

Existentialism and Absurdism

- *Parthiva Sinha, Bankura Sammilani College, West Bengal*

Abstract

Two major philosophies that originated during the 19th century were Existentialism and Absurdism. They were developed as a result of two world wars that led to despair, ravagement, and the breach of human rights. They both agree that the universe is inherently meaningless, but *Existentialism* states that we must create our own meaning. *Absurdism*, on the other hand, focuses on the tension between a meaningless universe and our constant striving to find meaning. To embrace the Absurd is to own up to the meaninglessness of it all and move on, to keep living and living well. All of this called into question religious credences and the esse of God. Sartre and Camus were two major characters of that time. Jean-Paul Sartre and Albert Camus met in Nazi-occupied Paris during World War Two and became expeditious friends. After a decennium of companionship, the two men would split up over their differing views on Communism. Their public breakdown would be a major cultural event. This essay aims to analyse the kindred attributes and distinctions between these two contrasting philosophies: absurdism and existentialism. To understand this, two plays, *No Exit* by Sartre and *The Stranger* by Albert Camus have been compared. While comparing those plays, the major conceptions of the philosophies, such as liberation, individuality, the meaninglessness of the world, and deplorable faith, are accentuated.

Keywords: *Existentialism, Absurdism, No Exit, The Stranger, individuality and God's existence.*

Introduction

The Second World War, another blow, aggravated man's feelings of helplessness, disorientation and estrangement. It was far more destructive than the First World War as it caused inundation on life and property. It deprived man of his right to live a free, ecstatic and harmonious life. Moreover, it led human beings to a world that was algid, dejecting, which guarantees nothing. Death became a certainty, which was imminent and optically discerned sporadically.

Modern man's quandaries, especially after the World War, have become prodigiously intricate. As the natural world has become barren outwardly because of massive death and eradication, the internal state of man has become intricate as well as perverted. Moral values have lost charm and dignity. People reached a condition of solitariness beyond alienation when affect is stopped, when there is no way back to society, when the ego is self-devouring, and when they have reached the state of mute. Beyond fear and terror, modern seclusion additionally retards and kills emotion in integration to extirpating kineticism.

The catastrophic social and historical events of the twentieth century and their devastating outcome resulted in man's silence, alienation and deracination. In order to save man from the crisis, there appeared philosophers, writers, theoreticians, and scientists, whose writings had salvaged man from deracination and helpless condition. They reflected man's involutions in their works and they tried to give solutions that could minimize the alienating effects of the nightmarish events on man.

The term "existentialism" was invented by Marcel Gabriel, who was a French philosopher and playwright. The movement is a part of the family of philosophers, Sartre and Simon De Beauvoir. The heart of Existentialism is the shunning of any school of thought, the repudiation of any adequate belief, system, or somebody, and a discontent feeling with a traditional philosophy like superficial and academic life, causing a disconnect with life. Existentialism is a philosophy that talks about an individual who takes responsibility for his actions and does not avoid his existential individuality. This philosophy carries the clear and simple message that every individual is responsible for his or her actions and for who he/she is and the way he/she deals with the world. Existentialism is predicated on the notion that individuals transmute their essence with time. Moreover, existentialists believe that there is

no objective form of veracity; rather, they believe that veracity is the product of our personal cull. Whereas, Existentialists do not support the following concepts-

- 1) A good life is the product of wealth and honour.
- 2) Individuals are controlled by their social values.
- 3) Individuals should accept whatever happens to them and not try to change it.
- 4) Science is doing a great job of making life better. For existentialism, the important thing is every human is free and he has the choice to make nature. Sartre argued that "the fundamental choice man makes and gives direction to his life, is made by reflecting his previous life up to present. In other words, we've made our choice implicitly"(Flynn, 2006, p.12).

The philosophical idea that existence in general is nonsensical is known as absurdism. This means that the world is not entirely comprehensible by reason and is devoid of significance or a greater purpose. In the context of absurdism, the word "absurd" also has a more particular meaning that describes a conflict or disparity between two things but leaves room for debate as to what exactly those things are. These debates have a variety of repercussions for both the validity of absurdism and the justifications offered for and against it. The conflict is typically described as a collision between a logical man and an irrational world, between intention and result, or between subjective evaluation and objective merit. The assertion that the entire world is ludicrous is a key component of absurdism. In this way, it contrasts from the unarguable and less general concept that some specific people, events, or stages of life are ludicrous.

In the academic literature, several aspects of the ridiculous are examined, and various theorists usually focus their definitions and research on certain aspects. On a more concrete level, the battle of the individual to find meaning in a meaningless environment sums up the conflict that lies behind the ludicrous. The theoretical part, on the other hand, focuses on the epistemic limitations of reason's ability to see and comprehend reality. The conflict is typically described as the collision of two elements: an internal element, a part of human nature, and an external element, a part of the nature of the universe. The ability to see through the arbitrariness of any ultimate aim, on the one hand, and the inability to quit caring about such reasons, on the other hand, have been presented as internal components by some

subsequent theorists. By asserting that the ludicrous must come from consciousness of the contradiction, some explanations also include a metacognitive element.

Some justifications for absurdity centre on the insignificance of humans in the grand scheme of things, the significance of death, or the absurdity of positing an ultimate goal. Arguments against absurdity frequently assert that life is in fact meaningful or highlight the unfavourable effects or inconsistencies of absurdity. The supporters of absurdism frequently bemoan the lack of professional philosophers' attention given to the subject despite its significance and the possibility of causing existential crises in those who are impacted. There have been many suggested ways to deal with absurdity and its effects. Suicide, religious conviction in a higher purpose, and resistance against the ludicrous are the three answers described in the classic absurdist literature. Rebellion is typically advocated as the best course of action because, unlike the other two, it does not attempt to escape the absurdity and instead sees it for what it is. Other approaches, such as adopting irony to take life less seriously or avoiding knowledge of the underlying conflict, have been proposed by later theorists. Some absurdist contend that it doesn't matter how or if someone reacts. This is founded on the notion that if nothing really matters, then neither does how people react to this fact.

Jean-Paul Sartre and his Existentialism

Soren Kierkegaard, a Danish theologian and philosopher, is credited with coining the phrase "existentialism." According to Soren Kierkegaard, existentialism is a rejection of any essentially abstract thought as well as a rejection of a purely logical or scientific philosophy, or, to put it another way, a denial of the absoluteness of reason. (Roubiczek, 10).

In addition to writing plays and novels, Jean-Paul Sartre was a philosopher. His existentialist system, a collection of ideas that describe human freedom and duties within a framework of human dignity, was his greatest contribution to twentieth-century thought. In other words, he developed a philosophy that was interested in existence in all of its social, political, religious, and philosophical manifestations. All of Sartre's writings—novels, plays, essays, or significant philosophical treatises—serve as vehicles for the ideas he expressed. Sartre had little interest in aesthetics and was not a stylist. Even "black and white" has been used to describe his pieces. The philosophical underpinnings of the works were more significant to him than their aesthetic qualities; he switched between literary genres more to meet his ideological objectives than to achieve any aesthetic goals.

On June 21, 1905, Sartre was born in Paris. The young Sartre had to move into the home of his maternal grandpa, Charles Schweitzer, after the death of his father, Jean-Baptiste Sartre, a French naval officer, and Anne Marie Schweitzer, first cousin of Albert Schweitzer. Sartre was little and had crossed eyes as a child, characteristics that remained with him throughout his life, making him largely unsuitable for kid-friendly activities. He may have picked up the skill of evaluating people and events from a dispassionate, methodical perspective early on as a result of his physical constraints and irregular family life. Every day, he would talk to his mother while looking for new acquaintances in the park. When he saw that kids his age weren't particularly interested in him, he would return dejectedly to his apartment and begin to dream. Such is the backdrop for what would eventually develop into a profession founded on profound and serious thought restrained by a creative, artistic talent. He initially attended the Lycée Henri IV in Paris, but once his mother remarried; he changed to the Lycée in La Rochelle. He entered the elite École Normale Supérieure in Paris after graduation and achieved the incredible accomplishment of graduating first in his class despite the rigorous criteria of the institution.

He made friends with the young Simone de Beauvoir while he was a student at the École, who consistently finished second to him on all of the tests. One of Sartre's most inspiring and reliable colleagues and potential co-workers came from this bond, which blossomed into a lifetime of love and support. The closest Sartre came to formalising a relationship with another person was through his friendship with Simone de Beauvoir. Sartre did not believe in legal marriage. In two of her best-selling books, *Memoirs of a Dutiful Daughter* (1959) and *The Prime of Life*, she gives a personal account of their formative years (1962). Sartre made a number of significant friendships with writers and philosophers at the École and the Sorbonne, including the philosopher Simone Weil and anthropologist Claude Levi-Strauss, who later rose to prominence in their respective disciplines. He worked as a high school instructor in Le Havre, Lyon, and Paris between 1931 and 1934. It was a time when he started to feel the need to concentrate his ideas in a way that would make them understandable to wide audiences. He was able to fully immerse himself in modern German philosophy during a one-year sabbatical at the French Institute in Berlin in 1934, particularly the writings of Heidegger and Husserl. Sartre was drawn to Heidegger's atheism as he transitioned from his Catholic upbringing into a theistic world. After coming home, he taught at the Lycée Condorcet in Paris for the years 1934 to 1945. With the publication of his novel *Nausea*, which some reviewers consider to be his best work, he had his first significant literary

breakthrough. The novel served as the foundation for a number of works by Sartre that advance similar concepts. They are all based on the idea that man feels "nausea" when confronted with an absurd and pointless environment. Though the literary genres vary, the concepts remain the same. In terms of putting his ideas and thoughts into effect, Sartre was a very practical man. He had no qualms about participating in political protests that shared his ideals, and his works would increasingly emphasise the significance of "activity" to him. This is especially true of the pieces he created during World War II. Sartre was enlisted in the French Army in 1939, and after France fell in 1940, he was taken prisoner of war. This experience was significant for two reasons: (1) it strengthened his political stance as a leftist thinker who opposed the fascism that threatened Europe at the time, and (2) it gave him the chance to write his first play, which he dedicated to his fellow prisoners of war and had a biblical theme. After being released in 1941, he made a strong commitment to the Resistance's efforts. Sartre stopped teaching in 1946 and focused solely on writing because he could no longer fit the monotony of a typical job into his busy schedule.

In his post-war writing, Sartre expands on these themes and places a major emphasis on the idea of social duty. This latter development was informed by his growing respect of Marxist philosophy. Sartre's pre-war literature is primarily a defence of individual freedom and human dignity. Sartre's ground-breaking philosophical work *Being and Nothingness* and his debut play, *The Flies*, both debuted in 1943, solidifying him as one of France's most insightful and talented playwrights. In an effort to further explore his thoughts on freedom and the human condition, he authored *No Exit* a year later.

He wrote the political treatise *Critique of Dialectical Reason*, which includes the essay *Search for a Method* in 1960. It is incredibly thick and complex. Although this article rivals and even exceeds the complexity of *Being and Nothingness*, students of political science and philosophy are more likely to find it interesting today. Sartre received the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1964 for his contributions to literature. But he declined the Nobel Prize because he did not want to be connected with it as a cultural icon.

The existentialist views in the play *No Exit* are noted below:

- "Existence precedes essence" means that human first exists and then he searches for his/her essence in this world.
- "Human is condemned to be free" that, all human beings are free to choose and live free according to their will.

- “Bad Faith” refers to the idea that an individual avoids his freedom and responsibility because of the fear and anxiety of that responsibility and let the other people make the decision for him (Senejani.2013).
- “Being for itself” (it is related to one’s own reality, subjectivity and existence) and “being in itself” (refers to the reality of the external world to one or the objectivity) (Mart. C, 2012).
- Human nature does not exist neither there is God as Nietzsche stated, “God is dead” (Mart.c,2012).

Existentialism is less of an-‘ism’ than a posture that expresses itself in a variety of ways. Because of the diversity of positions associated with it, no single stringent definition is possible; however, it suggests one major theme; it lies accentuate on concrete individual subsistence, liberation and cull. Existentialism fixates on the lack of construal and purport in life and solitude of human subsistence. Existentialism genuinely concerns what authentic route people may take in the world where values and certainties are smashed into fragments how people can cope with negative aspects of human esse like melancholy, frustration, pain, apprehensiveness, alienation caused by modern society.

Along with the consideration of the role of time and cognizance of death, these questions seem to be the concern of existentialism. Existential philosophy is concerned with the esse of the individual’s life and death. They do not go with traditional endeavour to get the ultimate nature of the world in abstract system of mentally conceived. Instead, they probe for what it relish to be an ‘individual’ human is being in the world. Whether the thing is veritable of erroneous, that depends on the decision the individual makes. What is veritable to one may be erroneous to other. So, veracity is subjective according to existentialism. The existentialists conclude that human cull is subjective because individual determinately must make their own culls without avail from such external standards as laws, ethical rules, or traditions.

It is through our choices that we create meaning in our life. Since our involvement in the world creates essence, there is no predetermined essence to govern our existence. Thus, as conscious person, a man can shut being-in-itself. No God is needed to account for his being. So, Sartre connects existentialism with humanism, not in the sense of regarding man as the ultimate and, but in the sense of regarding man as the creator of all values.

Albert Camus and his Absurdism

The Algerian village of Mondovi is the place where Camus was born (1913–60). He belonged to a family where most of the family members were unlettered. His father died during the First World War. Camus was a very promising and perspicacious student and was revered by his edifiers. During his secondary level inculcation, he suffered from tuberculosis, which affected his studies. His life experiences are reflected in his later works, such as, "You are strong, and I have to be open and honest. What I can tell you is that you are about to die" (Verrips, 1997, p.17). And because of these experiences, Camus concluded that "life is absurd". In 1957, he was awarded the prestigious Nobel Prize in literature. Camus is kenneled as an Existentialist, but he preferred to be viewed as an Absurdist. His major literary works are *The Plague*, *The Stranger*, *The Myth of Sisyphus*, and *Caligula*.

Camus almost always picks up and re-examines the same fundamental philosophical concerns in his mature writings, whether he is composing play, fiction, or non-fiction. The main ideas in his mind are these repeated topoi. When his name is spoken, concepts like the absurd, alienation, suicide, and revolt almost immediately come to mind. Therefore, any overview of his contribution to modern philosophy would be lacking without at least a cursory explanation of these concepts and how they interact to create a unique and creative worldview.

At the time of his passing, Camus was preparing to write new dramatic works for the screen, stage, and television. He had started his literary career as a playwright and theatre director. He further released several successful adaptations in addition to his four original plays (including theatre pieces based on works by Faulkner, Dostoyevsky, and Calderon). He was a man of the theatre and particularly proud of his work as a dramatist. However, compared to his more well-known novels and significant essays, his plays never enjoyed the same level of popularity, critical acclaim, or incandescence.

The Stranger, *The Plague*, and *The Fall* are Camus's three books that were published during his lifetime, together with *The Rebel* and *The Myth of Sisyphus*, two of his most influential philosophical articles. *The First Man*, an autobiographical novel; *Caligula*, *The Misunderstanding*, *The State of Siege*, and *The Just Assassins*; several translations and adaptations, including new versions of works by Calderon, Lope de Vega, Dostoyevsky, and Faulkner; and an extensive array of essays, prose pieces, critical reviews, transcribed speeches, and interludes are also included in his body of work. In order to set the stage for a

more thorough study of Camus' philosophy and worldview, including his core beliefs and recurrent philosophical issues, the most significant of his writings are briefly summarised and described here.

After learning of Camus's passing, Sartre published a moving eulogy in the *France-Observateur*, paying tribute to his former friend and political rival for his notable contributions to French literature as well as his heroism and tenacious humanism in the face of the overwhelming and deformed events of the time.

Sartre's insightful assessment states that Camus was more of a writer of Voltaire-style philosophical tales and parables than a novelist. This assessment is in line with Camus's own assessment that his fictional works were not true novels (Fr. romans), a form he associated with the richly detailed and densely populated social panoramas of authors like Balzac, Tolstoy, and Proust, but rather contes ("tales") and recits ("narratives") combining philosophical and psychological insights. In this regard, it's also important to note that Camus never claimed to be a philosopher or to be a deep thinker at any point in his career. Instead, he nearly always referred to himself as un écrivain—a writer—in a straightforward but proud manner. This is crucial to remember while evaluating his place in intellectual history and twentieth-century philosophy because, in no way, does he meet the criteria for system-builders, theorists, or even disciplined thinkers. Instead, he was (again, Sartre's assessment is spot-on) a sort of all-purpose critic and contemporary philosopher who exposed myths, attacked deception and superstition, opposed terrorism, spoke out in favour of reason and compassion, and stood up for freedom. In short, he was a figure very much in the Enlightenment tradition of Voltaire and Diderot. Due to this, it may be appropriate to just accept Camus's description of himself as a writer and add the qualifier "philosophical" for greater precision and definition when evaluating his career and body of work.

Obviously, Camus's writings continue to be the fundamental factor in his significance today and the foundation of his cultural heritage, but his notoriety is also a result of his model life. His beliefs are amply expressed in his works as well as in his public pronouncements and personal political stances, demonstrating that he actually lived his philosophy. In other words, he left behind both his words and his deeds. Together, those statements and deeds represent a core set of liberal democratic values that the contemporary intellectual engaged can fully endorse and uphold. These values include tolerance, justice, liberty, open-mindedness, and respect for personhood, condemnation of violence, and resistance to tyranny.

His unusual prose style is one of Camus's most innovative contributions to contemporary dialogue on a purely literary level. Camus's style embodies a conscious attempt on his part to marry the more sonorous and opulent manner of 19th-century Romantic fiction with the famous clarity, elegance, and dry precision of the French philosophical tradition. It is terse and hard-boiled while also lyrical and capable of great, soaring flights of emotion and feeling. The end effect resembles a cross between Diderot and Hugo or between Hemingway and Melville, two authors who Camus admired. The majority of the time when we read Camus, we find the straightforward syntax, basic vocabulary, and cutting aphorisms found in contemporary theatre or noir detective fiction. Aside from that, it's important to note that Camus enjoyed the works of Dashiell Hammett and James M. Cain, and that his own writing has affected the tone and existentialist loner heroes of a number of other crime authors, like John D. McDonald and Lee Child. This subdued, laconic tone usually serves as a counterweight for in-depth reflections and elaborate descriptions that resemble Proust. Furthermore, this basic language frequently serves as a foil for lengthy reflections and elaborate descriptions that resemble Proust. This is where we should point out that the author's attempt at conciliation or unity of diametrically opposed styles is more than just an aesthetic gesture; it also serves as a moral and political message. In essence, it asserts that the lives of reason and emotion do not have to be mutually exclusive and that they may and ought to coexist.

The lesson that Camus teaches that it is still possible for a serious thinker to face the modern world with hardly a grain of hope, yet utterly without cynicism is perhaps the greatest inspiration and example that he provides for contemporary readers. In Camus, words like justice, freedom, humanity, and dignity are expressed honestly and unapologetically, without apology or embarrassment, and without the wry or mocking facial expressions or invisible quotation marks that almost always follow similar terms in contemporary public conversation.

According to Camus, absurdism is the conflict between the human capacity to search for meaning and its inability to find it because he is in a frigid, unsound cosmos where it is not possible- "Man stands face to face with the irrational. He feels within himself his longing for happiness and reason. The absurd is born of this confrontation between human need and the unreasonable silence of the world" (Camus, 1955, p. 28).

Camus and Nietzsche describe how a man is left with three options when he searches for a purpose in a purposeless world: the leap of faith, suicide, and facing absurdity (Roskowski, M, 2013). Whereas Camus is not in favour of suicide and leaps of faith as suitable answers, separating from Nietzsche's view, he says that humans should believe in their existence and their physical reality because that's the only thing they can feel, touch, and believe in. What is present is logical and believing in one thing that is beyond human limitations means deceiving the present. A leap of faith means that a man develops spiritual belief, but still, if life is absurd, then everything in it is absurd. The best solution, in his view, is to know and face the reality that life is absurd and to spend life with this ultimate truth. A few of Camus's principles of Absurdism are the denial of God, a sense of isolation, freedom of choice, suffering, and others versus an individual as the centre of the world.

Sartre's No Exit

No Exit is a one-act play consisting of four characters—Valet, Garcin, Ines, and Estelle. At the commencement of the play, Valet is leading a man denominated Garcin into a room. Anon, the audience realises that this room is Hell, with no windows or mirrors and only a single door. Furthermore, he is joined by a lady, Ines Serrano, and then another woman, Estelle Rigault. After that, the valet leaves, and the door gets closed. Everyone was expected to be tortured, but no torture occurred. All three are put together to probe one another's misdeeds, desires, and not-so-good recollections. Anon they come to ken that they are torturing one another, as they verbally expressed: "Hell is other people". (Sartre, 1989, p-45)

Initially, they optically discern the events on earth that are cognate to them, but then they are left with personal cerebrations and with the other two. The last, Garcia endeavours to open the door to get out of the room, but nobody leaves because of the unknown fear and hate, especially Garcin, who wants validation from Ines that he is a recreant.

Garcin is a poltroon and calloused man. He ran from the army during the Second World War and cheated on his wife glaringly. Without exhibiting sympathy for his wife, he brings affairs home and asks her to bring coffee to the bed. He disrelishes Ines because she kens his faults and lusts for Estelle. After all, he will feel manly if she treats her like a man, which is not the case.

The second character that enters the room is a woman, Ines, a lesbian. A postal clerk by vocation, whose sins are convoluting a wife's opinion against her husband and the murder of a man who is Ines's cousin, seems to be the only one among the three who is a good manipulator and has a better understanding of the potency of opinion. She is the only character who dares to accept the sins that she, Garcin, and Estelle have committed and accept the authenticity that she is a cruel person. Estelle was an aristocratic lady who espoused an affluent man for the sake of mazuma and was additionally involved with a puerile man. She kills her illegitimate child by throwing it into the river afore her doter and that coerces her doter to commit suicide. She endeavours to get proximate to Garcin so she will be able to define herself as a woman to a man. She has prurience for "manly men", which Garcia shows to be her sins of apostasy and murder. The fourth character is the valet, and the audience kens little about him. He only verbalizes with Garcin, and we come to ken that his uncle is the head valet who does not have ocular lids and cannot blink ocular perceivers. The play *No Exit* has a profoundly intriguing locale, which is Hell. The outlandish thing is that there is no visible torture, as there is in genuine Hell. This hell consists of a room with three couches and no windows, no mirrors, and only a single door. There are no human luxuries that are available in the mundane human world, and even the mundane human privileges such as tears, slumber, and blinking ocular perceivers are taken away. When the three are introduced to Hell by a well-mannered valet, they realise they are dead, and the place commences to take shape and become its veritable essence.

Camus's *The Stranger*

In 1942, Albert Camus published his novel *The Stranger* (L'Étranger). It was divided into two parts, where the single main character narrates the events from his own point of view before he commits a murder (part 1) and after he has committed a murder (part 2). The turning point towards the end of part 1 was his mother's funeral, at which he did not show any sadness and has no wish to see her body. After this, he apathetically murders someone. At the end of the novel he awaits his own execution.

In January 1955 Albert Camus wrote:

I summarized *The Stranger* a long time ago, with a remark I admit was highly paradoxical: 'In our society any man who does not weep at his mother's funeral runs the risk of being sentenced to death.' I only meant that the hero of my book is condemned because he does not play the game. (Carroll,27)

The Outsider, or *The Stranger*, Camus's first novel, is both a brilliantly crafted story and an illustration of Camus's absurdist worldview. *The Stranger* is a novel that revolves around the story of a puerile man designated Meursault, a cold, detached but mundane man. He lives in French Algiers and works as a shipping clerk. The story commences with a telegram received by Meursault, which was about the news of his mother's death. He attends his mother's funeral. But his eccentric, placid, and detached demeanour during his mother's death surprises all other attendees. On the next day, he met a resplendent woman, Maria, and became magnetized to her. They spend time with each other, visually examining comedy movies and slumbering together. Maria is surprised when she comes to know that Meursault has lost her mother just yesterday. However, the next fortnight of Meursault's life are spent in such an unorthodox way, as if nothing tragic has transpired to him. Having a hangover with the incipient girlfriend, going to the beach on vacation with a friend's pimp and girlfriend, having dinners with the friend, and taking naps to look homogeneous to this man is so weird and detached. During vacation, Meursault and his friends were confronted by Arabs. One of the Arabs was Raymond's wife's brother, who cheated on him and then beat him as her husband. Raymond was Meursault's friend. The Arab was shouted by Meursault and the only explication Meursault had for his murder was the striking sun on his face.

During his murder tribulation, it is visually examined that the court is much more fascinated with his cold deportment at his mother's funeral than in his authentic malefaction. He was judged as an aberrant, abstruse, unconfirmed, and misanthropic person. He was sentenced to death. The chaplain arrives three times and endeavours to convince Meursault to seek pardon, but at all times he relucts. He was so exasperated by him that he endeavoured to beat him, and he denounces Christianity and the subsistence of God. He wants liberation and an incipient life, but in such a way that he can recollect the present one. He does not believe in an afterlife. For him, everything is frivolous and nonessential, so there is no reason to seek pardon.

Camus does not optate us to cerebrate of Meursault as a stranger who lives outside of his society, but as a man who is a stranger within his society. Had Meursault been some kind of outsider, a foreigner, then quite probably his acts would have been accepted as irrational evil. But Meursault was not an outsider; he was a member of his society—a society that wanted meaning behind action and demeanor. Meursault is confined for failing to cry at his mother's funeral. The hero is condemned because he does not participate in the game. Keeping this thing in view, he is an outsider to the society in which he lives, wandering on the fringe, on the outskirts of life, solitary and sensual. If we optate to get a more precise picture of his character, we must ask ourselves in what way Meursault doesn't play the game. Meursault doesn't play the game in the sense that he relucts to prevaricate. Lying is not only saying what is erroneous. It is withal saying more than is veritable; it is verbalizing more than one feels. To make life simple, we all do it every day. The hero of the novel, Meursault, doesn't optate to make life simpler. He is a unique engenderment, flat but very natural, resplendent but not sentimental, emotional, or feeling. He verbally expresses who he is. He relucts to obnubilate his feelings. Society immediately feels threatened. For example, he is asked to verbalize that he regrets his malefaction in a time-venerated fashion. He replies that he feels more exasperation about it than veritable regret. And it's this nuance that condemns him. So it can be verbalized that Meursault is an indigent and unclad man, in love with a sun that leaves no shadows. Far from destitute of all sensibility, he is driven by a tenacious and ergo profound zealousness, the ardency for the absolute and the veracity. This veracity is as yet a negative one, a veracity born of living and feeling, but without which no triumph over oneself or the world will ever be possible. The Outsider is the story of a man who, without any heroic pretensions, concurs to die for the veracity. The inscriber Albert Camus has endeavoured to make his character represent the only Christ that we visually examine. In the middle of the widespread perspicacious and moral bewilderment that followed World War Two, Camus was a voice advocating the moral and convivial values of equity and human dignity. Though his vocation was cut short, he remains one of the most influential authors of the twentieth century, regarded both for the quality of his fiction and for the depth and insightfulness of his philosophy.

Subject of Desire

At first, Garcia appears to be a very nice gentleman and a noble person, but as soon as we go ahead in the play, we realize that's not at all. He had a wife who loved him unconditionally, but he despised her for no reason. And the only thing he recalled of her memories is how she got on his nerves. While talking about his life events, he told a story that mirrored his character;

Well, here's something you can get your teeth into. I brought a half-caste girl to stay in our house. My wife slept upstairs; she must have heard-everything. She was an early riser and, as I and the girl stayed in bed late, she served us our morning coffee. (Sartre, 1989, p-25)

This narration too points out that he was a sexual pervert and a womanizer. He used to control his wife and use other women to consummate his sexual desires. The words signal his asexual relationship with his wife, but still, she seeks him. This is betokened to impose the theory of desire.

The second example is the lovely Estelle, an objective worldly character only conscious of her makeup. She wants to be admired by men all the time, even in Hell. She throws glances at Garcin just to become his center of attention for corporeal affection:

GARCIN: And you didn't want one?

ESTELLE: I certainly didn't. But the baby came, worse luck. I went to Switzerland for five months. No one knew anything. It was a girl. Roger was with me when she was born. It pleased him no end, having a daughter. It didn't please me! (Sartre, 1989, p-28)

Because the reason for her presence in Hell was apostasy and murder, she was so consumed with materialism that she ignored her doted's love and murdered her daughter. The above lines show that the sole prevalent ground she had with her puerile boyfriend was her fancy for sexuality. In his theory of sexual desire, Sartre believes that sexual desire is so vigorous that it cannot be resisted. And physical activity is the only way to satiate this feeling.

The third example of Sartre's sexual perversion is Ines, who calls herself "a cruel one". She desires Estelle in the same way she desires Florence, but she has no emotional attachment to her and does not miss her in Hell.

The same desire can be described in the character of Meursault, who was more absorbed in Marie's body than the feeling she had for her. We can optically discern that he misses his cigarettes and his physical affixment to Marie even while in confinement. In all cases, we find that all four are slaves to their desire for sex, and none of them have any feelings of profound appreciation; instead, they show their detachment towards it. They take love for granted, and they deal with their doers not as humans but rather as objects that consummate their physical needs.

Sartre and Camus are of the view that the world is meaningless and that it is we who give meaning and interpretation. Their ideas can be seen in their work, as Ines stated-

To forget about the others? How utterly absurd! I feel you there, in every pore. Your silence clamours in my ears. You can nail up your mouth, cut your tongue out - but you can't prevent your being there. Can you stop your thoughts? I hear them ticking away like a clock, tick-tock, tick-tock, and I'm certain you hear mine. (Sartre, 1989, p-22)

The setting of the drawing room fortifies their conception. This signals a circumscribed macrocosm that does not contain anything captivating, and it seems diminutively minuscule to most people. And, just as this world is nugatory to these three characters, Meursault has discovered equipollent. He is so nonchalant to the world and its interpretations given by other consciousnesses that he is impervious to the great incident of his mother's death but affected by the sunlight striking his ocular perceivers.

The other existential concept is "existence precedes essence," which allows man to choose his essence without being bound. The major idea that underlies this doctrine is the rejection of God. In the play No Exit, there is no obvious rejection, but the immoral actions of all three characters imply that they have no spiritual connection to the deity. On the other hand, being an absurd hero, Meursault has a very clear rejection of God and Christianity because he knows they are unworthy and beyond physicality. As he argued with the chaplain about the existence of God: "I explained that I didn't believe in God." (Camus, 72)

Deplorable faith is another notion of existentialism and absurdism which states that relying on others to engender your essence is the cause of lamentable faith because one is unable to take responsibility for his actions. Garcin and Estelle are prime examples of lamentable faith.

When the door opens, Garcin is not able to leave because he is unable to take responsibility for his actions and cannot face his decision to absquatulate from his army, which was a

pusillanimous act. As a result, he closes the door once more and chooses to be judged by Ines, and allows her to create his essence, as he says.;

GARCIN: It's because of her I'm staying here.

[ESTELLE releases INEZ and stares dumbfoundedly at GARCIN.]

INEZ: Because of me? [Pause.] All right, shut the door. It's ten times hotter here since it opened. [GARCIN goes to the door and shuts it.] Because of me, you said?

GARCIN: Yes. You, anyhow, know what it means to be a coward.

INEZ: Yes, I know.

GARCIN: And you know what wickedness is, and shame, and fear. There were days when you peered into yourself, into the secret places of your heart, and what you saw there made you faint with horror. And then, next day, you didn't know what to make of it, you couldn't interpret the horror you had glimpsed the day before. Yes, you know what evil costs. And when you say I'm a coward, you know from experience what that means. Is that so? (*Sartre*, 1989,p-42)

Estelle too relies on others. She believes in her subsistence when she optically discerns herself in the mirror as other people do. She does not accept the responsibility for her doted's suicide. She believes in what Ines tells her about a pimple on her face when Ines becomes her mirror. This shows her ethos is developed by Ines, not by herself. This concept of deplorable faith is availed by Sartre's verbalization that "Hell is other people."(*Sartre*, 1989,p-45)

Ines, on the other hand, is sturdy in her opinions and can make decisions. She knows the art of dominating and affecting others, as she did in Hell. She, like Meursault, is veracious about the quantifications and wrongdoings that she has committed. Both Ines and Meursault are not trepidacious to take responsibility for their actions, and they are ecstatic with that. And this is the major characteristic of absurdism.

Garcin and Estelle are not capable of leaving their past. They still recall their past events, verbalize about their doted's and friends on earth, and can't concentrate on the present. But Ines and Meursault are among those who live in their presence without cerebrating of their past or worrying about the future. To Ines, it is frivolous to recall her past because it does not contain any denotement. As she says, "all you own is here." She doesn't believe in justifying herself in terms of what sort of person she used to be; rather, she lives in her present and

chooses her freedom to establish her essence and accept the reality that she is in Hell. As it is said by Sartre, "life begins on the other side of despair".

Meursault and Ines are virtually homogeneous in their opinions. He asserts equipollent to Ines does. According to Meursault, no matter where and in which condition you live jubilant along with it. Despite being in confinement, he was blissful. His ecstasy was not because he was hopeful or certain; rather, he accepted the authenticity that he would die and nothing could obviate him from dying. He additionally believes in the present and wants to live with full ardency. He was so free that he wanted to live again despite being so close to death, as he said, "start life all over again".

He is conscious of what he does and gainsays that it is morally good or deplorable-

Actually, I was sure of myself, sure about everything, far surer than he; sure of my present life and of the death that was coming. That, no doubt, was all I had; but at least that certainty was something I could get my teeth into—just as it had got its teeth into me. I'd been right, I was still right, I was always right. (Camus,p-74)

Because he is an absurdist, he does not believe in abstract things. He appreciates Marie's dress, body, and cachinnation because they are concrete, but does not probe for her profound appreciation. He does not mourn his mother's death, as grief is an abstract thing and he does not possess it. He believes in what he can perceive, such as sunlight, which he regards as his adversary.

Existentialism and Absurdism: Difference

We must revisit the fundamental principles of existentialism in order to comprehend the distinctions between it and absurdism.

Existence Comes First: Instead of merely existing, we live and encounter things. Since there is no such thing as a universal humanity, each individual must forge their own identity through interaction with the outside world. Apart from what we do, we are not human. We are not human (essence) until we act (existence). It is a distinction between "being in-itself" and "being for-itself".

Absurdity: There are two problems with human reasoning: 1) It is defective, and 2) There are aspects of the universe that logic and reason cannot account for. We are frequently driven by emotions and desires, such as anxiety, remorse, and a desire for power.

Alienation: The elevation of reason (as in science) artificially separates us from the real world. We are estranged from 1) God (spiritual abandonment), 2) nature (technology erects barriers), 3) other men (helplessness in the face of an absurd society), and 4) ourselves (inability to see a complete picture of ourselves).

Angst: We fear the future in general ("When will I blow up?"), but we also fear taking accountability for our moral decisions ("the sorrow of Abraham"). We are all different individuals and cannot be put below the general, universal moral code, thus occasionally we must make choices that are exceptions to it. Can we accept that the outside world is not a part of us?

The Meeting with Nothing: We are isolated from everything and stand on the terrible edge of the Void. Nothing exists that we could possibly accept or even rely on.

The concept of the absurd frequently appears in existentialist literature, especially Camus. The idea of contrast between two things is absurdity. The absurd is created as a result of this conflict between human need and the illogical silence of the outside world.

Absurdism is the name given to the school of thought that embraces the absurd. Even though absurdism is sometimes referred to as a subfield of existentialism, it is a particular concept that is not essential to an existentialist viewpoint.

Existentialism and absurdism differ in how they approach the question of what gives life meaning. Although existentialism holds that we must construct our own meaning, they both agree that the cosmos is intrinsically meaningless. Existence comes before essence, according to the existentialist axiom; after being born, we exist before making the decision to create our own essence and purpose.

Contrarily, absurdism focuses on the conflict between a meaningless universe and our ongoing search for significance. The absurd emerges as a result of this tension. According to Absurdist, all of us are caught up in this tension, leaving us with three options: commit suicide, reject absurdity and seek solace in myths and religion, or accept absurdity. Accepting the meaninglessness of it all and moving on, to keep living and living well, requires embracing the absurd. Camus famously used the metaphor of Sisyphus dragging a boulder up a hill in his *The Myth of Sisyphus* (1942) for all of eternity to demonstrate this. Camus says, "The body's judgment is as good as the mind's, and the body shrinks from annihilation. [Humans] get into the habit of living before acquiring the habit of thinking" (Camus,p-7)

The fundamental philosophical and epistemological tenet that there is no such thing as objective meaning is absurdism. Absurdist are thinkers and artists who confront this premise and all of its ramifications. So what's the friggin point of it all, asks the absurdist. Existentialism is a fundamentally positive philosophy that embraces absurdity while stressing the significance of avoiding boredom by developing unique meaning. Existentialists, then, are those who value free will and work to have genuine, individually meaningful lives. "Since the conventional notion of truth is obviously false, how can I purge my life of deceit and be true to myself?" asks the existentialist.

Absurdism is the philosophy that is sometimes the sub-branch or offspring of existentialism because of their interconnectedness with each other. The word "absurdism" refers to something irrational and ridiculous. The philosophy of the Absurd is based on the conflict between the human capacity to search for meaning in life and the human incapability to find it. Because finding meaning in a meaningless universe is humanly impossible.

Existentialists are obsessed with the meaning of life. They focus exclusively on the individual. Though life is very difficult and does not have any objective or universally known value, yet, existentialism attempts to find happiness and meaning in a modern world characterized by alienation, isolation, loneliness, frustration, inauthenticity and absurdity. Existentialism deals with man's disillusionment and despair. This philosophy maintains that man is full of anxiety with no meaning in life; just simply exist, until he makes a decisive choice because he creates his self by making self-directed choices.

Existentialism begins as a voice raised in protest against the absurdity of pure thought, a logic that is not the logic of thinking but the immanent movement of being. It recalls the observer of all time and existence, from pure thought's speculations to his conditioned thinking as an existing individual seeking to know how to live and live the life he knows. (Blackham,2)

Conclusion

The crux of *No Exit* is the notion that hell is other people. Difficulties are not as arduous as they become because of others. Our perception of the world is built by our circumventions. Every conception is shaped by the people with whom we reside. Their opinions form our opinions and even how we act and move in society. Only the sense of being looked over by others makes us conscious of ourselves. It places us in a position to be as impeccable as anything can be and not make a single error, for we are being optically discerned by others.

The three characters in this play are bound to be in that room, and they cannot leave it. They wait for an executioner, but no one comes in. They realize, sooner or later, that they are being tortured by one another. The hell in which they are confined is hell because others are there with them. The door would not open, and even when it did, they would not leave for trepidation of the unknown. So, by "Hell is other people," (Sartre, 1989, p-45) Sartre means that we are unable to escape the watchful gaze of everyone around us.

No Exit supports the idea that mental anguish is worse than physical anguish. A person is reduced to the status of a question by the very appearance of other people. In Sartre's existentialism, being close to other people irritates a person since their appearance has the power to reduce that person to a protest. At that moment, in the action, eyes are weapons and judgements are bullets. The ability to categorise people based on appearances and judgements develops into a method of possession and control. (Devaki, 172)

The Stranger reflects Meursault's predominant interest in the physical world, exhibiting very little emotion throughout. During his mother's funeral, he doesn't shed a single tear but is rather preoccupied with repining about the sun beating down on the funeral procession. Furthermore, he is consummately apathetic to his girlfriend Marie's espousement proposal. He understands that it's the societal norm and accedes that they could get espoused if Marie wants to, but makes it clear that it doesn't matter to him. This again mirrors Meursault's interest in the corporeal, rather than the spiritual. However simple the descriptors used for the barely present emotions, Meursault's narration becomes quite elaborate and vivid when describing the physical world around him: "Then everything began to reel before my eyes, a fiery gust came from the sea, while the sky cracked in two, from end to end, and a great sheet of flame poured down through the rift." (No Exit, 38-39) is used to describe his suffering underneath the scorching summer sun. Throughout the book, Camus's philosophical tenets of absurdity and existentialism are shining through. In essence, absurdity here refers to humanity's futile attempt to impose meaning and rationality on a meaningless and irrational universe. This concept is reflected by the behaviour and thoughts of Meursault, the main character in the novel. His external world is governed by emotionless observations of his physical surroundings, albeit sometimes quite detailed. This becomes clear after the first two sentences of the book: "MOTHER died today. Or, maybe, yesterday; I can't be sure.. " (Camus, 1989, p-4)

The Stranger can be seen as both a dispiriting incarnation of the newly developing mass personality (i.e., a figure totally void of fundamental human sentiments and aspirations) and, on the other hand, as a lone hold-out, a final sample of the old Romanticism—and as a result, a figure who is perceived as both threatening and alien by the bionic vast bulk. The character or viewpoint of the "stranger" or outsider is a recurring motif in Camus's literary works, which also appears in his moral and political writings. The most blatant example is Meursault, the laconic storyteller of *The Stranger*. He appears to view everything objectively, including his own actions. He notes his findings with clinical objectivity, much like an anthropological, but while being cautiously watched by the people around him.

Janet Mcknight comments on *The Stranger*-

Camus famously built up this novel from the half-hearted joke that any man who did not cry at his mother's funeral would be found guilty of murder. From this quip beginning, Camus's novel ends beautifully with Meursault's outbreak of rage against a persistent chaplain, causing Meursault to feel washed clean of hope, and ready to open himself to "the gentle indifference of the world." With this, the reader is left to ponder their existence among the many possible strangers in the world, including themselves and the ideals that they shun or embrace. Are we as readers, as writers, as human beings, only able to discover the 'internal stranger' in ourselves once we become free from all hope? And for the legal minds of the group, we can wonder whether the journey of law itself requires a penchant for absurdity or for imagination, and which of these indulgences would be 'stranger' in real life than in fiction... (Mcknight)

No Exit and *The Stranger* are the most profound plays to understand the concept of existential and absurdist philosophy. By comparing them, it has been kenneled to the researcher that both philosophies virtually carry the same concepts except for a little difference in them. For example, Ines opts to be in liberty to live in his presence and she engenders her essence that was to torture the other two in Hell. Meursault additionally culls liberation, but he does not engender his essence; rather he is free because he accepted that "life is absurd" and he kens that engendering essence in this world is additionally absurd.

Works Cited

Blackham, Harold John. Six Existentialist Thinkers. United Kingdom, Taylor & Francis, 2012.

Camus, Albert. *The Stranger*. New York, Vintage Books, 1942.

Camus, Albert and Justin O'Brien. *The Myth of Sisyphus and Other Essays*. New York, Vintage Books, 1955.

Carroll, David. *Albert Camus the Algerian: Colonialism, Terrorism, Justice*. Columbia University Press, 2007. JSTOR, <https://doi.org/10.7312/carr14086>. Accessed 8 Jan. 2023.

Devaki, V.. (2019). Jean-Paul Sartre's *No Exit* in Relation to Power and Torment. 12. 172-176.

Flynn, Thomas. *Existentialism: A Very Short Introduction*. United Kingdom, OUP Oxford, 2006.

G., Verrips. *Albert Camus: Een Leven Tegen de Leugen*. Amsterdam, Uitgeverij Balans, 1997.

Mart, Çağrı Tuğrul. "Existentialism in two plays of Jean-Paul Sartre." *International Journal of English and Literature* 3 (2012): 50-54.

McKnight, Janet. (2014). *Stranger Than Fiction? That's Absurd! A Book Review of Albert Camus' The Stranger*. 10.13140/2.1.4676.6882.

Roubiczek, Paul. *Existentialism for and Against*. Reissue, Cambridge UP, 1964.

Roskowski, Matthew. "Absurdity and the leap of faith." (2013).

Sartre, Jean-Paul, and Stuart Gilbert. *No Exit and Three Other Plays*. Reissue, Vintage, 1989.

Senejani, Akram Amiri. "Sartre's Existentialist Viewpoint in *No Exit*." *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature (IJSELL)*, vol. Volume 1, no. Issue 3, 2013, pp. 15–23, www.arcjournals.org/pdfs/ijSELL/v1-i3/v1-i3-ijSELL_2.pdf.