

I. Introduction

This study attempts to analyse the Nexus between 'Truth' and 'Power' in the play *An Enemy of the People* by Henrik Ibsen. It basically examines the Foucauldian concept of 'Truth' and 'Power'; in that how power diffuses itself in the system of authority, has the effect of truth which is produced within the discourses of knowledge.

'Power' means "a position of ability to compel obedience, domination, a military force; ability to wage war; capacity of acting or producing effect; a mental or physical ability or aptitude (Oxfords Dictionary)" and so on. But here in this study power means not these literal power but foucauldian power that is always relational. Power, for him not only the domination over central elements to marginal but even in marginal elements within, it is circulated. Power is of different characters; but in general, concept of power is taken even negatively as unnecessarily despotic force to confirm the truth. Nevertheless, there is another method of exercising power. This is to serve the people, serve the humanity; and this exercise of power is creative and productive that is largely founded on the common ground of mutual understanding and benefits between the rulers and ruled.

The dictionary meaning of 'Truth' is the quality or state of being true" where as 'true' means 'exact' 'accurate' (ibid). In new historicist perceptive 'Truth' is not accurate or exact. It is sliding ground. As the system of power changes, truth also changes.

Foucault considered 'Truth' to be no more than an effect of power. Truth for him is "a thing of this world" (qtd. in Faubian xviii) which is recognized only in worldly forms. In this context James D. Faubian writes:

[. . .] meaning that truth exist or is given and recognized only in worldly forms, through actual experiences and modes of verification; and meaning also that truth is a serious matter and a serious force in our world, and that there is work for us to do in investigating the presence and effects of truth in the history of our societies. (xviii)

Nexus is a state of relation between the things. 'Truth' has the direct connection with the 'Power'. The idea of nexus between "Truth" and "Power" has historically existed in politics, in economy and in relation through the exercise of itself. In the modern era, power manifests itself not as a visible force emanating from the central authority or sovereign but an invisible web of material and ideological relation. In order to determine the truth, power appealed to the notables to the persons, given their position, their age, their wealth and their notability, etc.

Discourse is another tool, which comes with 'Truth' and 'Power'. Discourse is the way of presenting something in straight sense; it is talking and communicating using signs to designate things. Discourse is productive: patriarchal discourse produces woman as a cultural construct. Penological discourse produces criminal, western discourses through media produce their orient and so on. Talking about foucauldian notion of discourse, Arun Gupto writes: "One understands discourse as a regular and systematic series of

statements and the rules that make such statements by the social institutions" (118-19). Thus what is truth is what is said or made statement about a thing.

People have been worried about the possible misuses of discourse to strengthen the power. Historians, sociologists and journalists have written millions of words about it, but more effective result has come from imaginative writers because it stirs us intellectually and emotionally, and deepens our understanding of our history and our society. It would be quite possible to continue mentioning a hundred important writers whose works raise the issue of 'Truth', 'Power' and discourse. One of them is Henrik Ibsen's *An Enemy of the People*, which I have chosen for my dissertation.

The Norwegian playwright Henrik Ibsen, considered by many to be one of the greatest dramatists of all times, is also called the father of modern drama. In the mid – 1870's, he created a new tradition of realistic prose drama that dealt boldly with contemporary social problems and individual psychology, offering an alternative to the melodrama that had dominated early nineteenth century theatre. In the first twenty-five years of his career, Ibsen wrote romantic and historical dramas designed to glorify Norway and Norwegian audiences from popular Danish plays. With his later, major works twelve prose dramas of increasing complex by beginning with *The Pillars of Society* (1877) and ending with *When We Dead Awaken* (1899) – Ibsen set a standard for realistic theatre that would be emulated through out the western world. Ibsen's nineteenth century audiences were often shocked by the new and realistic subject matter of his plays. *Ghost* (1881) openly referred to inherited venereal disease, and *A Doll's House* (1879) displayed an astonishingly liberal attitude toward the emancipation

of women. Both plays were attacked as "Immoral" and banned from several cities in Europe.

Henrik Ibsen was not a very popular playwright in Norway in his own time. His plays were often too realistic and challenging in describing people's every day life to really appreciate by the big masses. People of good families in Norway, even considered his plays scandalous, as the plays revealed many big secrets about what was going on behind closed doors in the Norwegian society. Ibsen wrote about social problems, behaviors and political issues that were so sensitive in his own time, which people hardly even dared to talk openly about them in their own homes.

An Enemy of the People (1882) though somewhat controversial, was revolutionary in its unflinching portrayal of the greed and self-interest in small-town politics. Unlike his previous plays, *Ghost* and *A Doll's house*, it received a cordial welcome from the people and has remained one of the most popular dramas by Ibsen. Ibsen spares almost no one as he examines the power of self-interest to shape human attitudes towards truth and civic responsibility.

Most of the critics agree that the play is a satire on the popular clichéd democracy. Ibsen has written a sharp satire on the autocracy practiced under democracy by the majority in a liberal society. Democracy supposes that whatever the majority of the people vote is right. But Ibsen believes the majority is not always right. Though Dr. Stockmann, the protagonist, the mouthpiece of the writer, is right in the discovery that the water in the newly constructed baths is contaminated with sewage, contains microbes and is spoiling the health of the people; he is howled down at a public meeting and voted a public enemy. At the

meeting public representatives, liberal press and the manipulated public compactly stand against the innocent and intelligent doctor who has truth supported by facts. Revealing such a controversy in democracy Ibsen has sharply mocked at the political hypocrisy, opportunism of the liberal press and conservatism of the public. In "Introduction", Ivor Brown has remarked, "this play is Ibsen's reaction to mob verdicts, when the mob has played upon by frightened, foolish 'leaders of Opinion' who are in fact only followers of convention their creed a mummy, stuffed and dead" (vii).

Similarly another critic Joches Chung doubts on the majority rules. He finds satires on the popular cliché of democracy and public empowerment in reading of *An Enemy of the People*. He views,

Except for the simple-minded discourse of 'majority rules' and the cliché that public is entitled to decide what they want it appeared to me that certain aspects had been too much neglected during the promotion of our democracy. How do we trust the expertise in a democratic society, who can never be the majority? The doubt on 'majority rules' expressed in *An Enemy of the People* can be of some consideration to us (199)

In the same way, Shahid Nadeem, director of '*Dusman*' Pakistani version of *An Enemy of the People* comments about the play in his note after directing the play. For him also it is doubtful that the majority is right or wrong. "The century-old Ibsen's questions still unanswered: 'Is the majority right?' collective will and wisdom is a great virtue but should not we question the established and certified truths every once in a while" (52).

Gautam Roychowdhury regards *An Enemy of People* has a theme of 'Truth' and 'Organization'. For him 'Truth' can not be declared only by majority but can also be represented by a single one. He further writes:

The world criminals today represent organized force—sometimes in the name of patriotism, religion. Terrorism, reigns revolution is a distant star, reason cries alone. The lone voice of reason gives a crying call for truth—it summons the conscience of the people, not to its number and majority. (23)

Ibsen himself writes about *An Enemy of the People* as a direct answer to the mass of hypocritical nonsense and abuse that had been showered upon *Ghost*. In a letter to his publisher he wrote.

I have enjoyed writing this play . . . Dr. Stockman and I got on so very well together: we agree on so many subjects but the doctor is a more muddle headed person than I am; and because of this and other peculiarities of his, people will stand hearing a good many things from him, which they perhaps would not have taken in good part if they had been said by me. (qtd. in Gallienne xxi)

From this letter, we know Dr. Stockman is mouthpiece of Ibsen himself. Through him the playwright wants to show his ideology about democracy, majority, and power relation and so on.

For Evale Gillienne, Ibsen's play *An Enemy of the People* ridiculously criticized the liberal press of the time as opportunist. In his own words it is "hilarious caricature of the editor, reporter and printer of the people monitor" (ibid). Unlike them Rolf Fjeld sees the hero of the play of *An Enemy of the*

People, Thomas Stockman as a Kierkegaardian hero who considers one single individual is the highest power. Dr. Stockmann's last utterance that "the strongest man in the world is the one who stands most alone" (77) echoes him as an existential hero. He further writes:

Under the democratic, rather than autocratic, system that increasingly prevails in the nineteenth century, it is now, for Stockmann, the majority that tends to be wrong, and the minority right—since only a tiny knowledgeable minority, holding their position like outposts, can comprehend in perspective the accelerating changes of a historical process that shows itself to be more and more genuinely innovative, rather than cyclical and repetitive. (xxii)

Ram Mohan Holangundi regards Ibsen as one of democracy's sharpest critics. In democracy, for him there is party politics and party politics invites opportunism. He further writes: "Those who want to win the majority over to their side must use rhetorical tricks, promise a bright future, and appeal to people's short-term interests" (Proceeding 51). But Ivor Brown believes Ibsen is against only the hypocrisy, irrational autocracy and conservatism under the name of 'democracy' not against the true people's rulers. He further views:

The voice of the people is very far from the voice of God in Ibsen's reckoning. In *An Enemy of the People* he rakes with his sarcastic indignation that kind of sentimental liberalism, which attacks the cult of the individual director only to substitute a groveling

worship of the mass-true, clear-minded liberalism is not open to his charge. (vii)

Safi Ahmad views this play with his social context of Bangladesh "The other play that carries immense relevance to our society is *An Enemy of the People*, since it touches on the issues of corruption that find it's patronized and motivated way into the corridor of power" (130).

For Morken Andersen, the role of the protagonist of the play, Dr. Stockmann is like the protagonist in a Greek tragedy, stepping out from the chorus to voice their experiences. Andersen posits:

Does the visionary healer, the trusted doctor have the right to go against the masses, even if he knows and can scientifically prove that it will for their own good? Can he make his own truth their truth? Or should he take it open himself to be a representative of their opinions, their tastes and view of life, like the protagonist of the Greek tragedy? (*Proceeding* 6)

Some critics have tried to under value this play, saying that it is very weak artistically because of its content of small town – politics and the straight forward way of dealing with the content

Moreover, Ivor Brown strongly resists such a comment and remarks:

In the theatre its absence of sex-interest handicaps it with those for whom clandestine adultery and conjugal manoevers are the chief ingredients of drama. But for those who have a more comprehensive view of life and more adult test in drama, *An Enemy of the People* is a supreb piece of social landscape whose

lessons reach out from Norway of seventy years ago every community and every age in which democracy is given lip-service.

(viii)

F.L. Lukas views this play as counter –defiance of *Ghost*, his previous play, *An Enemy of the People* was his counter-defiance and he completed it with what was, for him, useless speed" (171).

Most critics have commented on the play in relation with democracy, middle class hypocrisy, their conservative ideas and class struggle. Those some of the comments have bordered on 'Power relation'. They have not talked about it in detail in the relation to the truth and power. It tries to prove the foucoulidian principle of nexus between' truth ' and 'power'. It tries to prove that the 'power' by means of discourse converts the 'truth' as 'false' and 'false' as 'truth'.

II. Theoretical Modality

Foucauldian Notion of 'Power, Discourse and Truth': A Theoretical modality

Power

Power is the ability to influence the behaviour of others in order to further particular desire and purpose. This general concept of power is centralized within the system of hierarchy. The absolute and higher power is conceived only in the center from where the subordinate elements are controlled and ruled. But Michel Foucault rhetorically analyses the traditional concept of power, for him, the power lies in the centre. The power is not circulated from top to bottom. Power is not vertically shaped but it circulates horizontally. The power covers all direction of social levels at all times. Power circulates as never ending proliferation of exchange. It is circulated through the exchange of material goods as buying and selling, battering, gambling, taxation, charity and various forms of theft. On the other hand, it circulates through such institution as marriage, adoption, kidnapping and slavery.

One way of rethinking power is to see it as relational, rather than hierarchical. Instead of power being seen, as a repressive force that some people have access to and other don't power can be thought of simply as enabling. Power enables things to happen. Foucault uses the metaphor of matrix to describe power. The matrix is contributed in two ways: first by many relations of force, cooperative resistant and transformative that operate in a given sphere of activity and second, by the strategies by which they operate. This matrix in operation and not simply repressive force is what Foucault describes as power: "power is not an institution, and not a structure; neither is it certain strength we are endowed with;

it is the name that one attributes to a complex strategic situation in particular society” (qtd. In Cranny Francis 66).

Another important corollary of Foucault’s model of power is that power is seen as pervasive. In *History of Sexuality* (vol. one), Foucault writes about the pervasive nature of power:

Power is everywhere; not because it embraces everything but because it comes from everywhere [. . .] power comes from below: that is there is no binary and all encompassing opposition between ruler and ruled at the root of power relations, and serving as a general matrix no such duality extending from the top down and reacting on more and more limited groups to the very depth of the social body. (93-4)

This means, that we are all implicated in the operations of power. No particular group can absent itself from the operation of power because no group exists in isolation. Even within the most isolated group power will operate. In Foucault’s terms lines of force will run through that group which will operate strategically at certain points to produce effects.

So, if power is relational, and we are all involved in it, then it becomes very difficult to hold to a position that simply attributes power to any group in society. This is not the same thing as saying that some groups are not potentially privileged by their position within mainstream society.

For Foucault, subject is at any given time a contingent product of a particular set of techniques of government and technologies of the self. Thus, his genealogies analyse the ways in which new forms of subjectivity arose as effects

of disciplinary and pastoral power. Pastoral power, for him is considered as old power technique that originated in Christian institution. It is a form of power whose ultimate aim is to assure individual salvation in the next world. It is not merely a form of power that commands. But it must also be prepared to sacrifice itself for the life and salvation of the flock. Therefore, it is different from royal power, which demands a sacrifice from its subject to save the throne. He further writes:

Concurrently, the officials of pastoral power increased. Sometimes this form of power was exerted by state apparatus or, in any case, by public institution such as the police [. . .] sometime the power was exercised by private ventures, welfare societies, benefactors, and generally by philanthropist. (“Subject and Power” 334)

Disciplinary power, on the other hand, the type of instruments and techniques can be taken over used by any institution: penitentiaries, certainly, but also schools, hospitals, military centers, psychiatric institutions administrative apparatuses, bureaucratic agencies, police force, and so on. Alec McHoul and Wendy Grace write:

Disciplinary power was one of the great ‘inventions’ of bourgeois society and is the primary means whereby the ‘cohesion’ of this type of social body is ensured and maintained. But disciplinary power cannot thereby be seen simply to ‘reflect’ that requirements of the economic (capitalist) base. Foucault thus challenges the Marxist conceptions of modernity which claim that economic forces determine other social factors – at least ‘in the last instance.

Foucault argued on a number of occasions that power is much more 'material' force than the exigencies demanded by economic priorities. Disciplinary power played an indispensable role in the constitution of industrial capitalism, while simultaneously determining the characteristics of 'bourgeois life'. (71)

For Foucault disciplinary institution requires an ever-alert attention to the 'government of all composite parts and invention of certain tactical manoeuvres to ensure the implementation of discipline.

Foucault suggests that modern government with its pastoral power works through the self-regulating of subjects. It pre-supposes rather than annuls their capacity as agents.

Foucault certainly makes a distinction between the operation of discipline and pastoralship. Discipline, he suggests is inherently violent. Laws, rules and norms are set up and people who go against them are punished with violence – beaten, incarcerated and the like. Such violence might confront resistance, but it cannot allow resistance since it operates by dominating, by forcing other to conform: if violence comes up against any resistance, it has no other option but try to minimize it. Pastoral power, in contrast, has to flow through the consciousness of subjects in such away that they internalise the relevant laws, rules and norms so as to regulate themselves in accord with them. It operates not as a direct, immediate form of domination as does violence but as a type of influence. Moreover because it must of certain acts, it must treat the subject to the very end as a person who acts.

Modern government ever uses the popular clichés like freedom, liberalism, human rights, public empowerment, etc. But for Foucault they are all illusory in that we do not truly make ourselves through our own creative activity but rather construct ourselves in a way that is prescribed for us by the technologies self sanctioned by the modern regime of power. Mark Bevier writes “liberal freedoms are in fact expressions of a pastoral power that subjugate and make subject to” (354).

Foucault never imagines the freedom and power goes side by side: “consequently there is not a face-to-face confrontation of power and freedom as mutually exclusive fact but a more complicated interplay” (“Subject and Power” 342).

Foucault sees every action and every historical event as an exercise of power. The society is a huge web, and much of the power tends to be concentrated toward the higher echelons. He has spent a large bulk of his career analysing the ebb and flow of power in different situations and with relevance to different accepts of human life. He sees the exchange of power as a form of war like domination. Power flows simultaneously in different directions and different volumes according to the various forms of power relations in the network of power exchange.

He states that power is not only repression it is something positive. Sometimes power needs to prohibit unnecessary and negative thing. Power is needed to control bad manner and attitude. If power is positively applied order, justice and equality will be created in the country. Similarly if power is forcefully applied there will be the problems of domination, violence and disorder. He states:

In defining the effects of power as repression, one adopts purely juridical conception of such power, one identifies power with a law which says no power is taken above all as carrying the force of prohibition.... What makes the power hold good, what makes it accepted, is simply the fact that it does not only weigh on us as a force that says no; it also traverses and produces things, it induces pleasure, forms knowledge, produces discourse. (*Power* 120)

The problem of exercising power is false knowledge is used in the practice of power. James D. Faubion states in his introduction to *Power* essential works of Foucault volume three; “the rational exercise of power tends to make the fullest use of knowledge capable of the maximum instrumental efficacy” (xix). He further states the evil nature of exercising power; “Nothing, including the exercise of power, is evil in itself but everything is dangerous” (ibid).

There are various types of power in the world, the rulers try to use power to control and rule their citizens. But, the present world is highly intellectualised by which the way of exercising the power is not with the blood-shed, but with the change of concept and beliefs of the individual in the society and change in belief is possible only through the various types of discourse. When power is used for power’s sake then different tricks are to be applied with the better linguistic discourse, so as to maintain one’s controlling positions. It is a sort of trick of throwing dust in the eyes of the ruled ones.

Discourse as a Means of Power

A discourse is another term, which is inherent part of power. Discourse is a social language created by particular socio-cultural situation at a particular time and place, and it expresses a particular way of understanding human experience. If we are not familiar with modern science, the discourse of liberal humanism, the discourse of white supremacy, the discourse of ecological awareness, the discourse of Christian fundamentalism, and the like, we are unable to know the circulation of power in our society. Thus from a new historical perspective, no discourse by itself, can adequately explain the complex cultural dynamics of social power. Discourse is always in a state of flux, overlapping and competing with one another in any number of ways at any given point in time. But no discourse is permanent. Discourse wields power for those in change, but they also stimulate opposition of that power.

Michel Foucault endorsed a Nietzschean position in developing his theory of discourse. Nietzsche argued that all knowledge is an expression of the “will to power” (Selden 100) and that we use language to suit our aim. This means that we cannot speak of any absolute truths or of objective knowledge because all language activities are related to our will to power. Like Nietzsche, Foucault regards discourse as a central human activity but not as a universal ‘general text’ (ibid) a vast sea of signification. His main thesis is that discourse is involved in power. He views that discourses are rooted in social institutions and that social and political power operates through discourse. Discourse therefore is inseparable from power because it is the ordering force that governs every institution. This enables institutions to exercise power and dominate. Selden writes:

The work of Michel Foucault has gone much further than this in mapping the discursive formations which, often in the name of science, have enabled institutions to wield power and domination by defining and excluding the mad, the sick, the criminal, the poor and the deviant. For Foucault discourse is always inseparable from power, because discourse is the governing and ordering medium of every institution. Discourse determines what is possible to say, what are the criteria of 'truth', who is allowed to speak with authority and where such speech can be spoken? (76)

This makes clear that power holder by means of discourse excludes others.

Foucault believes that we can never possess an objective knowledge of history

“because historical writings are always entangled in tropes” (Selden 102).

Discourses are produced within the real world of power struggle. Discourse is used as a means to gain or sometimes even subvert power. Discourse is central human activity.

A discourse can be simply described as a way of talking about an issue or practice. Yet if we consider the ramifications of that simple statement, we can see that it is more than just a kind of arbitrary theorizing. Our ways of talking about issues, and further, they tend to determine how we act, so discourses are part of who we are (how we experience ourselves) and how we think, speak and act—how we experience the world. Foucault believes that discourses operate not only by defining their field of interest, but also by establishing what available perspective on this field is and also by defining the ground rules about what kinds of theory

can be regarded as legitimate in to this field for a theorist operating from this perspective.

Discourse is also a means by which power is distributed in the matrix of force relations, which constitutes society. A discourse can be seen as providing a trajectory for these force relations; that is channelling those forces to produce certain effects, which we experience as power, being able to deconstruct by a particular discourse what values are embedded in it; the rhetoric it uses—is simultaneously a way of analysing the operation of power in society, specifically those relevant to the field of concern of the discourse.

For Foucault discourses are composed of endlessly proliferating meanings, none of which are stable. A discourse consists, he said, of numerous statements and events. Discourses have the direct relation with power. Mark Bevir took Foucauldian discourse on the negative and positive effects of power. He further writes:

Discourses appear as a result of external and internal controls, as understood respectively as the negative and positive effect of power. External controls exclude various statements from discourse by identifying them as intelligible, false or even insure. Internal controls define rules for the production of statements by insisting on things such as the role of the author, boundaries between disciplines, and a respect for intellectual authority. Truth is a thing of this world produced by external and internal constraints. (349)

For Foucault, no discourse, whatever its claims, can represent the truth of crime, madness, sexuality and so on. It can only treat them, contain them

somehow, within the 'sovereign' discourses of science. This is the power of one discourse in relation to another one. Power is always discursive relation rather than something which person or group wields or bears. Alee McHoul and Wendy Grace also relate Foucault's discourse with power. They posit:

Discourse moves in, and as, the flows of power. Discourses for example scientific discourse never move outside the limits of power so as to be able to 'purely analyse' it. The structuralists notion that 'ordinary' language always needs to be supplemented by an analysis of its truer and deeper meaning is effectively annulled. (McHoul 23)

They regard interpretation is nothing more than one discourse and say, "complete interpretation is impossible" (ibid). Truth can never be achieved through the discourse because truth changes as the system of power changes.

The discourse is formative and action-orientated. It is constructed to achieve particular social goals rather than representing facts. And it helps power holder to control people. The people have beliefs on presented truth because when one does not have what one wants, one has to believe on what one has. Our social lives are dominated by the written words of discourse. Any form of discourse is considered to be a source of power because it tells us to speak and act in certain ways. Almost every slice of social life is taken over by the rules and rituals of discourses and the expert carry it out within society. This form of modern sociological theory has shown us a shift towards a different type of organization of power in the ordinary world. So discourse is more of an invisible type of power that we take for granted, and do not even think to question in our everyday lives.

Uselessness of Revolt

Foucault regards single individual, a group of minority or an entire people who want to revolt against the authority and throws the risk of their life in the face of authority is useless. Any authority, for him, can minimize the revolt by using their tricks, "Because no authority is capable of making it utterly impossible." (*Power* 449) He further writes, "And because the man who rebels is finally in explicable; it takes a wrenching away that interrupts the flow of history, and its long chain to reasons, for a man to be able 'really' to prefer the risk of death to the certainty of having to obey" (*Power* 449).

We cannot say that Foucault talks about the liberation of 'embodied' individual. No doubt the writing of Foucault's latter career, pay much heed to human right, the revolutions, and the resistance of the 'subjects', he unlike Kant and Enlightenment Philosophers, does not see an individual breaking open from inside 'tutelage'. For him the revolts only try to alter the power relations by rising from another discourse. Revolts of this kind will also be nothing more than simply an attempt to create another 'essentialist' discourse.

There is no difference of a single man's death, a particular cry or a particular revolt in the general politics. For Foucault, "when a singularity revolts, in transient as soon as power violets the universal" (*Power* 453).

Though it is useless to revolt, we should continue to revolt the unjust authority. Although the subjects cannot liberate themselves form the states institutions, they can, according to Foucault "Promote new forms of subjectivity through refusal of a kind of individuality that has been imposed on (them) for several centuries" (*Power* 336).

Discourse and Media

As the civilization has become more complex and the need for invisible power has been increasingly demonstrated, the technical means have been invented and developed by which opinion may be regimented. With printing press, newspaper, television, radio and other technical means control over people is more effective because ideas can now be given effectiveness greater than the effectiveness of any personality and stronger than any sectional interest. So these technical means can manipulate the public mind and create public acceptance for a particular idea. As Joscha Chung views:

The influence of media on people's judgement never be underestimated, especially by political issue where nearly every newspaper and TV channel has their particular tendency. It is therefore not surprising that we are able to see numerous controversies and conflicts because of the commercial logic, and each media presents those issues with a more or less hidden angle derived from their tendency. (200)

Among many technologies, media has played a vital role in shaping our perception. It is therefore worth looking at what the media presents, how it does so, and what factors affect the way it is done. Even in the developed and freer nations, news and information is subject to partially and unbalanced coverage or just plain omission of the major issues. Accurate media representation of world issue is crucial. Whenever media reports are censored or biased, the people's basic rights are systematically undermined. In these situations, its violations and unaccountability often go unnoticed and suppressed viewpoints become commonplace. Of course press freedom is just one amongst many, many variables, that would indicate healthy

democracy, but it is one of a number of variables to indicate a healthy and diverse media, which itself is an integral component of functioning democracy. Ram Mohan Holagundi sees the formation of public opinion invites half-truth and untruths. He further views:

Given the political parties constitute interest constellation; the press might serve as a counter-weight informing public opinion by objective information and independent opinions. However, the press orients itself to the prejudice of the readership, not to the truth. For this purpose, information is filtered and adapted. [. . .] Newspapers are not only inhibited by political but also economic interest. (*Proceeding 52*)

So the free and liberal press could not work as the name suggests. They are totally controlled by the political and social institutions. They are the messengers of power. The ideologies of the people who are in power manifest by these institution. They create discourse as they want. If they turn, they are either suffering politically or economically. The cliché that the 'Liberal Press' is not more than one discourse produced by the power circuit.

Nexus between 'Truth' and 'Power'

Michel Foucault revisits the major theoretical career in the light of Nietzschean notion of genealogy. The notion allows him to place grater emphasis on unconscious operations of power dispersed throughout the social body, especially in major social factor such as factories, schools, hospitals, prison and so on. Genealogy makes Foucault present a highly politicised analysis of truth and power: genealogy assumes that truth, wherever it appears, is always relative to an order of power.

In an interview of *Truth and Power* Foucault talks about the interrelation between truth and power. He argues that there is no 'truth' as such but 'truths'. Power is within the subject of human discourse like sex, family, politics, society, and other institutions. Power is spread everywhere. Truth is something that is constructed under the control of power of various aspects. Truth, in practice, is not something objective or absolute. Truth changes as power changes. Truth is not constant. Rather it is sliding ground. It is completely shaped by power. In a sense truth is like a controlled horse of a clever master.

Foucault spends much of his career tracing the threads of truth and power as they intertwine with the history of human experience. He is a thinker who knows no bounds of subjects or fields. His ideas stretch from literature to science and from Psychology to labour. He deals a currency that is accepted everywhere as 'Truth and Power.' He specially loves to study asylums and prisons because they are close to an encapsulated power structure. Using technique gathered from psychology, politics, anthropology and archaeology, Foucault presents a highly politicised analysis of the flow of power and power relations. He further says about the power exercised method in his essay 'Truth and Power' as:

The way power was exercised concretely and in detail—with its specificity, its techniques and tactics, was something that no one attempted to ascertain; they contented themselves with denouncing it in a polemical and global fashion as it existed among the 'other' in the adversary camp. (*Power* 117)

Truth and power are just like the two sides of the same coin but it is linguistic discourse that originates the truth and truth produces the power and again it is the

knowledge that brings the better discourse and effective power. The discourses are produced within a real world of power struggle. Power cannot exist without truth and it is unstable because it is he who controls the power also controls the discourse.

A society has many systems that the people practice and the language is interwoven with social practices by the circulation of power. Power that diffuses itself in system of authority has the effect of truth, which are produced within the discourses of knowledge. But the discourses are neither true nor false; "effect of truth are produced with in discourses which in themselves are neither true nor false" (qtd in Adams, 1134). Hazard Adams on the introduction of Michel Foucault in his book *Critical Theory since Plato* writes:

Truth, then, is itself a product of relations of power and of the systems in which it flows, and it changes as systems change. By the same token, the old epistemological subject is no longer of importance (except, of course, as a historical product). Such a subject was constituted historically itself and cannot be presumed as 'truth' in any genealogical account. (1134)

In other words, the truth is related with power and it changes with change of power. Truth is like sliding ground, which is not lacking in power. It induces regular effect of power. Each and every society has its regime of truth. What power conceived as truth, the types of discourse and with the mechanisms and instance, which enables one to distinguish true and false statements, could not condemn it because it functions as true and fact.

The reality, Foucault suggests, is that the subjects individual and selves are constituted by power, that is, stable identities and unified selves are in fact the necessary and dignified selves are in fact the necessary fictions of power as it shapes people through a matrix of social and bodily relations. Therefore, he clearly sees truth to be intertwined with power.

The important thing here, I believe, is that truth is not outside power or lacking in power. Contrary to a myth whose history and functions would repay further study, truth isn't the reward of free spirits, the child of protracted solitude, nor the privilege of those who have succeeded in liberating themselves. Truth is thing of this world: it is produced only by virtue of multiple forms of constraint. And it induces regular effect of power. Each society has its regime of truth, its "general politics" of truth that is, the types of discourse it accepts and makes function as true. ("Truth and Power" 131)

Truth, according to Foucault, is social construct as each society creates a regime of truth consistent with its belief, values and mores. Foucault identifies the creation of truth in contemporary western society with five traits: the centring of truth on scientific discourse, accountability of truth to economic and political forces, the diffusion and consumption of truth via social apparatuses, the control of the distribution of truth by political and economic apparatuses, and the fact that it is the issue of a whole political debate and social confrontation.

For Reger Deacon western scientific values, political forms, moral customs and economic practices are mostly influential than other factors determining the creation of truth. For him truth can be considered good and worth knowing by,

"linking together, relations of power, forms of knowledge, feeling of desire and procedures of subjection, including, mechanisms for governing others and technology of the self" (437). By doing these things 'truth' is "discoverable but not transparent" (438) because it often mixed up with belief, error and desire.

For Foucault, individuals would do well to recognize that even the so-called ultimate truth is the construct of the political and economic forces that command the majority of the power within the societal web. There is no truly universal truth at all; therefore, the individual cannot convey universal truth. The intellectual must specialize, specify; so that one can be connected to one of the truth-generating apparatuses of the society. As Foucault explains it:

Truth is to be understood as a system of ordered procedures for the production, regulation, distribution, circulation and operation of statements. Truth is linked in a circular relation with system of power, which produces and sustains it, and to effects of power, which it induces and which extends it- A 'regime' of truth. (*Power* 132)

Truths are not born equal, because some discourses are more powerful than others. At issue remains the relation of knowledge and truth to political action. The modern world has repeatedly seen government manipulate their populations by outright lies and cover-ups of truth.

Because of this, Foucault sees the political problems of intellectuals not in terms of science and ideology, but in terms of truth and power. Truth is the function of power; power is fashioned by and circulated through the discourse of truth. The question of how to deal with and determine truth is at the base of political and social strife.

III. Textual Analysis

A Great Discovery and its Significance

All the citizens of the small Norwegian coastal town are very proud of the Baths for healing waters are making the town famous and prosperous. They call “magnificent” or “belauded Baths” or even “pulse of the town” (12) for these Baths. With many disagreements with his brother Peter Stockmann, Dr. Thomas Stockmann agrees that the Baths are the source of the town’s good fortune. Peter regards these Baths make the town Prosperous "the whole life of the town will centre around the Baths” (2). Hovstad, the editor of the People’s Messenger, and his sub-editor, Billing, are also laud in praise of he Baths. They ever demand Dr. Stockmann to write about the Baths.

The conflict of the play concerns the truth of the discovery Dr. Thomas Stockmann receives from the university report stating that the water of the Baths are contaminated. Dr. Thomas Stockmann, medical doctor of the Baths, also the protagonist of the play calls it “A great discovery” (11); for Peter Stockmann, the Burgomaster of the municipality, Chairman of the Baths it is “a snag”. The whole play centres on this issue. Dr. Stockmann has become suspicious for the whole year about the Baths when several visitors become ill after taking the Baths. He states:

Dr. Stockmann: I have investigated the whole thing as consciously as possible.

I’ve long had my suspicious about it. Last year we had some extraordinary cases of illness among the patients – both typhoid and gastric attack –

Mrs. Stockmann: Yes I remember.

Dr. Stockmann: We thought at the time that the visitors had brought the infection with them; but afterward—last winter—I began to question that. So I set about testing the water as well as I could. (11)

Being confirmed about it, he announces his discovery with factual proof. “(*showing letter*) Here it is! And it proves beyond dispute the presence of putrefying organic matter in the water—millions of infusoria. It’s absolutely pernicious to health, whether used internally or externally” (12).

As a medical doctor of the Baths, he has felt it his duty to investigate. So he has set the samples both of their drinking-water and of their sea-water to the university. After getting the report, he changes the way of thinking of the condition of the Baths as “simply a pestiferous hole” (*ibid*). He reveals the conclusion that the Baths condition is becoming the worst. He states:

Dr. Stockmann: I tell you the whole place is poisonous whited-sepulchre; noxious in the highest degree! All that filth up there in the Mill dale — the stuff that smells so horribly — taints the water in the feed — pipes of the pump — room; and the same accursed poisonous refuse oozes out of the beach. (*ibid*)

He has refused from the beginning that the Bath-buildings and water-works should not be placed where they are now. He calls this a “damned blunder” (25) of his brother Peter Stockmann, the Burgomaster. The problem arises from tanneries above the town is oozing into the pipes leading to the reservoir and infecting the waters. This meant that the big pipes would have to be relay at a tremendous cost to the owners or to the town. Thomas Stockmann, “a man of science” (27) wants to close these Baths until they are repaired because it may affect the town people’s health seriously.

In the beginning he is unaware of the socio-political significance of this discovery. So he immediately informs it to the director of the Baths with a statement. He believes that his brother, Peter Stockmann, the Burgomaster cannot sit without helping him and his 'great discovery'. He states, "he cannot possibly be otherwise than pleased that so important a fact has been brought to light" (13). He, after confirming the cause of the pollution by conducting laboratory test is going to alarm the town's people through an article in the daily-*People's Messenger*. Pressman and representative of citizens' forum (House-owner Association) assure him of their support. Hovstad, the editor of *Peoples's Messenge'*; vehemently agrees with Stockmann's discovery related with public health and promises him to his further activities:

Hovstad: I suppose you will let me put a short announcement of your discovery in the messenger

Dr. Stockmann: Yes, I shall be much obliged if you will.

Hovstad: It is highly desirable that the public should know about it as soon as possible

Dr. Stockmann: Yes certainly. (14)

Similarly Billing, the sub-editor of the same daily, also remarks positively to the doctor's discovery, "strike me dead if you won't be the first man in the town doctor" (ibid). Aslaksen, the president of the House-owner Association, pleads for moderation, but promises to fight what is right. He believes that he is with the majority of the people. He states: "You may find it no such bad thing to have us small middle-class men at your back. We form what you may call a compact majority in the

town-when we really make up your minds that have to say. And it's always well to have the majority with you, doctor" (19).

They all regard Doctor Thomas Stockmann as 'a true friend of the town':

Hovstad: You are a man to be backup, Doctor.

Aslaksen: Yes, there is no doubt the Doctor is a true friend to the town; he is what I call a friend of society.

Billing: Strike me dead, if Dr. Stockmann isn't a Friend of the People, Aslaksen! (34)

Moreover, according to Aslaksen, the House-owner Association is going to adopt the expression for Dr. Thomans Stockman as 'A Friend of the People' (34).

The whole play is based upon the effect of this 'Great Discovery' that Stockmann invents just now. Through this great discovery, Ibsen not only wants to show conflict between Dr. Thomas Stockmann and other characters of the play but also shows the real visible nature of society. Doctor's discovery is not simply scientific discovery about the water supply in the town's Baths but it is at the same time his recognition of socio-political situation of truth and power. Ibsen, through his mouthpiece character Dr. Thomas Stockmann has several times attacked the majority and its opinion among society. Dr. Thomas Stockmann states in public meeting;

Dr. Stockmann: I have said I would speak of the great discovery I have made within the last few days-the discovery that all our sources of spiritual life are poisoned, and that our whole society rests upon a pestilential basis of falsehood. (52)

In this way, Ibsen reflects this view of polluted institution through this discovery where there regards majority's opinions always right.

Doctor's Attempt to Assert the Truth and Subsequent Failure

Dr. Thomas Stockmann, immediately after discovering the fact wants to reveal the truth of the pollution of the water to the public. But Peter Stockmann, the president of the Baths and the Burgomaster of the municipality, who is also the elder brother of the Dr. Stockmann, forbids him from publishing the facts as the tourist season is about to begin. In the course of the debate when the Burgomaster charges him of "want to cut of he town's chief source of prosperity" (28), he defends himself, "that source is poisoned man! Are you mad? We live by trafficking in filth and corruption! The whole of our flourishing social life is rooted in a lie!" (ibid). The Burgomaster fears the fact that repairing of water supply network will cost a lot of money and take several months. He states:

Burgomaster: [. . .] Have you taken the trouble to think what your proposed alternations would cost? From what the engineer said, I gathered that the expenses would probably mount up to several hundred crowns.

Dr. Stockmann: So much so that?

Burgomaster: Yes, But that is not the worst. The work would take at least two years. (24)

So for Peter, closing the Baths for two years makes a loss of great financial income to the town as well as the rich shareholder of the Spa.

Though his brother tries to convince him, Dr. Stockmann does not agree with him telling that it is the truth related with public interest and health; "It would be dishonesty-fraud, a lie, and absolute crime against the public, against the society as a whole" (ibid). He further notifies his brother that he will publish the fact in "the liberal, independent press" (25) *People's Messenger*. He believes that they are waiting

to publish the fact soon. They even provoke Dr. Stockmann to fight for the truth. But they are also motivated by their self-interest. They are socially and economically weak. The Burgomaster follows him there and erects the barrier on his way. He cleverly convinces the pressmen about effect of Doctor's report if it is published. Dramatically the two editors and the printer then turn against Dr. Stockmann and support the Burgomaster, believing that the majority would do so. Havstad could not print the Doctor's article. So the doctor becomes unable to assert the truth to the public through this newspaper.

The Doctor attempts to reveal the fact by calling the meeting second time. He feels uncomfortable to get the meeting halls and finally gets on his friend Captain Horstor's house. Most of the citizens who attend the meeting have already disliked him because the Burgomaster and the newspaper editors had spread the news that he wanted to close the Baths and ruin the town. Aslaksen is nominated as chairman by the Burgomaster and controls the meeting that a discussion of the Baths is ruled out of order. Aslaksen ruled the Doctor's lecture time and again, "In the virtue of my position" (53) or "It seems to me that the honourable speaker is wandering rather far from the subject." (55) The Burgomaster Provokes him to rule, "Mr chairman, are such expressions permissible" (ibid)?

Though there he is ruling by the chairman Mr. Aslaksen, he tries to reveal the truth of the pollution, and he convinces the people that in the name of the majority the leaders corrupt the society. In the public meeting he states:

Dr. Stockmann: [. . .] I'm keeping as closely to my text as I possibly can; For my text is precisely this that the masses, the majority, this devil's own

compact majority-it's that, I say, that poisoning sources of our spiritual life, and making a plague-spot of the ground beneath our feet. (55)

He further convinces the people that "the majority has might unhappily but right it has not. It is I, and the few, the individuals, that are in the right. The minority is always right" (54). He wants to talk about the pollution of the water in the Baths but he is disturbed by the provoked people.

Dr. Stockemann: [. . .] I am about to make great revelations, my fellow.

Citizen! I am going to announce to you a far-reaching discovery, beside which the trifling fact that our water-works are poisoned and that our health-resort is built on pestilential ground sinks into insignificance.

Many voices (shouting): Don't speak about the Baths! We won't listen to that!

No more of that (52)

He attempts to assert the truth of the pollution without any self-interest and ego various times but he is unable to convince the public.

In the public meeting, Dr. Thomas Stockmann has called to disclose his discovery but his manipulative opponents falsely put blame on him for misleading the people, and declare that he is in fact 'an enemy of the people'.

Aslaksen: Both as a citizen of this town and as a human being, I am deeply shocked what it has been my lot to hear tonight. Dr. Stockman has unmasked himself in a manner I should never have dreamt of. I must reluctantly subscribe to the opinion just expressed by some estimable citizens; and I think we ought to formulate this opinion in a resolution. I therefore beg to move, "That this meeting declares the medical officer of the Baths, Dr. Thomas Stockmann, to be an enemy of the people" (59).

In the beginning, the same Aslaksen adopts him as a friend of the people but later he himself through House-owner Association declares him as an enemy of the people.

When power circuit exercise, the beliefs and attitudes of an individual or a group can change as in the play.

Burgomaster's Role in Concealing the Truth

Peter Stockmann the Burgomaster of the municipality wants to conceal the truth of pollution of water discovered by his brother, Dr. Thomas Stockmann. From the very beginning, he is the one who opposed the discovery. Hovstad, Billing and Aslaksen support the doctor's discovery at first. Morten Kill is also the one who opposes the discovery from the very first. He calls, "I could never have believed that you would play monkey-tricks with your very own brother" (16). The Burgomaster is motivated by the economic self-interest and conservatism. He wants no more risk to his position socially, politically and economically. After knowing the doctor's discovery about the Baths, the first reaction of the Burgomaster is that he had not, "succeeded in convincing myself" (24) by the doctor's report. He even says, "I believe you exaggerate greatly" (ibid). In addition, being a doctor of the Baths, he has to seek the alternative way instead of closing them "A competent physician should know what measures to take—he should be able to obviate deleterious influence, and to counteract them in case they should make themselves unmistakably felt" (ibid).

He goes to the doctor and insists that he keeps his knowledge himself because the income of the town would be lost if the reports are made public.

Burgomaster: [. . .] Therefore—and on various other grounds—it is of great moment to me that your statement should not be submitted to the Board of Directors. It must be kept back, for the good of the community later on I will

bring up the matter for discussion and we will do the best we can, quietly; but not a word, not a whisper, of this unfortunate business must come to the public ears. (25)

For him, the repair would be too costly that the owner of the Baths cannot stand the cost. He states, "At a rough provisional estimate the alternations the doctor thinks desirable will come to two or three hundred thousand crowns" (40). It is unpopular to increase the taxes to clean up the water. For him, the town people never allow to further expenses, "The proprietors are not in a position to go to any further expense" (ibid). So it is the best way to conceal the truth. But concealment of truth, of pollution of water is "dishonesty" (24) for Dr. Stockmann. And he informs his brother, Peter Stockmann, he has given the article already to Hovstad for publishing the fact about the condition of Baths:

Burgomaster: It must and shall be prevented

Dr. Stockmann: It cannot be, I tell you: for too many people know about it already

Burgomaster: know about it! Who? Surely not those fellows on the *People's Messenger*

Dr. Stockmann: Oh yes: they know [. . .] (25)

Then the Burgomaster again insists Dr. Stockmann to give a statement to reassure the public, "All sorts of rumours will get abroad, and evil-disposed persons will invent all sorts of additions to them. It will therefore be necessary for you publicly to contradict these rumours" (27). He further says "we consider it absolutely necessary that you should issue a statement in the term indicated" (28). In the case of the doctor's denial, they themselves put forth a statement to reassure the public and conceal the truth.

In the process of concealment of the truth of the contaminated Baths, the Burgomaster follows Dr. Stockmann in the office of the *People's Messenger* from the back door. He wants to conceal the real truth so he enters there from backside. He convinces the newsmen very cleverly that the proprietors of the Baths should pay large amount of money if the doctor's report is made public. And he informs them that they have to close the Baths for a couple of years. Aslaksen, the president of the House-owner Association immediately changes his promises to help the doctor and says, "It's all than fancy" (41). Hovstad and Billing also change their promises and are ready to publish the Burgomaster's statement instead of the doctor's article. They all involve in concealing the truth by their newspaper. They ruin doctor's report so that people could be motivated.

Again in the public meeting called by Dr. Stockmann, the Burgomaster, interrupts by choosing Aslaksen, the chairman to rule the doctor's announcement about the Baths, "I should certainly say that a chairman ought to be elected" (48). After choosing the chairman, according to their plan, the Burgomaster motivated people by giving a speech before doctor's lecture. He convinces the people cleverly that the doctor should not talk about the condition of Baths, "the meetings decline to have the proposed lecture of speech on the subject by the medical officer of the Baths" (50). Time and again he persuades Aslaksen, the chairman of the meeting, to rule Dr. Stockmann's lecture when he enters the issue of Baths, "such an insinuation-!" (52) Or "I beg to endorse the chairman's remark"(55). Hovstad, Billing and Aslaksen are also responsible to conceal the truth. But they are only the minor actors. The Burgomaster, who previously planed to conceal the truth, succeeds by taking the help with them. He is the director of concealment of the truth.

Uselessness of Revolt

Dr. Thoman Stockmann, the medical officer of the Baths, discovers that the water of the Baths is contaminated. Peter Stockmann, the Burgomaster forbids him to publish the fact to the public. The doctor tries to revolt to the power, which is exercised by the Burgomaster of the municipality. Foucault says, "The impulse by which a single individual, a group, a minority, or an entire people says "I will no longer obey" and throws the risk of their life in the face of authority, they consider unjust seem to me to be something irreducible" (*power* 449). Doctor's revolt against the majority is useless because minority becomes subordinate in society. He has to follow the norms, laws, rules, etc. accordingly that majority wants. Power makes the majority rule the people. Dr. Stockmann has no more self-interest than public welfare. But it is against the authority. He is ordered by the Burgomaster not to publish the fact. The Burgomaster orders, "An official, you have no right to hold any individual conviction" (27). He revolts against the unjust authority and tries to publish the fact through the "liberal independent press" (25) but there also the institution cheats him. Instead of his article they want to publish the Burgomaster's statement, which is against his article.

He again attempts to revolt by calling a public meeting. There too he is suppressed by the opinion of damn "compact majority"(54). His challenges fall on deaf ears. As he knows the majority could not understand the meaning of his words. He is voted "an enemy of the people" (59). He is dismissed from the post.

All the people who regard doctor's discovery is correct suffer in one-way or the other. His daughter Petra is fired from the school where she has been teaching for sometime. Captain Horster is also dismissed from his job. Provoked crowd of

mischievous men stones the Doctor's house and the landlord sends the vacation notice to him. Morten Kill, whose leather factory is the main source of the pollution, changes his will, which would have provided considerable money to the doctor's wife and children.

Other characters do not want to revolt; Hovstad and Billing step back from the Burgomaster's side because both of them fear that they will lose their jobs if they go for truth. Hovstad says, "I shall not print it, I cannot, and will not and dare not print it" (45). "Dare not", it is a term all of them repeat in front of the doctor to support him. The landlord of Dr. Stockmann dares not do anything else and gives him notice to leave the house "He is very unwilling to do it; but he dare not do otherwise on the account of his fellow citizens" (62) Petra's school principal gives her notice to leave the school, "She dares not do otherwise" (64). Captain Horster's ship-lord, Mr. Vik, also gives him notice to leave the ship "He would gladly have kept men on if only he dared" (66) and even the director of the Baths, his own brother Peter says, "we dared not do otherwise on the account of public opinion" (67). As Foucault says, "what difference does a particular death, a particular cry, a particular revolt make compared to the great general necessity, and on the other hand, what difference does a general principle make in the particular situation where we are" (Faubian 453)? The Dr. Stockmann's revolt makes no difference in society. The power makes the general necessity of anything and creates no more use by a single individual or minority's revolt.

Most of the Ibsen's main characters usually revolt against the society but we can observe these all revolts change no more but their useless effort. Foucault says,

"Against power one must always set inviolable laws and unrestricted right" (*Power* 453). Individual is no more than the slave of power.

For Foucault, though it is useless to revolt, we should continue to revolt against unjust authority. Doctor changes his will to go from his town and plans to revolt against by opening new types of school.

Discourse and Power: Determination of Truth

The entire play is the network of controlling and searching of power, which is the result of linguistic discourse. The central issue of the play is whether to conceal or to reveal the truth of pollution to the public. In this struggle the authority especially the Burgomaster wants to conceal the truth. That is because the discovered truth has endangered their position in power and may lose the profit. The authority uses pastoral power to manipulate the public to conceal the truth. Before the Doctor reads his report in the public meeting, the Burgomaster has already published another statement that the doctor's would be report is no more than a rumour.

Burgomaster: In my statement in the *People's Messenger* I have made the public acquainted with the essential facts, so that all well disposed citizens can easily form their own judgement. From that statement it will be seen that the medical officer's proposal besides amounting to a vote of censure upon the leading men of the town at bottom only means saddling the ratepayers with an unnecessary outlay of at least a hundred thousand crowns. (50)

He wants to suppress the doctor's opinion not directly but to manipulate the public. The people always consider their leaders are right. Before the meeting one confused man convinced by another in such a way that each and every activities of Aslaksen should be followed "Just keep on your eyes on Aslaksen and do as he does" (47).

Similarly when Aslaksen and the Burgomaster regards the need of a chairman in the meeting, they blindly follow them "A chairman! A chairman!" (49) as if they have internalised the rule of the meeting. Foucault says, "Pastoral power is not merely a form of domination of a form of power that commands" ("Subject and Power" 333). Aslaksen and the mayor need not to command the public in the meeting to follow what they want but they themselves are motivated, as they want.

The unseen characters like principal of Petra's school and Ship-lord of the Captain Horster's ship without commanding by anybody dismiss them from their post. In the same way the Landlord of the Doctor's house also gives the vacation notice. They are controlled by the domination of the authority that may harm if they do not do so. They are operated by not as a direct, immediate form of domination as does violence but as a type of influence. In modern time this form of power is mostly used to dominate the individual, a group of minority or an entire people.

Power is all pervasive, for Foucault "It is not just ruthless domination of the weaker by stronger (to paraphrase Nietzsche); in fact, it is not to be 'had' at all" (McHoul 39). In the play most of the people use their power over others. Hovstad tries to blackmail Petra when she refuses to translate the book he had given her because it opposes her belief and the *People's Messenger* as well "Because your father cannot do without my help" (38). Mr Vik, the ship-lord of Captain Horster also uses his power when he gives his hall to Dr. Stockmann for the public meeting, "Well captain, so you lend your house to enemies of the people" (60). When Horster replies, it is his right to use his private property. Then he indirectly threatens "then of course you can have no objection if I follow your example" (ibid)? That is why he can dismiss from his post because the ship is his private property. In the play, power is used by various persons

at various times. Petra's school's principal, Mrs Busk uses her power to dismiss her from the post. The landlord uses his power to send vacation notice to Dr. Stockmann. Aslaksen uses his power of printer and says to the doctor when he requests to print his article as a pamphlet with his own expenses, "No, if you offered me its weight in gold. I darenot land my press to such purpose, doctor" (46). Morten kill uses Mrs Stockmann's inheritance to purchase the remaining stock in the contaminated Baths. He even threatens Dr. Stockmann to change his will if he wants to save this money "If its no, all the shares go to the Hospital -and that this very day"(71). In these each and every action the Burgomaster of the municipality, Director of the Bath and Police, plays the real role. All of the above mentioned characters are feared by his further action if they do not do so.

In the disciplined society people have to follow laws, norms and rules. These are made by power, exercised by power, with them ruled by power. In the name of norms, laws and rules, they control over other. In the play, the mayor represents the real power holder who wants to suppress the truth of pollution of water, discovered by Dr. Stockmann by showing the rules, laws, and norms. For him Dr. Stockmann should not express his ideas without their acceptance. He calls it 'an official secret'. The mayor blames him being an insane first, "As you have not had the sense to refrain from chattering to outsiders about this delicate business, which should have been kept an official secret, of course it cannot now be hushed up" (27). Power always makes the public unaware about many things related with public interest and health by calling the official secret. Similarly he marshals Dr. Stockmann has no right to hold any individual conviction as an official, "As an official, I say. In your private capacity, of course, it is another matter. But as a subordinate official of the Baths, you

have no right to express any conviction at issue with that of you superiors" (27).

Administratively, the Burgomaster is a dictator who marshals all the power of the town council, Board of the Baths and the Police.

Burgomaster: As you please so long as it does not concern the Baths. With them we forbid you to meddle.

Dr. Stockmann(shouts): You forbid ! You! A set of

Burgomaster: I forbid it I, your chief; and when I issue an order, you have simply to obey. (ibid)

If an individual official does not obey the authority, he/she may dismiss from the post.

Dr. Stockmann does not agree to issue another statement to reassure the public, the mayor threatens him, of his dismissal, "Your dismissal from the Baths. I shall be compelled to move that notice be given you at once, and that you have henceforth no connection whatever with the Baths" (28). The Burgomaster exercises all his influence over the majority of the people against the innocent and truthful character of the doctor. All he cares about is how to save the position and property. He is in the power so when he calls the Dr. Stockmann, "the man who scatters broadcast such offensive insinuations against his native place must be an enemy of the society" (ibid), the majority of the people agree with him. He again threatens the doctor not to reveal the truth, "You have had your warning now" (29).

Mrs. Stockmann is the one who accepts that those who have might only then they can use their right. She, in the course of the debate with her husbands says, "Ah Yes, right, right! What good does it do to have the right if you have not might" (29)? Ibsen, by her expression wants to prove that right, is not for the individual being but it is for the power.

In the public meeting, the Burgomaster and the nominated chairman of the meetings, Mr. Aslaksen, directly interrupts Doctor's lecture time and again. In the disciplined society one individual cannot present his/ her attitude if it is considered to be opposite to the belief of the authority. When the meeting is motivated to the will of the power, they vote the innocent doctor as " enemy of the people" (59).

Another way of presenting power through media is effective. Power captures the means of communication so that they can easily manipulate the public opinion. In the play, the influence of media on people's judgement can be observed before the meeting starts in the hall. They discuss about the news published in the "*People messenger*" as

Third citizen: But he's all wrong; the *people's messenger* says so.

Second citizen: Yes he must be wrong this time; for neither the House-owner Association nor the Citizens' Club let him have a hall.

First citizen: They wouldn't lend him the hall at the Baths. (47)

Here we can observe the shaping of public mind by totally the media or the newspaper. They even blindly follow their leaders. A man says, "Just keep you eye on Aslaksen, and do as he does" (ibid). Rammohan Holagundi writes:

In *An enemy of the People*, it is not readers, but capital interests which put pressure on the newspaper. Editor Hovstad wants to stand up for the right opinions but unfortunately the creditors of the paper do not agree, and they have power to stop it. The majority is not necessarily right. People may be dominated by thinking in grooves. (*Proceeding* 52)

In the office of the *People's Messenger*, the pressmen seriously talk about the proprietor of the paper if they go against the authority.

Hovstad: Do you know of anyone else that will pay our paper and printing?

Billing: What a confounded nuisance it is to have no capital!

Hovstad (*sitting down by the desk*): Yes, if we only had that----

Billing: suppose you applied to Dr. Stockmann.

Hovstad(*turning over his paper*): What would be the good? He has not a rap.

(35)

For Aslaksen the paper is the total control over the subscribers not the editor, "It's a public opinion, the enlightened majority, the House-owners and all the rest. It's they who control a paper" (45).

The Burgomaster succeeds with his discourse to control the people so that the doctor is wrong. Hovstad readily wants to print his statement instead of the doctor's article "When this appears, the public will be in possession of all necessary information; it is an authentic statement I place in your hand" (ibid).

In this way, the report, which is scientifically proved by an authentic university, has become wrong and the statement, which comes marshals the doctor's report, becomes the authentic statement. The Burgomaster's power over doctor's report is the example of power exercised in society.

Nexus between 'Truth' and 'Power'

The doctor's view of the problem of contaminated Baths seems reasonable enough. He receives the support of the liberal town newspaper and a majority of the people but is almost opposed by his own brother, Peter, the Burgomaster of the town, and the senior member of the Board of Directors of the Baths. Burgomaster questions the scientific accuracy of the tests must be subordinated to the economic well being of the town, "The matter in question is not purely scientific one, it is a complex affair; it

has both a technical and economic side" (27). Dr. Stockmann loses all the public support for his position as soon as the economic consequences of his discovery become known. He is ridiculed at the public meeting and a mob marches near his house and stones it. People seem to be willing to accept truth only as long as their financial and power positions are unthreatened by it.

In addition to the scientific discovery, the doctor in his struggle for truth recognizes another social truth-The Nexus between 'Truth' and 'Power'. As Foucault says, "it being understood also that it is not a matter of battle 'on behalf' of the truth but of a battle about the state of truth and the economic and social role it plays ("Truth and Power" 132). The truth is not outside power or lacking in power in the play also. Dr. Thomas Stockmann's the protagonist, construction of truth on the contaminated Baths cannot resurface as true since the truth cannot establish the nexus with the power circuit exercised by the Burgomaster of the municipality, who by means of his power converts the truth of pollution as false.

When the Doctor is in the power in the power or as the medical doctor of the Baths his constructions of truth counts as reasonable and trustworthy. But it is immediately invoked when the Burgomaster, his brother, Peter stands against him because he is superior in exercising the power. All the characters also stand against him when he is in minority, Havstad the editor says, "The majority always has right on its side" (54). Billing supports the ideas of his superior, Hovstad that the majority has truth, "Yes and truth too" (ibid). They know the real truth, which is in the doctor's discovery but they are the slave of power so they stand with the majority.

Power can manipulate the public easily. Aslaksen, Hovstad and Billing do this business forever. The Burgomaster really uses the sovereign power manipulates them.

The truth is not outside the limit of power. Doctor realises it before he is voted as 'an enemy of the people'-that the compact majority is the real enemy of 'truth' and 'freedom'.

Dr. Stockmann: Yes, you may be sure. I shall name them! For this is the great discovery I made yesterday: (*in a louder tone*) the most dangerous foe the truth and freedom in our midst is the compact majority. Yes, it's the confounded, compact, liberal majority—that and nothing else! There I've told you. (54)

He discovers the two facts, the first contaminated Baths with scientific proof and the second social truth that the compact majority always destroys the truth and freedom of people. But he cannot prove them to the people because he is inferior in exercising power. Individuals would do recognize that even the so-called ultimate truth is the construct of the political and economic forces that command the majority of the power within the societal web. There is no universal truth at all; therefore nobody can convey the universal truth.

Those who are in power economically or politically create discourse. Their discourse is acceptable to the society because they are in authentic position; and it becomes truth at last. The Burgomaster creates the discourse in the statement, which is published in *People's Messenger* instead of the Doctor's article. He is in power, so his creation of truth is acceptable in the town. The discourse (statement) helps power holder to control the people like Dr. Thomas Stockmann who wants to serve the people without any self-interest. The Burgomaster also convinces the pressmen and the people cleverly so that they are motivated against the Doctor's view because it may cause devastation in town's economic condition. They all convince the people in the public meeting that the Doctor is wrong.

In this way the truth that the Dr. Stockmann has discovered is concealed and the truth that the mayor has said to Doctor as "An enemy of the society" (28) is revealed everywhere. It is because of the Burgomaster's power for saving his position politically and economically. The truth is linked in a circular relation with system of power, which produce it, sustain it, and the effect of power, which it induces and which extend it.

Conclusion

This study has taken Foucauldian notion of nexus between 'Truth' and 'Power' in analyzing the present text '*An Enemy of the People*'. It has been focused on the analyses of how power circuit is exercised in the society and converts the real truth as false. The conflict of the play is one between the ruler who hold the power and the ruled one.

The protagonist of the play, Dr. Thomas Stockmann, discovers that the healing waters, the principal source of income for the town are polluted, causing typhoid, fever and gastric illnesses to the users. Stockmann is the honest man in the town. His honesty is revealed here being a revolutionary figure to prove what is right. When he realizes that all of his associates would prefer to conceal the fact that the Baths are polluted, he is at first amazed and then infuriated. He attempts to reveal the truth many times. The pressmen denies to reveal the truth of pollution and its information to the public through the press; he at last, calls a public meeting in the home of Captain Horster to assert the real cause of the pollution. All his efforts to reveal the truth of pollution and makes public aware goes in vain when the power twists the situation according to what they want.

Peter Stockmann, the Burgomaster of the municipality, who holds the power of the town, fears economically, socially and politically to implement the discovery of the Doctor in the town. So the truth related to public interest and health strikes at the self interest and ego of the people like Peter Stockmann. Through false propaganda, he manages to tame the power of the press, and reverses the public opinion. He uses all types of power like request, proposals, insists, demands, orders, threatens to conceal the truth and becomes successful at last by manipulating the public. Power

uses the discourses like 'official secret', 'rules ', 'laws', etc. to suppress the individual's right in society.

The Doctor seems to be a revolutionary figure but his revolt does no changes in society. The power can suppress individual revolt by using their tricks. Henrik Ibsen always makes his main characters to revolt against the unjust authority but almost all ends up in fruitless. Doctor's revolt against the unjust authority shows the uselessness of revolt where he is innocently fighting for the truth and welfare of the society is voted as 'an enemy of the people' at last.

Power uses different techniques like pastoral and disciplinary to control the people whatever they like. Hovstad, Billing, Aslaksen, Landlord, Principal, Shiplord, etc. are motivated by pastoral power. Nobody orders them to take action. They themselves do as they have internalized the rules norms and laws. They may revolt against the authority by not taking the action but they fear because the power can harm if they do so. Similarly the Burgomaster uses disciplinary power that directly imposes the power upon Dr Thomas Stockmann for concealing the truth. He uses official rules, laws, and norms and so on to make the truth 'untruth'. The Burgomaster also threatens Doctor to dismiss from the post if he would go against his will. He manages to nominate Aslaksen the chairman of the meeting, can run according to him. Aslaksen gives Burgomaster, the first chance to address the public. He convinces the mass that the Doctor is totally wrong. The Burgomaster even proposes not to allow the Doctor to present his account. He interprets the Doctor's effort to improve the Baths as his ill intention. He persuades Aslaksen, the chairman of the meeting, time and again to rule the Doctor when he enters into the issue of Baths.

Ibsen through this play wants to show the connection between 'Truth' and 'Power' in such a way that we can easily understand it after reading the play. The pure truth through this "great discovery" is understood by each main character except the public in the meeting. After knowing the political consequences of the discovery, the Burgomaster from the very beginning opposes it. He convinces Aslaksen, the president of the House-owner Association, it relating with economic consequences of the discovery. Hovstad and Billing fear to support this discovery with the connection of their job and proprietors of the newspaper. Truth is the constructs of political and economic forces that command the majority of the power in the societal web. The Burgomaster has the power politically and economically and after manipulating the public opinion, he is in the side of the majority. His constructions of truth that Dr. Thomas Stockmann as "An Enemy of the People" is considered to be the real truth in society. The public meeting after voting, declares him as the enemy. The Doctor, who is working as a true friend of the society, is seen as the enemy of the society. His construction of truth with scientific proof is made false by imposing the power.

In this way Henrik Ibsen, in *An Enemy of the People* foregrounds the notion of 'Truth' and 'Power' by showing the nexus between them. Truth has the relative relation with socio-political and economic power in society which is clearly seen in the play by dramatizing the two main characters Dr. Thomas Stockmann and the Peter Stockmann, the Burgomaster.

Works Cited

- Adams, Hazard. Ed. *Critical Theory Since Plato*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich. 1972.
- Ahmed, Shafi, "Why do you need Ibsen in Bangladesh today?" *Ibsen: Beyond Time and Space*. Eds. Prakash Subedi, Jeebesh Rayamajhi and Bal Bahadur Thapa. Kathmandu: Gurukul; 2006. 123-33.
- Andersen, Merete Morken. "An Artist as an Enemy of the People Ibsen in the perspective of Role Theory." *Proceeding*. Dhaka: Centre for Asian Theatre, 2006. 5-20
- Bevir, Mark. "Foucault, Power and Institution." *Political Studies* *Xlvii* (1994): 345-359
- Brown Ivor. Introduction *An Enemy of the People*. William Heinemann, 1907. vii-xi
- Chowdhary, Sir Goutam Roy. "Director Note" *Brouchure, Ibsen Theatre Festival*. Kathmandu: Gurukul, 2006. 23
- Chung, Joscha. "Is this Our Citizenship and Morality?" Eds. Prakash Subedi, Jeebesh Rayamajhi and Bal Bahadur Thapa. 197-213
- Cranny-Francis Anne, Wendy Waring and et all. "Ways of thinking." *Gender Studies*. Palgrave Macmillan; 2003. 62-78
- Deacon, Roger. "Truth, Power and Pedagogy: Michel Foucault on the rise of the Disciplines." *Educational Philosophy and Theory* *vol.34* (2002): 435-458.
- Fjelde, Rolf. ed. Foreword *Four Major Plays by Henrik Ibsen*. New York: New American Library, 1970. ix-xxxiv

- Foucault, Michel. "Nietzsche, Genealogy and History." *Intellectual History Reader*. Ed. Beerendra Pandey. Kathmandu: M.K. publisher, 2005. 81-102
- - -. Introduction. *Power*. By James D Faubian. New York: The New Press, 2000. i-xl.
- - -. *Power*. Ed. James D Faubian. New York: The New Press. 2000.
- . *The History of Sexuality*, Trans. Robert Hurley. Vol.1. New York: Pantheon, 1978. 3 vols. 1978-86
- Gallienne, Evale. Trans. and ed. Introduction. *Six plays by Henrik Ibsen*. New York: The Modern Library, 1951. vi-xxx
- Gupto Arun. "Foucault and his analysis of History." *Healing Thoughts on Tender Theory*. Kathmandu: New Hira Books Enterprises, 2004. 113-120
- Holagundi, Rammohan. "Was He One of Democracy's Sharpest Critics? A view of Henrik Ibsen As a Critic of Democracy." Dhaka: Centre for Asian Theatre, 2006. 49-57
- Ibsen, Henrik. *An Enemy of the People*. Trans-Eleanor Marx-Aveling. London: William Heinemann, 1907.1-77
- Kiria Nina. "The Plays of Ibsen of Georgian Theatre." Eds. Prakash Subedi, Jeebesh Rayamajhi and Bal Bahadur Thapa. 235-270
- Lucas. F.L. "An Enemy of the People" *Ibsen and Strindberg* London: Cassell, 1962. 171-177
- McHoul Alec and Wendy Grace. *A Foucault Primer*. New York: University Press, 1993.

Mori, Mitsuya. "Ibsen, Social or Anti Social." Dhaka: Centre for Asian Theatre,

2006. 23-32

Nadeem, Shahid. "Director's Note" *Brouchure, Ibsen Theatre Festival*.

Kathmandu: Gurukul, 2006. 51-52.

Selden, Raman. "Poststructural Theories." *A Reader's Guide to Contemporary*

Literary Theory. Harvester Wheqtsheaf, 1990

Zahedi, Farindokht. "An Enemy of the People in Iran." Dhaka: Centre for Asian

Theatre, 2006.151-157