New World but rather will remain and fight. Captain Horster invites them to remain in his house. He will proceed his medical practice with the poorest patients, as everyone else will deny him. He embraces his wife and asks her to look at how beautifully the sun is shining. He resolves to hunt down the wolves that control the city, and his only regret is that he doesn't know any men who can continue the mission after he dies. The doctor's sons arrive, having been sent home because they got into a fight. The doctor concludes that he will set up a school for poor children in the great hall where he was branded an enemy of the people. Mrs. Stockmann, however, is still worried that the "wolves" might hunt him down. He replies that he is stronger than the wolves because he stands alone.

By the end of *An Enemy of the People*, Dr. Stockmann's position has changed several times. Sometimes he seems to be proud that he is "an enemy of the people," but early in Act V, says that the words wound him and is lodged in his heart. What is consistent is a sense of honor and a short temper. His partial embrace of the title enemy of the people is full of sarcasm, as seen when he turns on Hovstad and

Aslaksen with his cane. He spoke out against the tyranny of the majority, but he still sees that men like Hovstad have a lot of control, and he is sincerely happy to be Hovstad's enemy. Thus, he eagerly calls himself an enemy of the people to Hovstad's face, implying that corrupt Hovstad is the real enemy. As righteous as Dr. Stockmann possibly, we should take note of that he surely makes things hard for himself. This is best captured in his decision to remain in town. He decides to stay because he is incredibly angry, and he wants to keep fighting. In Act II, we see the mayor accuse Dr. Stockmann of being forever resentful of authority, implying that the doctor has a history of assaulting expert. Thus, Dr. Stockmann's position toward the finish of the play is as much as a result of his morals as of his naturally defiant personality. The end of the play provides an interesting contrast between Mrs. Stockmann and Petra. Mrs. Stockmann accepts her husband's eccentric behaviour. Petra, on the other hand, eagerly supports him. When he remarks that he doesn't know who will carry on after he dies, Petra says that problem will be solved in time. Clearly, Petra can follow him--only she isn't a man. Ibsen is highly conscious of gender issues. In a play otherwise about the extent to which a free democracy is not free, Ibsen finds room to speak up for women. He also shows that the doctor's ideas, too, can be old-fashioned.

The inclusion of "*An Enemy of the People*" in the present study is open to questioning by many scholars. Admittedly the play is male-centric, revolving around Dr. Stockmann, inhabited by Mayor and others and hinging on the concept of "responsibility" and "manipulation". It does not boast of having well delineated, rounded characters, so typical of Ibsen's women. Undoubtedly, he gave some fantastic female characters such as Nora and Hedda, but not in this play.

However, a close analysis unravels few interesting surprises. The plays resonate with the prevailing mood endorsed by Stockmann's patriarchal belief that reforming society is man's work. In the given milieu the presence of Catherine and Petra raise some pertinent questions: What's the role of women in that society? How do women work? What sort of access to education do they have? What are the expectations regarding age to marry or be considered an old maid? What expectations are there around having sex, and children, and child-rearing?

This to a great extent have been answered in the depiction of Catherine and Petra, the only females in the play. Catherine is a stereotypical wife and mother,

concerned with her family's happiness, security and material comfort. There's a future generation to worry about; Dr Stockmann's choices are going to have serious ramifications for his child. In fact, she is apprehensive and nervous at Stockmann's conflict with authority and evinces more timidity. However, finding her husband cornered and ridiculed, backed against a wall she does not hesitate in confronting men and making her concerns explicit. Mrs. Stockmann declares that she is behind his cause for truth. Women does not count for a lot here, but then there was not much could be done about that plain reality.

Furthermore, Ibsen created the character of Petra to challenge the stereotype of women, to make sense of the new spirit of feminist independence. She is an unmarried teacher, passionate, intellectual, impish and hot-headed:

"There is such hypocrisy both at home and at school. At home we can't speak, and at school we have to tell lies to the children."

She is a strong, independent woman, opinionated woman who will not back down when in the presence of a man: "Father, He can't speak to you like this" amply demonstrates her strength and spunkiness.

Thus, both Catherine and Petra while offering offer interesting contrasts also at the same time share similarity. For instance, if Catherine on finding her husband cornered is unafraid of confronting men and making her concerns known, Petra too who is, as female characters by late 19th century standards is quite modern champions vociferously her father's cause. These are issues, things not assigned ordinarily to women to do during this time. Both these women, Petra more so than Catherine, are rather atypical for women of their era and thus fit in comfortably with the other iconoclastic women of Ibsen's oeuvre.

WORK CITED

Bentley, Eric. *The Playwright as Thinker*. New York: Meridian Books, 1965.

Garland, Henry & Mary Garland. *The Oxford Companion to German Literature*. London: Oxford University Press, 1976.

Heiberg, Hans. *Ibsen: A Portrait of an Artist*. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1969.

Howe, James. "Matriarchy." *Encyclopedia of Anthropology*. Ed. David E. Hunter and Phillip Whitten. New York: Harper, 1976. 261.

Hurt, James. *Catiline's Dream: An Essay on Ibsen's Plays*. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1972.

Ibsen, Henrik. *Ibsen: Letters and Speeches*. Ed. Evert Sprinchorn. New York: Hill, 1964.

Johnston, Brian. *The Ibsen Cycle: The Design of the Plays from the Pillars of Society to When We Dead Awaken*. Boston: Twayne, 1975.

Meyer, Michael. *Ibsen*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd., 1967.