

## I: Introduction

Edward Albee, a prominent practitioner of Existential Philosophy in America in 1960s, focuses on the absurdity of life in his dramas. But he is not considered as grim as Samuel Beckett, Eugene Ionesco and Jean Genet, his plays are more critical of American dreams and social behaviour. *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* is a critique of American society that highlights the futility of life. The parable of modern existence and the American ethos find a common articulation in Albee's concern with illusion and reality. With substantial theatrical force, Albee has brought into focus, the pointlessness and absurdity of the human situation.

The play begins in George and Martha's house at 2:00 am early morning. They have returned from a party held at Martha's father's house. They are heavily drunk, and as Martha informs, expecting their guests Nick and Honey whom she had met at party but George is unaware about this? Nick is the professor of Biology in the same college. He is handsome, self-confident man of thirties, but his wife is shallow-minded. At the beginning, George is disgusted for the late-night guests. As they all sat drinking and talking, Martha and George start a verbal quarrel embarrassing the guests. Martha makes fun of George in front of their guests, Nick and Honey, and mocks at his failure. Later she even talks about their imaginary son which they (Martha and George) have agreed to make secret. This violation of the agreement existing between herself and her husband infuriates George. When Nick and George are alone, Nick also tells George that he married Honey because he had wrongly thought that Honey had become pregnant, and also because she had a lot of money in her home.

Martha pokes fun of George time and again before the guests, and they continuously fight with each other. Martha tries to make love with? before her husband but George shows his indifference. Martha feels enraged and soon takes Nick upstairs with her to seduce him. George feels humiliated and angry, and is unable to control his anger; he flings a book at doorbell. The sound of bell awakens Honey and she tells George that she did not have any children as she was afraid of child-birth pain. George thinks of an idea to torture Martha and tells her that he had received a telegram about the death of their son. In the constant accusation, it becomes clear to Nick that the son is not real but a figment of their imagination. Nick and Honey leave, Martha is completely shattered and heart-broken. George tries to console Martha and the play ends.

*Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* is, thus a social document on existential theme. Existentialism believes that life is meaningless and futile but we tend to live by creating different means to search meaning in life. In the play Martha and George create an imaginary son to get meaning in life. They feel easy to live in the world of illusion. Their conversation about their past and other relatives hints that they are childless and the childlessness pinched them amid the other people in the society. Though their son is imaginary, they are happy to have one. By creating an imaginary son they at the same time kill two birds by one stone: they get a way of searching meaning in their lives, and they find the increased position in society. Their increased social position is just an illusion. They are aware of it but they pretend to be so. We all have to have many pretensions to live. Without this life is not worth living.

George is the professor of History department for a long time but he could not get the upper position as expected by his wife Martha and his father – in – law,

the dean of the college. For this Martha humiliates him time and again. But he is not moved. He accepts all the accusations and disgust of Martha as there is no way out of absurdity and futility of life. But when, again, she infuriates him telling her new guests Nick and Honey about his past life and his attempt to write a novel, George determines to revenge Martha of his fiasco. He reminds Martha to stop criticizing him but that suggestion fuels her to convey more. As she has already confided about their son and his arrival at the coming birthday to Honey, George reminds her of their compromise to not to speak about their child. Because of Martha's sexual advances to Nick and their upstairs scene, George decides to throw his last ace against Martha's attack. George informs Martha and their guests about the death of their child. Nick even knows their child is just an imaginary one as he is leaving. The guests leave and George is consoling Martha.

Their creation of an imaginary son to search meaning in life shows that they are trying to escape from reality. Reality of life is always bitter; life is meaningless and absurd, and when we realize it, it is much difficult to live. Realization is the source of tragedy. To avoid the tragic reality of life they create an illusion: son. But when they kill that imaginary one, they do not cease to live they go on living as before. It is evident and important that their affirmation of futility of life is not the product of their quarrel but it's the natural process. We tend to live by creating any illusion in life to search meaning. We have already known that life is meaningless but we pretend the reality. The pretension of reality gives the gut to live life simply and heavenly. If we try to live life as what it is – meaninglessly.

The childless couple go on living as before when they kill their imaginary son because they have realized the absurdity of life. There is no hope and meaning

in life, and at the same time there is no alternative of living too. Why do Martha and George create fictional child and Nick and Honey create a fake pregnancy? Why does George destroy his fictional child? Why does he quarrel with Martha and Nick? George and Martha create an imaginary son. Later when George is annoyed with Martha, he kills the unborn child. What does the incident show? When the guests leave and the death of the child arrive, why does George console Martha? From all these various questions a final problem arises what is the cause behind peoples going on living despite the understanding of absurdity of life?

*Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* is at once more or less direct, because Albee focuses on the immediate interaction of his characters, on the moment-by-moment playing out of their various games, stories and confrontations, rather than on the explication of thematic paradoxes. To dissolve another dichotomy, the play's 'content' reflects its form, but the form is-in a still more important sense – its content.

For Albee the world makes no sense because the moral religious, political and social structures man has erected to delude himself have collapsed. Richard Schechner on *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* in *Tulane Drama Review* writes:

Albee makes dishonesty a virtue, perversion a joke, adultery a simple party game . . . The American theatre, our theatre, is so hungry so voracious, so corrupt, so morally blind, so perverse that *Virginia Woolf* becomes a success. (10)

Schechner finds *Virginia Woolf* a perversive and corrupt drama but it is successful because of the corruptness of society. Albee's depiction of such issues is not his mistake but the pressure of the American society. He finds that the corrupted and decadent people of the American society easily accept such dramas. He even

praises Albee for his depiction of social reality and alarming the American conscious people.

On the other hand Robert Potter tries to mould *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* in the frame of morality play. He finds in this play too the aspects of morality play. He asserts:

The human drama of a morality play is an analogous, but crucially different, presentation of the life cycle. Beginning in innocence man falls by exercise of free will and appetite in dilemma of his own making. From this depth, however he is inexorably delivered by divine grace to achieve salvation and eternal life, the end of human life is not 'mere oblivion' but regeneration never death, always a rebirth. (10)

For Potter the fall in the morality play is due to man's engagement in worldly affairs and his ignorance of divinity because of his escape from reality into an illusion. So, illusion becomes the base of man's fall.

Critic Lynn Dumenil finds the equality of women in Albee's drama. Their equal participation in parties and drinking, for him, is the cause of medias and their frequent use of Freudian sexuality. He opines:

In particular, women wanted equality with men in matters of style and behaviour. They insisted upon their rights to drink and smoke in public to be unrestrained in their behaviour and in particular to obtain sexual satisfaction. This new emphasis on sexuality was evident in changed expectations about the material sexual relationship. Propted by the media popularization of Freud and the

increasing availability and use of birth control the ideal marriage was more sexual. (180)

Here, Dumenil claims that the women of 1960s were trying to be equal with the males. For this, they are energized by the media which popularized the Freudian sexuality. They have used sex to control the male and be equal with them. They take this pills for birth control and try to be ever energetic and young. This illusion encourages them to go on it but that is leading them to their doom which they have never thought.

Surprisingly, Rose A Zimbardo has found out the Biblical themes and symbols in Albee's *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?*. He finds Albee creating the modern theme where he [Albee] frequently uses the Biblical symbols. Zimbardo shows:

Albee in creating this theme has used a pattern of symbolism that is an immensely expanded allusion to the story of Christ's sacrifice. But the symbolism is not outside the story of modern man and his isolation and hope for salvation. He uses the allusion to support his own story. He has chosen traditional Christian symbol, think not, because they are tricky attention getters, but because the sacrifice of Christ is perhaps the most effective way that the story has been told in the past. (45)

Zimbardo's finding the Biblical symbols in *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* is shocking but not futile. The suffer George or Martha can be compared to Christ. They may seem suffering life Christ if we see their position from the Biblical or religious standpoint which Zimbardo has done.

Albee's depiction of the then society in *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* has been eyed by different critics. They find social and familial disintegration in American society. It's also evident that the American society is fueled by the existential concern. The meaninglessness and futility of 1960s American society is the most influential concern of Albee. He portrays a society where there is no meaning but the individual go on living though they are aware of their futility of living. Martha, George, Nick and Honey's survival has no fruitful meaning but they live and act just to feel the illusion of life and to prove the futility of existence.

## II: Existential Philosophy

### 2.1 Existentialism

Existentialism is a philosophy that originated especially after the Second World War in Europe, though its traces go back to Kierkegaard of nineteenth century. The term is compound word of 'exist' and 'essence'. That is to say, man exists before he acquires essence, a definite individuality. Furthermore, existentialism focuses on our consciousness of the world, other people, and ourselves rather than on external objects taken as things apart from consciousness with its emphasis on the subjective side of our thoughts, perceptions, feelings and actions; existentialism not only explores the variety of human experiences, but also reveals how the objects, people, and events we perceive are coloured by our own subjective patterns. As the critics, the meaning of existentialism also varies. In *The Dictionary of Philosophy* Thomas Mautner opines that though the views of different philosophers varies, they are similar in basic concepts. He writes:

The existentialists differ widely from one another and, given their individualistic emphasis, it is not surprising that many of them have denied involvement in any 'movement' at all. Kierkegaard was a devout Christian; Nietzsche was an atheist; Jean-Paul Sartre was a Marxist and Heidegger, at least briefly, a Nazi. Kierkegaard and Sartre enthusiastically insisted on the freedom of the will; Nietzsche denied it; Heidegger hardly talked about it at all. But one would not go wrong in saying the existentialism represented a certain attitude particularly relevant to modern mass society. The existentialists have a shared concern for the individual and for personal responsibility . . . Sartre emphasized the importance of free



individual choice regardless of the power of other people to influence and coerce our desires, beliefs and decisions. (141)

But Richard Tarnas finds existentialism more grim and chaotic. He assumes the human condition in this alien world absurd and bleak. He defines existentialism as:

. . . [A] mode and philosophy reflecting a pervasive spiritual crisis in modern culture. It addresses the most fundamental naked concerns of human existence – suffering and death, loneliness, guilt spiritual emptiness, and ontological insecurity, the sense of cosmic absurdity, the frailty of human reason and the tragic impasse of the human condition. Man is condemned to be free. (389)

Tarnas finds man facing the necessity of choice and thus knows the continual burden of errors. He lives in constant ignorance of his future, thrown into a finite existence bounded at each end by nothingness. The infinity of human aspiration is defeated before the finitude to human possibility.

Similarly, Jostein Gaarder in *Sophies' World* says that "both the idealism of the Romantics and Hegel's historicism had obscured the individual's responsibility for his own life" (377).

Existentialism as a mode of thought believes that man has to choose and create meaning for his own existence in the world. So man is what he makes of himself. Man is free to do whatever he wants and responsible for whatever he makes. Thus existentialism talks about individual existence, freedom and choice. It shows the human condition more precisely and clearly than any other school of thought.

Existentialism is a revolt against traditional philosophy which takes philosophy as a science. Traditional philosophers produced knowledge that would be objective, universally true, and certain. The existentialists do not go with the traditional attempt to get the ultimate nature of the world in abstract systems of thought. Instead they search for what it is like to be as 'individual' human being in the world. They point out the fact that every individual even the philosopher seeking absolute knowledge is only a limited human being. So, every individual has to confront important and difficult decisions with only limited knowledge and time in which to make these decisions. This human condition resides at the core of the existentialists. Existentialism places the emphasis on the lack of meaning and purpose in life, and the solitude of human existence. It maintains that existence precedes essence. This implies that the human being has no essence no essential self, and is no more than what he is. He is only the sum of life in so far that he has created and achieved for himself. In this connection Sartre's view is:

We are like actors who suddenly find themselves on stage in the middle of a performance, but without having a script, without knowing the name of the play or what role they are playing, without knowing what to do or say-yes, without even knowing whether the play has an author at all -whether it is serious or a farce. We must personally make a decision, to be something or other – a villain or a hero, ridiculous or tragic. Or we can simply exit, immediately. But that is also choosing a role – and that choice, too is made without our ever knowing what the performance was about. (qtd. In Skirbekk and Ciilije, 44).

The fundamental problem of existentialism is concerned with ontology, the study of being. The human being's existence is the first and basic fact; the human being has no essence that comes before his existence. The human being as a being is nothing. This nothingness and the non-existence of an essence is the central source of the freedom the human beings faces in each and every moment. The human being has liberty in view of his situation, in decisions which make him solve his problem and live in the world. Thrown into the world, the human being is condemned to be free. The human being must take this freedom of being and the responsibility and guilt of his actions. Each action negates the other possible courses of action and their consequences; so the human being must be accountable without excuse. The human being must not slip away from his responsibilities. The human being must take decisions and assume responsibilities.

Although all the existential philosophers assume that life is without meaning and we are just the beings thrown into the alien world without any past or history, they encourage us to live. They do not yield us to end the meaningless life, despite the absurdity of life living tries to give meaningless life. Despite the absurdity of life 'living' tries to give meaning in life. We dies without getting any meaning but we should struggle for our life. Albert Camus takes the example of mythical character Sisyphus whose life was most absurd but he lived on. He was condemned to pull the rock to the top of the mountain just to roll it down again. Again he should come down and take the stone up, again to roll it down. This futile act was Sisyphus's punishment but he lived his life happily. Camus views:

All Sisyphus's silent joy is contained there in this fate belongs to him. His rock is his thing. Likewise, the absurd man, when he contemplates his torment, silences all the idols. In the universe

suddenly restored to its silence, the myriad wondering little voices of the earth rise up . . . . There is no son without shadow, and it is essential to know the height. The absurd man says yes and his effort will henceforth be unceasing. If there is a personal fate, there is not higher destiny, or at least there is but one which he concludes is inevitable and despicable. For the rest, he knows himself to be the master of his days. At that subtle moment when man glances backward over his life, Sisyphus returning toward his rock, in that slight pivoting he contemplates the series of unrelated actions which becomes his fate, created by him, combined by his death. Thus, convinced of the wholly human origin of all that is human, a blind man eager to see who knows that the night has no end, he is still on the go. The rock is still rolling. (qtd. in *Creation of Knowledge*, 69)

Camus also cites the example of Oedipus' blinding. Oedipus was a Greek who was destined to kill his father and marry his mother. How much he tried, he could not whitewash his fate, and when he realized the reality, he did not kill himself, just blinded himself and struggled with his fate by his remained life. He would kill himself like his wife-cum mother but he chose to live, struggle for his existence. Thus existential hero is one who has understood the futility and absurdity of life but goes on living. Like Sisyphus Oedipus is another one. Thus Camus believes:

One does not discover the absurd without being tempted to write a manual of happiness. "what! By such narrow ways - ?" There is but one world, however. Happiness and the absurd are two sons of the same earth. They are inseparable. It would be a mistake to say that happiness necessarily springs from the absurd discovery. It happens

as well that the feeling of the absurd springs from happiness. "I conclude that all is well", says Oedipus, and that remark is sacred. It echoes in the wild and limited universe of man. It teaches that all is not, has not been, exhausted. It drives out of this world a good who had come into it with dissatisfaction and preference for futile sufferings. It makes of fate a human matter, which must be settled among men. (qtd. in *Creation of Knowledge*, 69)

Even after realizing the tragedy, 'all is well' for Oedipus, what tragedy do we have? Asks Camus. He highlights the fact that problems and miseries come in life but we should not bend us to these. We must struggle for life like Oedipus. His tragedy is more tragic than the 'tragedy' itself but he takes it simply, just a beginning of a new day, so he says, "all is well".

Similarly, Jean-Paul Sartre emphasizes on individual freedom and responsibility. Robert Soloman says: "The tenet of Sartre's existentialism is the freedom of human consciousness freedom to act, freedom to value and freedom to make itself" (86). He also agrees "Existence precedes the essence". In accordance with Sartre, we first exist, appear on the scene, makes choice and create ourselves. It means we make ourselves what to be only after we exist. We create meaning in our life by making choices.

Sartre is much critical of God. He does not believe in God. He thinks that God does not exist, if exists, he too is useless. To support this idea, he states that, "Existentialism isn't so aesthetic that it wears itself out showing that God doesn't exist. Rather, it declares that even if God is exist, that would change nothing" (51). Though he frequently talks about freedom, his view towards it is negative. He supposes freedom as a curse but not as a boon for him, man is condemned to be

free (52) because one has to choose the route of life, he is responsible for his actions in life. So, life is determined by choice a person makes. 'Man is condemned to be free' because he has not created himself-and is nevertheless free. Because having once been hurled into the world, he is responsible for everything he does.

In our life, there is no predetermination and fate like qualities, everything happens according to our choice. According to Sartre, there is no predetermining essence but one creates essence by choosing. So, existence is primary. He argues that existence and freedom go together. For Sartre, "Freedom is existence and in it existence precedes essence" (66). When he talks about freedom, he also states individual freedom relies upon the freedom of others. In this way, like most of existentialists Sartre focuses on freedom of choice and personal responsibility conveying that there is no absolute power to control a man.

About Sartre's term 'existence', 'essence' and 'existence' mean different than the general meaning and dictionary meaning. In *Sophie's World* Jostein Gaarder clarifies it:

The key word in Sartre's philosophy, as in Kierkegaard's, is 'existence'. But existence did not mean the same as being alive. Plants and animals are also alive, they exist, but they do not have to think about what it implies. Man is the only living creature that is conscious of its own existence. Sartre said that a material thing is simply 'in itself' but mankind is 'for itself'. The being of man is therefore not the same as the being of things . . . . Sartre said that man's existence take priority over whatever he might otherwise be. The fact that I exist take priority what I am. 'Existence takes priority over essence' . . . . By essence we mean that which something

consists of – the nature, or being, of something. But according to Sartre, man has no such innate 'nature'. Man must therefore create himself. He must create his own nature or 'essence' because it is not fixed in advance. (456-457)

Gardner finds Sartre a real existentialist. Sartre's view of 'essence' and 'existence' clearly show his concern for essence before existence that it is not present in advance but we, the individuals' have to create it.

Existence comes first in human life as each man, however, circumscribed by his historical and environmental situation. So, he is the author of his own life. Focusing this point sharply, Sartre writes, "if God does not exist, there is at least one being in whom existence precedes essence, a being who exists before he can be defined by any concept, and that this being is man" (15). Unlike Kierkegaard and other theistic existentialists, Sartre insisted that existentialism deals with the treatment of an individual and not God, a pre-established ethic or a universal conception of divine nature that Nietzsche called 'god hypothesis'. Preferring existence rather than essence of an individual. Sartre writes, ". . . first of all, man exists, turns up, appears on the scene, and only afterwards defines himself (15).

We all are mere being in this world devoid of absolute power like God. Like many other traditional thinkers, when we believe God as a creator, he is generally regarded as a superior sort of craftsman. Sartre argues when God creates man in his own image, he knows exactly what he is creating. Thus the concept of man in the mind of God is similar to the concept of art in the mind of an artisan. Following certain techniques and conception, God produces man just as an artisan does (13-14). But for Sartre, God no longer exists and therefore, man comes from nothing. There is no God's will from which man discovers the appropriate value and

principle for his life as guiding force, "No general ethics can show you what is to be done, there are no means in the world, you're free, chose, that is, invent" (15). Man's freedom thus, is inescapable and manifests itself in each of the choices he makes. Freedom is what one is, even though it functions always within the given situation. In Sartre's world where freedom plays central role, people are found to be characterized by an awesome degree of liberty – Paradoxically enough Sartre thinks of man's freedom as a kind of condemnation because, he writes, "he did not create himself yet, in other respects is free, because once thrown into the world, he is responsible for everything he does (23).

Subjectivity of individual is much focused in Existential philosophy. As other existentialists claim, Sartre also stresses upon the subjectivity of the individual differentiating it from other inanimate object:

Man is always is the process of becoming. Man first of all the being who hurts himself towards a future and who is conscious of imagining himself as being in the future. Man is at the start a plan which is aware of itself rather than patches of moss, a piece of garbage, or a cauliflower; nothing exists prior to this plan, there is nothing in the heaven, man will be what he will have planned to . . . he is therefore nothing else than the *ensemble acts*. (16-23)

Standing very close to the philosophical outlook of Sartre is his life-long companion and intellectual associate Simone de Beauvoir (1908-86). But to suggest that because she was close to Sartre, her thoughts are a mere duplication of Sartre would be a mistake. She gives an original and independent interpretation of existentialism, though not radically different from Sartre's. Unlike him, she chooses to concentrate on the personal and moral aspects of life. She attempted to



apply existentialism to feminism. Sartre failed to produce his promised work on ethics. Beauvoir treats existentialism from very much a feminist point of view. In her book, *The Second Sex* (1949), she takes the position that the history of attitude of woman has determined her own views. Robert Audi says:

Her feminist masterpiece, *The Second Sex*, relies heavily on the distinction, part existentialist and part Hegelian in inspiration, between a life of immanence, or passive acceptance of the role into which one has been socialized, and one of transcendence, actively and freely testing one's possibilities with a view to redefining one's future, historically, woman have consigned to the sphere of immanence, says de Beauvoir, but in fact a woman in the traditional sense is not something that one is made, without appeal, but rather something that one becomes. (256).

Beauvoir denied the existence of a basic 'female nature' or 'male nature'. It has been generally claimed that man has a 'transcending' nature so he will seek meaning and direction outside the home. Woman is 'immanent' which means she wishes to be where she is. She will therefore nurture her family, care for the environment and more homely things. For that, Beauvoir did not agree with the way we perceive the sexes.

Continuously Albert Camus is different from Sartre, Beauvoir and other existentialists in foregrounding the passion for life. His famous hero Sisyphus is a life loving hero who hates the God and has severe hatred for suicide or death.

Linda E. Patrick writes:

The absurd hero is epitomized by Camus' Sisyphus, who endures an absurd life that has been narrowed down to endless labor without

results. What makes Sisyphus a hero is that he uses what freedom he has left to rebel against all restrictions on his freedom. Sisyphus' concern for the gods, hatred of death, and passion for life from the heart of his revolt. His rebel spirit succeeds in overcoming the conditions and forces that makes his life absurd because he is not only conscious of them, but also sneers at them.

Camu's hero is the epitome of struggle for life though he knows the absurdity of life. His philosophy could have stopped the suiciding men during 1940s and 1950s in European countries. He lures us to live the life having passion for it. He, though, accepts that there is no meaning to live but we also must remember that there is no joy in living if it would have plain, easy and meaningful; our task is to seek meaning in meaningless life having the understanding of absurdity of life. The modern absurd world is full of injustice and millions of work is repetitive exploitation jobs. He thought that we should rebel against these absurdities by refusing to participate in them. In *The Myth of Sisyphus*, Camus asserts that by refusing to surrender, Sisyphus, the representative of modern man, can create meaning through a free act of affirmation in which he gives meaning to a situation which until then he had none. In the *Myth of Sisyphus*, Camus says:

I leave Sisyphus at foot of the mountain! One always finds one's gods and raises rocks. He too concludes that all is well. This universe burden again. But Sisyphus teaches the higher fidelity that negates the hence forth without a matter seems to him neither sterile or futile. Each atom of that stone, each mineral flake of that high filled mountain, in itself forms a world. The struggle itself

towards the heights is enough to fill a man's heart. One must  
imagine Sisyphus happy. (70)

The living of the absurd man depends upon the maximum struggle against the absurdity. The world is full of absurdity and Sisyphus teaches revolt through action that offers freedom and justification for the continuation of life.

Camus found man's condition in a world without meaning, a world whose values were self-created or at least community created, a world in which many people do things as repetitive and as meaningless as what Sisyphus must do. It is Camus' insight into the awareness of Sisyphus during the process – his insight into the fact that Sisyphus *knows* what he is doing – that gives Camus courage. Like Sisyphus, Camus tells us, humans make their own fate, their own choices, and to that extent are in control of their own destinies. By defying the gods, Sisyphus made his choice and his fate.

To sum up, Existentialism or existential philosophy highlights the absurd human condition in the world. It not only makes us aware of the meaninglessness of our life and futility of our toil, but also encourages us to face the problems and miseries and go on living happily as Sisyphus and Oedipus. Although it shades light on the black and grim human condition in the world, it lures us to live by encouraging us to have passion for life and living. This optimistic notion is the prime sources of our living which existentialism wants to establish.

### III: Textual Analysis

#### Struggle for Existence

Human existence is always in question. But it is not by other animals or agents but by the human being themselves and the society they have created. Albee's *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* It depicts the human struggle for existence. The world of 1960s in America was the stimulating one. The Second World War, its outcomes, America being super power and the materializing process of American society always questioned the individual's. In *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?*, too we find almost all character struggling for existence.

George has married Martha because she is the daughter of the dean of the college. If not so, he certainly would not marry Martha as she is 'unbearable' and elder than him. The father of Martha also sees potentiality in him to be his son-in-law; the sources of existing power in George. In the conversation between Nick and George, we find how disgusted is George with Martha. He, it seems, does not like Martha at all:

GEORGE: How old are you?

NICK: Twenty-eight

GEORGE: I'm forty-something. [*waits for reaction . . . get none.*] Aren't you surprised? I mean . . . don't look older? Doesn't his . . . grey quality suggest the fifties? Don't I sort of fade into backgrounds . . . get lost in the cigarette smoke? Hunh?

NICK: [*looking around for an astray*]: I think you . . . fine.

GEORGE: I've always been lean . . . I haven't put on five pounds since I was your age. I don't have a paunch, either . . . what I've got . . . I've got

this little distension just below the belt . . . but it's hard . . . it's not soft flesh. I use the handball courts. How much do you weigh?

NICK: I . . .

GEORGE: Hundred and fifty-five, sixty . . . something like that? Do you play handball?

NICK: Well yes . . . no . . . I mean, not very well.

GEORGE: Well, then . . . we shall play some time. Martha is a hundred and eight . . . years old. She weighs somewhat more than that. How old is your wife?

NICK: *[a little bewildered]* She's twenty-six.

GEORGE: Martha is a remarkable woman. I would imagine she weighs around a hundred and ten.

By George's attitude towards Martha, we can clearly draw the conclusion that he is not least satisfied by this conjugal life with Martha. He just married to progress in his position.

On the other hand, Nick is married to Honey because of fake pregnancy. That's not only the cause, he explains, he married her because her father owns much money. When Honey informed Nick of being pregnant, he must had to marry her to be existing in the society. He was also ready to marry her because of her wealth. He confides George:

NICK: Sure. *[with no emotion, accept the faintest distaste, as GEORGE takes his glass to the bar]* I married her because she was pregnant.

GEORGE *[pause]*: Oh? *[pause]* But you said you didn't have any children . . . when I asked you, you said . . .

NICK: She wasn't really. It was a historical pregnancy. She blew up, and then she went down.

GEORGE: And while she was up, you married her.

NICK: And then she went down.

Nick is not hesitant to convey George his interest for his father-in-laws money.

Though he is a religious person he owns much money by the means of religion.

And Nick has eyes the wealth:

NICK: We are talking about my wife's money . . . not yours.

GEORGE: O.K. . . . talk.

NICK: No. *[pause]* my father-in-law . . . was a man of the Lord, and he was very rich.

GEORGE: What faith?

NICK: He . . . my father-in-law . . . was called by God when he was six, or something, and he started preaching, and he baptized people, and he saved them, and he traveled around a lot, and he become pretty famous . . . not like some of them, but he became pretty famous . . . and when he died he had a lot of money.

GEORGE: God's money.

NICK: No . . . his own.

Nick's struggle for his position and wealth is justifiable and natural. Though he seems greedy and selfish, we all have similar instinct in us. His struggle, but, would not benefit him forever. Life itself is futile and without meaning, then what is the meaning of such little advance in the means of economic matters.

Thus everywhere we find struggle for existence in this way or that way.

The society is so much complex and critical that we must struggle for our existence

either in moral way or immoral way. Nick has even planned to sleep with the wives of faculties to upgrade his position in the college. Martha is one of them. Except George and Nick, Honey and Martha are struggling for their existence. Both of them are childless. Martha with George has nurtured an imaginary child to be prestigious in the society. Honey does not want to have any child fearing the child-birth pain but she has used the pregnancy as a tool to marry with Nick. Her hasty marriage with Nick shows her struggle for existence. The imaginary child of Martha and George is just for camouflaging the society. They have to 'make' the child to survive in the society as they do not live easily without child.

### **American Society and American Dream**

American society of 1950s and 60s was the most turbulent. It was just after the world war second. The Vietnam War was yet to come; there was much churn in American society by civil rights movements, blacks and woman's liberation movement. The American Dream of long time was fading and the Beats and Hippies were on the verge of beginning. People were being materialized, mechanized and the familial values were deteriorating. In such situation Albee's *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* is set.

Albee claims each of the social values to be empty, resulting in loveless and sterile marriages, failed careers, ill-gotten wealth, squandered education and powerless and corrupt religion. With these values so decayed, Albee implicitly says the country is barren wasteland, where people must imagine another reality in order to compensate for what is missing. Albee has criticized the moral and spiritual damage inflicted upon people by an excess of material wealth and a misguided pursuit of 'American Dream'. The idea of 'American Dreams' if fulfilled were becoming a part of cultural tradition of Europe before America took a definite

shape of a nation. Robert E. Spiller, Willardthorp, Thomas H. Johnson and Henry Seidel Cannby write:

Ever since the early days of western civilization, peoples had dreamed of a lost paradise, of a Golden Age characterized by abundance, absence of war and absence of toil. With the first accounts of the New World, it was felt that these dreams and yearnings had become a fact, a geographical reality fought with unlimited possibilities. (192)

American society is not able to aid its members in either way. The individuals and the families are prone to be doomed. The marriage does not bring any hope in life and the wife's position is more pathetic and hell like. We can see Martha's position, she is not a successful person. Her marriage with George after her hasty and week-long marriage with the gardener's son, her sterility, and her incapacity to accomplish anything personally have left her a bored and frustrated woman. She is childless woman and a miserable housewife without any identity of her own. The life of Martha and George is a living hell, from which they find no exit. Martha declares it:

I cry all the time; but deep inside, so no one can see me. I cry all the time. And George cries all the time, too. We both cry all the time, and then, what we do, we cry, and we take our tears, and we put'em in the ice box, in the goddam ice trays [*begins to laugh*] until they're all frozen [*laughs even more*] and then . . . we put them . . . in our . . . drinks . . . [*sadly*] I've got windshield wipers on my eyes, because I married you . . . baby! . . . Martha, you'll be a song writer yet. [*Jiggles the ice in her glass*] CLINK! [*Does it again*]



CLINK! [*Giggles, repeats it several times.*] CLINK! . . . CLINK! . .  
 . CLINK! . . . CLINK! (109-110)

She is frustrated by her life, marriage and from her society completely. She does not find any hope of survival and life. Her inner thoughts provoked in these lines clarify the failure of American society and of course American Dream. Her monologue unveils her previous happy-go-lucky manner. She herself says, she has buried deep inside such frustrated and disgusting feelings only to be seen happy by her relatives and society.

American Dream is a concept that is intricately associated with Puritanisms. Before the actual discovery of America in 1492, the European Puritans had read about the promised land that god had preserved for them. The scriptures had presented a vision of land where Puritans could get salvation. The Edenic promise of the scriptures influenced the Christians, who as a result shaped their own vision of that yet undiscovered land. They wanted to escape the European chaos and hardship of life in order to make fresh start. They believed that the preserved land was the land of infinite wealth, unrestrained freedom and the land for liberty where a fresh beginning of life would be blessing. This promise was in the scriptures and Puritans believed and shaped their dream accordingly. This is immediately supported by the discovery of the new land by Columbus. Consequently Puritans' hopes for better living became intense as they prepared to migrate from Europe to the New found land. This ideal vision of America, the land of opportunity helped to shape the individual dream, which is collectively called the American Dream. This idealized vision of America influenced all European Puritans. Such an idealized vision has been presented in American writings. Some of the people believe in it while others argue that the American Dream has not

proved true, therefore, it is failed dream according to them. There are some others who argue that Americans' success is a partial fulfillment of the American Dream and it will be fulfilled one day. So they are living with the American Dream.

American Dream is not only a Utopian hope of 'mercantilism' and 'profit and greed'. It is also a political dream of a society where every individual is endowed with equal rights. Thomas Jefferson states in The Declaration of Independence of July 4, 1776, "We hold these truths to be self evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights that among these are life, liberty and pursuit of happiness". (13) The American Dream has been a failure because the vision of the 16<sup>th</sup> century European Puritans shifted as the Europeans encountered the Native Americans, brought slaves from Africa and got involved in slave trade. The class struggle, racial and ethnic problems deprivations of minorities in America, American hegemony over the world culture and many other contradictions prove the dream has taken different turn. But still a number of people believe in the dream as David Madden puts it:

American dreams have always been the nation's bumper crop . . .  
Traffic lights turn green, and the cars move on, following an  
impossible dream which, some have persistently said leads only to a  
precluded dead end . . . . American Dream is a cliché symbolic of  
the Dream defunct. (XV-XVI)

Madden's ideas clearly hints that though it has been old and less efficient, it is still working. It has as ever giving insight of struggle and success for the American people, and he hopes it would encourage them forever.

In this way, we can notice in the drama the evident example of disintegrating social views and the failure of American Dream. The society has become so corrupted that they use 'sex' to advance their social and economic position. Nick has planned to do so. His plan to upgrade his position by sleeping with the faculty wives shows the perversion of social norms. And, at the same time, the Americans are misguided to be prosperous and successful; they do not mind taking any illicit or illegitimate ways.

### **Failure of Finding Meaning in Life**

We come to this world without any prior knowledge. When we get our conscience, we try to seek meaning in our life. This search of meaning is always futile as there is no meaning in life. Because every individual fail to find meaning in his/her life. They try to get meaning by creating different means. So is the case with Martha and George. To search meaning in life they create a fictional child. But in their quarrel, they lose their temper and kill the son as they have created. Though they fail to find any meaning in their life – as it happens to all – they are not in fiasco; we find George consoling Martha as the curtain falls.

The futility of 'meaning search mission' in life brings the realization of absurdity of life. Martha and George's search via their imaginary son leads them to the realization of meaningless world. On the other hand Nick and Honey are also in the search of meaning in their lives. Honey wants to marry with Nick by hook or crook, of which she succeeds. She had thought after that life would be easier and meaningful, but nothing changes. There is no newness in her conjugal life too. She, even after her marriage, can not get any newness or meaning in her life .

Nick's struggle for getting upper position in the college by sleeping with important faculty wives seems failing. He fist of all experiments with Martha – the

daughter of dean of the college and wife to history teacher George – which does not seem fruitful. Martha finds him a bad partner which symbolizes his failure in finding meaning in life. Martha calls him a flops:

MARTHA [*her glass to her mouth*]: You're certainly a flop in some departments.

NICK [*wincing*]: I beg your pardon . . . ?

MARTHA [*unnecessarily loud*]: I said, you're certainly a flop in some . . .

NICK [*he, too, too loud*]: I'm sorry you are disappointed.

MARTHA [*braying*]: I didn't say I was disappointed! Stupid!

NICK: You should try me some time when we haven't been drinking for ten hours, and maybe . . .

MARTHA [*still braying*]: I wasn't talking about your potential; I was talking about your goddam performance.

NICK [*softly*]: Oh.

MARTHA [*she softer, too*]: Your potential is fine. It's dandy. [*Wiggles her eyebrows*]. Absolutely dandy. I haven't seen such a dandy potential in a long time. Oh, but baby you sure are a flop.

NICK [*snapping it out*]: Everybody's a flop to you! Your husband's a flop, I'm a flop . . .

MARTHA [*dismissing him*]: You're all flops. I am the Earth Mother, and you're all flops.

It shows the failure of Nick to find any meaning in life, by upgrading his position. He is failed in his first step of the ladder. But he does not seem disgusted. That is the existential spirit in individual which survives the men and encourages him to

go further. He does not have any sign of disgust and failure though he fails in his first attempt.

Similarly Nick's marriage to Honey is also an attempt to find meaning and even dream in life but it also fails. He just married Honey because he thought she was pregnant. But later on he found out he was deceived. He continues living with her in the hope of getting more wealth from her father. But he fails to get that. Yet he hopes she will give birth to a baby. These are the strings of choices tied to at the center of existence. To degrade cultural and familial values is also a choice, and degenerative process of living is also an obligatory choice. In this sense every choice is an effort or commitment to exist in the authentic sense, which each character strives for in the quest for the self and being which is an infinite process. Like the chain of dreams tied to the American Dream.

On the other hand Martha and George have created an imaginary son to find meaning in their life. But it is ironical that society, only accepts the couple complete when they produce any child. To follow the social discourse they are compelled to have one. When they cannot produce any child themselves, they make imaginary one. Which seems that they have got the meaning in life but when they kill it again, they are same as before.

The killing of child is also ridiculous and funny. George just kills their imaginary child to revenge with Martha as she mocks his capability and efficiency before the guests. Infuriated George uses his last but the surest weapon to counter attack her which proves to be Waterloo for him too. We see him consoling Martha at last. But actually he is not consoling Martha but himself.

GEORGE [*tenderly*]: I have the right, Martha. We never spoke of it; that's all. I could kill him any time I wanted to.

MARTHA: But why? Why?

GEORGE: You broke our rule, baby. You mentioned him . . . you mentioned him to someone else.

MARTHA [*tearfully*]: I did not. I never did.

GEORGE: Yes you did.

MARTHA: Who? Who?

Honey: To me. You mentioned him to me.

MARTHA [*crying*]: I FORGOT! Sometimes . . . sometimes when it's night, when it's late, and . . . and everybody else is . . . talking . . . I forget and I . . . want to mention him . . . but I HOLD ON . . . I hold on . . . but I've wanted to . . . so often . . . oh, George, you've pushed it . . . there was no need . . . there was no need for this. I mentioned him . . . all right . . . but you didn't have to push it over the EDGE. You didn't have to . . . kill him.

GEORGE: Requiescat in pace.

HONEY: Amen

MARTHA: You didn't have to have him die, George.

GEORGE: Requiem deternam dona eis, Domine.

HONEY: Et Lux perpetua lucat eis.

MARTHA: That wasn't . . . needed.

*[A long silence]*

It is not only the failure of Martha and George, it is the destiny of all the modern man in this wasteland; but we are prone to live in this absurd situation. They have to create the son and they have to kill it. They just created it to nip out one day when they wanted. The son's responsibility is just to develop a feeling of hope in life and passion for it. But the killing of it is inevitable because there is no inherent

meaning in life. Had not they killed their child on that, they would certainly have killed them the other day, but killing was necessary and fixed.

So, the search of meaning in this absurd world is never complete.

Understanding this – its ironical – we must go ahead to search meaning, and we are going. Life goes on after our death and it was so before our birth.

### **Affirmation of Futility of Existence**

Martha and George are the couple of fifties. George is 46 and professor at the college whose wife Martha is 52 and the daughter of the dean of the college. They are childless. They have created an imaginary son before the eyes of the society, but they have compromised to not to reveal the secret to other. When the drama begins they are just returning from the party the college dean has given. But to our surprise and of George, Martha has invited the new biology professor Nick and his wife Honey for party at late 2:00 am.

When the guests arrive, Martha and George quarrel and fight with each other by different means. Martha confides Honey about their son which George had forbidden. We also find George and Nick's past. Nick had married Honey because she was pregnant, which later becomes false. He(Nick) had eyed the property of his father-in-law too. Martha's regular mocking of George's failure and her sexual advances to Nick makes George furious enough to 'kill' their son. Thus, in front of the guests he informs Martha the death of their son which disgusts her much. Later, when the guests leave, we find them consoling each other.

The seemingly simple story has the complex mechanism. The creating of an imaginary son is the extreme of the modern showy but hollow life. As the modern people do not have any meaning in life, they want to create meaning out of nothing. But such creating does not aid them at all. Their imaginary child do not

heal them for all, thought it heals for sometime. By creating the imaginary child they have forgotten the futility of hollow life. But when they kill it – come out of illusion – they decide to live life realistically, i.e., absurdly, meaninglessly.

The couple are the deadening example of 'existential hero'. They go on further in life without any complain or regret of meaninglessness. They take the event easily as they have understood the real meaning of life – life is without any inherent meaning. For this, they do not avoid the attempts to search any meaning in their life even after knowing there is not any. We find the vigour and passion for life like Oedipus or Sisyphus even after experiencing the hollowness of life. They do not complain or blame anyone for it. They accept the result because the outcome is all created by them not by others.

At last we find both reconciled with each other any trying to bring happiness in life again. They have already been reconciled because the antagonism between them is also worthless and absurd:

MARTHA: Did you . . . did you . . . have to?

GEORGE [*pause*]: Yes

MARTHA: It was . . . ? You had to?

GEORGE [*pause*]: yes

MARTHA: I don't know

GEORGE: It was . . . time.

MARTHA: Was it?

GEORGE: Yes

MARTHA: Was it?

GEORGE: Yes

MARTHA [*pause*]: I'm old.



GEORGE: It's late

MARTHA: Yes

GEORGE [*long silence*]: It will be better.

MARTHA [*long silence*]: I don't . . . know

GEORGE: It will be . . . maybe.

MARTHA: I'm . . . not . . . sure.

When there is awareness of their failure, they just take it as a simple failure of their attempt, and they seem, are ready to try for another attempt. The tirelessness is the most important discovery of existentialism. It is also the basic value of life, which has sustained the whole humanity upto this position. This corpus of the individual the central nerve of the civilization and development of humankind. Had not they attempt the second time after the first failure, they would have been extinct like dinosaur many centuries before.

Individual's struggle and passion for life after so many failures leaves the human being superior over so many other animals. Human animal is the capable one who cannot forget his failure like the animals but goes ahead just to get another mission. Martha and George's enthusiasm is the sharp example of man's struggle for life and even for meaning.

Their realization affirms again once the futility of existence. They do not get any newness in life no child; not George's promotion to the post of dean; no permission to publish his novel, but they do not yield to failure or to the ground. If one crumbles down, they think, another would be ready. Likewise, Nick has also plan to be promoted in higher position. When he makes love with Martha, she calls him flop. But he tries to convince her to try him again when he is not drunk:

MARTHA [*unnecessarily loud*]: I said, you're certainly a flop in some . . .

NICK: I'm sorry you're disappointed.

MARTHA [*braying*]: I didn't say I was disappointed! Stupid!

NICK: You should try me sometime when we haven't been drinking for ten hours, and may be . . .

Though Nick was flop before, Martha's sexual play, he is not able to believe it. He has realized his failure, but at the same time he is already determined to try next time. Every time we affirm the futility of existence, we are already prepared to try for next time, so is Nick.

Martha and George are able to convince their guests about their son. But at last all of them including the guests Nick and Honey come out of the fug of illusion. They realize the fantasy of their illusionary son. As they pretend and make their guests believe in the child; enchanted by the same false hope, Honey changes her mind and declares that she needs a baby. Martha goes even to extent of referring to their son's girl friends, his study in college etc. Martha is really trying to wave one failure for another. Later George announces the death of their son, a shocking news to Martha and Nick:

GEORGE: Well, Martha . . . I'm afraid our boy isn't coming home for the birthday.

MARTHA: Of course, he is.

GEORGE: Martha . . . [*long pause*] . . . our son is . . . dead. He was killed . . . late in the afternoon. [*silence*] He drove against into a . . .

MARTHA: YOU CANNOT DO THAT.

GEORGE: . . . large tree.

MARTHA: You can't decide that for yourself . . . He is not dead.

GEORGE: Martha, I'm no a God. I don't have the power over life and death, do I? There was a telegram . . . and I ate it. (136)

The sentimentality of the situation is presented in the silences of their quarrel. George kills their son and Martha can't believe that George will break their agreement. However, George is trying to face a new reality. Though he believes in God, he appears more powerful than God by killing his son in the struggle for existence. This is shocking news to Martha and the whole house mourns over the death.

The creating of child and killing it is just an absurd work. But still it is meaningful as it is an attack on illusion and failure of former choice. The existential problem is depicted when George claims that he has no power over life and death because he is a miserable creature on this earth. George wouldn't have killed the son if Martha had obeyed George's request not to mention about the child. Once revealed, the son must die or come to existence. He is just the moon that Martha desires to grasp she dreams one dream after another at times to denounce George and at other times to challenge conventional values.

To sum up, we affirm the futility of life every time but we are not ready to take it for granted. We try the next luck just to get the answer 'NO' again, to reaffirm the futility and absurdity of our life. Surprisingly, the same enhancement for life and the mirage of success is the sustaining power of life and of whole human civilization. It had lead the human being in this position and it would lead further always. Martha and George, and Nick and Honey are the representative of all the human beings. They encourage the human beings to 'try again' in the futile search. The main motto of existentialism – and of course of Camus – was to sustain the feeling of 'hope' in individual. This is the very hope which kindles the

sparkle of optimism in individuals in this chaotic and hell –like modern world.

People were wiping out the light of their life when they understood the dark reality of life, but it is the existential philosophy and the existential writers like Albee who elegizes life and optimism in individual. Thus, while affirming the futility of existence in life, Albee at the same time call for the survival of the optimistic life.

#### **IV: Conclusion**

Edward Albee's *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* is an epitome of existential play. It affirms that human life is without meaning. As all of us know life is without meaning, Albee wants to make his point, we should go on living as Martha and George did. The life of man has become more complex in the modern time though it was always complex. The complexity of life is also the solely human creation. Despite the complexity the ancient people were happy and content as they did not try to seek any relation to external and unrelated complex matter which they avoided calling "divine". But the modern man has narrowed it down to the earth which instead of giving meaning, problematizes the life; but at the same time it made the individual aware of the basic fact of life and could give tips to how to live the meaningless life Albee Virginia Woolf is the best example to show such problems and prescribe some soothing balm for the wounded civilization. Struggle and aggression can be seen all over the lay through antagonistic mode of communication most remarkably in various game-playing. The content of the games allows the characters to strike at each other by revealing the nature of their private lives. And the struggle is existential because the characters feel alienation and identity crisis in the midst of pain, failure and frustration. They make arbitrary choices and make use of basic freedom in that crisis for being the existential figure. So, problem of disordered and tragic man is the background of the play. The existential struggle is fore grounded as prominent in the play.

Albee is excessively pre-occupied with family life gone wrong. Even the only value system of marriage, as an established norm or an institution of society does not provide any real meaning to them. Marriage cannot be a genuine bond but instead it makes the characters isolated being that alienates them. In a world of

isolated compartments, hatred becomes the tie that binds. They have been leading a kind of cat-and dog life. Their married life has become a battle of the sexes, with each partner trying to humiliate the other. Though they stay together, their alienation offers them the ground to struggle for their existence. They constantly seek their identity in their barren and frustrated life. Aggression becomes an outlet of that problematic self.

Albee in *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* attacks the concept of conventional family values. The family in his plays have become an empty myth, a form without content, a complex of attitudes and words handed down mechanically from one generation to another whose real meaning is lost. The four characters are parts of a steady continuum from generation to generation. Martha was morbidly attached to her father in a way which has happiness with her husband. There is nothing more about her mother. It is not told whether her father remarried as a widower or divorce. George's parents are one of the unsolved mysteries of the play. There is a talk that he killed them in separate accidents. Yet his own account attributes their deaths to someone who couldn't be himself. The introduction of a theme at once so arresting and so irrelevant can only suggest that Albee is excessively pre occupied with unsatisfactory family life gone wrong. The childless family consists of husband and wife only. They quarrel with each other even before the guests. They have created an imaginary son which replenishes the pit they have in their life. The camouflages replenishment is only an illusion which would be unveiled at last. The realization of actuality and the decision to live as before is the praiseworthy act of the family.

Martha and George are not ready to face the truth of life: meaninglessness. To search meaning and to cover up the bleak and gloomy reality of life they create

an imaginary son. The creation for some time gives – it seems only – the meaning in their life. The creation, being only the imaginary and fictional one, does not last long and they are again before the naked reality. Now they are experienced enough to face the meaninglessness of life. They now accept the futility of existence completely and seem ready to go further in life.

Futility is always the hallmark of life. But we have always tried to hide it by creating different illusion. As the only truth of life, death is always in the dark corner of our mind because we try to forget it always, we do not even ready to talk about death though all of us have its fear in our mind. Like the death-havoc, we also want to shadow the futile reality of our existence. But Albee, in the drama, has penetrated through it and has sought the theme that meaningless life should be lived meaningfully by realizing its absurd reality.

Life is just a journey towards death. It has not any meaning and end except death. We cannot even create anything new and worthwhile in this absurd world but we have been yielded that we can. When we know the dark face of life we may stray away from it which Albee wants to warn us. He is of the opinion that the meaningless life should be lived meaninglessly; without any faint hope of development but we must live because no other alternatives are plausible than living.

The plot of drama is of not much important. There nothing new happens. A couple has invited another couple for drinks. All the four drink heavily in the late night and criticize about one another. At last the guests leave. The quarreling hosts now cooled down and decides to sleep. But their conversations and confidements are of importance. They make great dialogues about the futility of existence and

their realization. They have experienced the absurdity of life so they are ready to face it.

To sum up, Albee presents a hopeful drama which encourages the 'hopeless' individual to live on the absurd life. Albee indirectly through his four characters suggests us that live the futile and meaningless life meaningfully by understanding is reality. We should be optimistic towards the meaningless life as it is always so, and our denial cannot change ever an ounce. No one could have been able to change the worthlessness of life then who are you (we) to try to change it.



### Work Cited

- Abrams, M.H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. 7<sup>th</sup> ed. n.p. Harcourt Asia Ptl. Ltd. 2001.
- Albee, Edward. *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* New York: Penguin, 1986.
- Audi, Robert, ed. *The Cambridge Dictionary of Philosophy*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1995.
- Camus, Albert. "Myth of Sisyphus". *Essays on the Creation of Knowledge*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Eds. Shreedhar Lohani, Rameshwar Adhikari, Abhi Subedi. Kathmandu: Ratna Pustak Bhandar, 1996.
- , *The Myth of Sisyphus*. Trans. Justin O' Brien. Great Britian: Middlesex, 1986.
- Esslin, Martin. *Absurd Drama*. Penguin Plays, 1965.
- Gaarder, Jostein. *Sophie's World: A Novel about the History of Philosophy*. Trans. Paulette Moller. New York: Barkley, 1996.
- Jefferson, Thomas. "The Declaration of Independence". *Essays on the Creation of Knowledge*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Eds. Shreedhar Lohani, Rameshwar Adhikari. Abhi Subedi, Kathmandu: Ratna Pustak Bhandar, 1996.
- Maddeen, David, ed. Introduction, *American Dreams, American Nightmares*. Amsterdam: Southern Illinois UP, 1970.
- Mautner, Thomas. *A Dictionary of Philosophy*. Coelwy: Blackwell, 1996.
- Patrick, Linda E ed. *Existential Literature: An Introduction*. Canada: Wadsworth, 2001.
- Potter, Robert. *The English Morality Play: Origins, History, and Influence of a Dramatic Tradition*. London: Rutledge, 1975.
- Sartre, Jean Paul. *Existentialism and Human Emotions*. Trans. Bernard Frenchman. New York: Castle, 1984.

Schechner, Richard. "Who's Afraid of Edward Albee?" *Tulane Drama Review* 7, no. 3, 1963. p.7-10.

Skirbekk, Gunnar, and Nils Gilje. *A History of Western Thought: From Ancient Greece to the Twentieth Century*. London: Routledge, 2001.

Spiller, Robert E., Williard Throp, Thomas H. Jonson and Henry Seidel Canby. Eds. "The American Dream". *Literary History of United States*. New York: The MacMilan Company, 1955.

Tarnus, Richard. *The Passion of the Western Mind*. London: Cox and Wyman Ltd. 1991.

Zimbardo, Rose A. "Symbolism and Naturalism in Edward Albee's *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?*". *Edward Albee: A Collection of Critical Essays*. Ed. C.W.F. Bigsby. Eaglewood Cliffs. NJ: Prentice, 1975.