

REVEALING THE ANIMAL VICTIM: A STUDY OF HUMAN-ANIMAL REPRESENTATIONS IN SELECTED ABSURD PLAYS

Chathushkie Samurdha Jayasinghe
Independent Researcher
csj2chat077@gmail.com

Abstract

*Past research has neglected victimized animals in representation and focused on the humans projected through their portrayal. This qualitative study re-examined animal representations in the Absurd theatre to expose their illustrated oppression. Uniting ideas of animal rights with principles of Absurd Theatre, the study was a textual analysis on *Waiting for Godot* (1953), *The Zoo Story* (1959), and *The Story of the Man Who Turned into a Dog* (1957). The research observed how human-centrism created in combining man and animal delivers visibility and agency to the oppressed through language and behaviour. Levels of identification created with human-animals were recognized to feature exploitation by generating sympathy. The common ground created between the human-animal and the deteriorated man of the Absurd Theatre further contributed to the animal victim's visibility and recognition. The importance of erasing hierarchical barriers and recognizing their history of victimization were highlighted in the conclusion.*

Keywords: Animal oppression, anthropomorphism, human-centrism, zoomorphism

INTRODUCTION

Though Animal Studies have laid emphasis on the plight of animals during conflict situations (Das & Sarangi, 2017), the depiction of such animal cruelty in literary texts written during times of war remains a marginalized discussion. Animal representations have frequently been analyzed to be allegories of political leaders (Williams, 1971), illustrations of human loss, isolation, and issues of existence (Malik, 2013), and depictions of emerging class distinctions of the time (Kumar, 2014), while they are rarely read for the animals that they are presented to be. The researcher contends this under-evaluation adversely impacts existing animal marginalization and downplay the commitment and contribution by the writers towards animal liberation. Thus, this paper was born from observations of animal cruelty in the Absurd Theatre; a movement prompted through World War II.

As an intervention, the paper investigates two primary premises; the conditions under which harsh treatment of animals are carried out within texts and how a unique technical aspect of their representation, the human-animal spectrum, assists in highlighting their oppression. In answering these questions, the paper explores three plays: *Waiting for Godot* (1953) by Samuel Beckett, *The Story of the Man Who Turned into a Dog* (1957) by Osvaldo Dragún, and Edward Albee's *The Zoo Story* (1959), all produced during the period of 1950s-1960s in Europe. Knowledge from Animal Studies is adopted in addressing the defined area of study through thoughts of Animal Rights activists and scholars such as John Simons and Erica Fudge, along with notions of Martin Esslin on the Theatre of the Absurd.

The Characters of The Absurd

Coined by Martin Esslin, the Theatre of the Absurd is a literary movement that arose in the late 1950s. Samuel Beckett, Eugène Ionesco, and Jean Genet are pioneers of this movement. It brought on to stage the atrocities of World War II and its results in the form of literary expression.

As the name suggests, the Theatre of the Absurd is a movement of literature built entirely for and from plays, though contemporary novels and poems may show some absurd features. Among this theatre's major characteristics are meaningless dialogues and repetitive actions. They are all executed through another primary feature identified within this movement which is the presence of absurd, forlorn characters. In fact, their gestures and words largely contribute to increasing the sense of irrationality within these plays, which is not as easy a task for novels or poems to perform, because as commonly written forms of art, their output may be deficient in performative behaviors, gestures or dialogues between characters.

The Theatre of the Absurd possesses what the novel, as above, is stated to lack and, through its uniform expression as a literary movement, sets an amicable premise for scholars to approach the characters and the discourses built around them. For instance, its presentation of characters in such a way that they are commonly and recurrently identified to lack individuality, emotion, or purpose shows how studies on such commonalities can contribute and develop the ongoing discussion of representation in the Theatre of the Absurd.

Thus, considering how characters, their dialogues, and behavior play such a primary role in both the Theatre of the Absurd and this study of human-animal characters, the researcher too focuses on Absurd theatrical pieces, despite novels like *The Animal Farm* (1945) by George Orwell and *Metamorphosis* (1915) by Franz Kafka consisting of commendable human-animal protagonists.

War and The Problem of Animal Histories

How most levels of irrationality found in Absurd theatre parallels the effects of World War II is largely understood when looking at the unreasonable chaos created through war and its aftermath being breeding grounds for mass exploitation of varying kinds. This realization brought about by war is powerfully illustrated in genre-defining plays such as *Waiting for Godot*, which was initially performed in 1953. How Samuel Beckett satirically laughs upon the characters' blind faith imitates the opinion held by the war-ridden on religion and God. *The Story of the Man Who Turned into a Dog* that premiered in 1957 highlights financial loss and unemployability, likely reflections on the plight of man during and after the war. Likewise, *The Zoo Story* by Edward Albee, first performed in 1959, illustrates the disruption of communication stemming from and leading to further estrangement from relationships. These plays may not directly define the above as overreaching negative effects of war but as works of a post-world war movement known to showcase the absurdity of human existence (Esslin, 1960).

Addressing what is overlooked in this definition, "Voiceless Victims of War: An Absurd Truth" by Bhagyalaxmi Das and Itishri Sarangi draws attention to victims of a world built upon war and destruction that go beyond human relations: "Elephants, camels, dogs, carrier pigeons, and even glow worms were deployed in huge numbers to fight an absurd war. They had no choice but to fight along with their human counterparts. The animals were the voiceless soldiers of war" (Das & Sarangi, 2017). The plight of animals as war victims is thus brought to light where they have been subjected to non-consensual control.

In spite of such contemporary acknowledgment of animal exploitation during the war, historiographical issues in writing about animals have frequently been raised (Fudge, 2002; Hilda, 2012) due to animal histories not being actively recorded in the past. This lack of documentation obstructs the researcher from declaring that the animals represented in the Absurd plays of the focus exclusively symbolize victims of World War II.

However, Fudge in *Centering Animals in Latin American History* particularly concentrates on current developments in animal studies where historians have become conscious of previously neglected animal realities (Few, 2013). It assists in creating the assumption that this same awareness of animal realities is also projected through the absurd playwrights of the focus. They strive to illustrate irrational and timeless animal exploitation that continually existed but was nevertheless neglected. Thus, in accordance with the notion that nature and power of animal representation can be determined through the animal visibility within a given time period (Baker, 2001), the great lengths of animal cruelty during World War II was possibly only one of several triggers for the playwrights to powerfully represent the longstanding concept of animal exploitation through a creative and novel representation like the human-animal spectrum.

METHODOLOGY

The Human-Animal Spectrum as The Path to Animal Visibility

As a platform of creative expression, the Arts is an ideal place to execute positive intentions of animal liberation. Yet, the thoughts of theorists on animal representation itself are divided. One common argument appears in *The Animal That Therefore I Am*, which declares that animals can never be accurately illustrated in the arts because representation is inseparable from the human point of view (Derrida, 2008). Knowledge, as such, sheds light on how the animal was marginalized not only in the physical world, as previously noted but also in its representation. Yet there have existed theorists in the past and the present like Erica Fudge and John Simons who counter-argue Derrida's supposition. For instance, in "A Left-Handed Blow" (2002), Fudge proposes that the same indivisible human-centrism is the key to illustrating and comprehending the concerns of the animal. Building on Fudge's premise, Simons, in *Animal Rights and the Politics of Literary Representation*, suggests Anthropomorphism as a starting point to this understanding where humans and animals are attached to each other in

representation (Simons, 2001). Such a positive outlook and choice of representation result in turning the same inevitable animal marginalization realized by Derrida to be a source of animal empowerment. This study builds on these ideas of Fudge and Simons by focusing on not merely the reductive anthropomorphic, but also zoomorphic blends of the human and the dog that contribute to highlight animal cruelty in the selected Absurd plays *Waiting for Godot* (1953) by Samuel Beckett, *The Story of the Man Who Turned into a Dog* (1957) by Osvaldo Dragún and Edward Albee's *The Zoo Story* (1959).

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Exposing Violence on Animals

“Pain is an evil and we, as humans, have no right to inflict it on each other or on animals”: (Humphrey Primatt, as cited in Simons, 2001). In many words and forms, this thought acts as the basis of animal rights and liberation movements that pioneered in the 1970s. By showcasing such pain and highlighting the absurdity behind inflicting it on animals, the intentions of the selected playwrights seem to align with the animal rights movements.

While human existence is continuously questioned through actions, conversations, and circumstances of its human characters, Samuel Beckett's *Waiting for Godot* extends its absurdity through Lucky, a relatively minor character but a powerful human-animal representation that demonstrates animal suffering created by man. Though being whipped and roped demarcated that he is a horse, he is often times called a pig and a hog (Beckett, 1952). In instances, qualities of a dog are also incorporated in Lucky's representation as he drools, pants, feeds on bones, and responds to the canine name “Lucky” (Beckett, 1952). Except in one instance, throughout the entire play, Lucky does not speak (Beckett, 1952). While it may rule out that he is an animal, combined with his noted behavior and various interpretations are given to him by other characters, his speech supports the idea that Lucky is an enslaved, domesticated human-animal representation.

Though masked under this guise of a human-animal mix rather than directly being presented as an animal, Lucky's exploitation is central to the play's plotline. As a showcasing

of the extent of abuse he goes through, Lucky is mercilessly and continuously whipped, shouted at, and kicked by his master Pozzo (Beckett, 1952). The depth of animal abuse is intensified by the words of the human oppressor that boasts his actions: “I am bringing him to the fair, where I hope to get a good price for him. The truth is you can’t drive such creatures away. The best thing would be to kill them” (Beckett, 1952). While these lines villainize Pozzo, they highlight an overall sense of human ungratefulness. This manner of showing the plight of the mistreated animal who is without hope even at the end of its service and certainly not after he is found to serve no value is also visible in *The Story of the Man Who Turned into a Dog*.

In *The Story of the Man Who Turned into a Dog*, two deceased watchdogs, following a twenty-five and thirty-five year service, are briefly acknowledged (Dragún, 1957), in each instance, by a mere repetition of words. Despite this recognition, without any display of remorse for their death, the play’s focus shifts to other matters of concern. Therefore, the repeated lines and, more so, the dogs’ lack of mention only momentarily hint about the exploitation of domesticated dogs and their neglect. The watchdogs are thus in the peripheries of the play. In contrast, it is noted how Actor #1, as the protagonist, becomes the center of attention once having replaced the position of the dog. He is offered ten pesos per month (Dragún, 1957) as a salary for the same job that the deceased dog performed for free. This marks injustice at the onset of the play itself, pointing that it is an exploitation of labour that the animal faced, exempting the fact that a dog requires no monetary gains. Despite such favoritisms, Actor #1, by circumstance, develops into a human-animal, and goes through a behavioral and psychological transformation from man to dog, upon which begins his projection of animal suffering. From the point where he is made to become a watchdog due to the lack of a better profession, he feeds on bones, is confined to a dog house, walks on fours and barks instead of speak (Dragún, 1957), which cannot altogether be simply a display of his everyday struggles. Labelled throughout the play as a man forced to live like a dog, these circumstances faced by Actor #1 may evoke emotion or, in the least, create a sense of understanding among the audience as fellow humans who pity the unfortunate conditions undergone by another of their kind. By making the readers identify with Actor #1 in this manner, the playwright indirectly succeeds in exposing the vulnerability of the animal, who would generally occupy the position of a watchdog. In turn, an overall awareness about the maltreatment of animals is tactfully created among the audience. In fact, the expected sympathy

from the audience towards the dead dog ought to increase further because, as noted, Actor #1 is portrayed to have a slightly better plight.

Edward Albee, too utilizes the concept of sympathy in his play as evidenced in his inclusive mindfulness and compassion against animal cruelty. Rather than being subtle or making the message come across as incidental as in the other two plays, the unfortunate state of a dog is initially expressed directly in *The Zoo Story*: “. . . bloodshot, infected, maybe; and a body you can see the ribs through the skin” (Albee, 1959). By making the human protagonist acknowledge the animal as a “misused one” (Albee, 1959) and voice its concerns with compassion, unlike in the other two plays, the human audience is inherently made aware of its poor, oppressed condition.

Albee also forms and uses the human-animal character in ways opposed to that of the other two writers in a discussion. Without adapting Zoomorphism to create the human-animal like Dragún and Beckett do, Albee draws an anthropomorphic description of the dog through Jerry’s dialogue. How according to Jerry, the dog makes sounds in its throat like a woman, smiles, is understood to possess comprehension and concentration skills, and is described to act upon emotions such as hate (Albee, 1959), verifying the claim that human-centrism is inseparable from the representation of animals while making the same inseparability an opportunity for Jerry to recognize and express the dog’s misery in a way comprehensible to man. Likewise, being similar to Jerry in kind, the human audience he caters to is likely to embrace his perspective and undergo similar effects of sympathy and compassion and cultivate parallel levels of understanding to Jerry. In fact, Jerry becoming the dog’s voice of expression along with the anthropomorphic representation of the dog appears to be a double-take in proving that the human-centrism in animal representation can, in reality, elevate the animal as opposed to mass belief.

While Albee attempts to maintain the authenticity of the dog by projecting him in the typical dog-like appearance with a lack of verbal expression (though he tactfully uses Jerry to speak on behalf of it), Beckett utilizes voice in multiple ways all resulting in making the animal victim heard. Though there is less evidence to suggest that the brief moment of speech in which

Lucky revels (Beckett, 1952) possibly symbolizes a sense of rebellion against the maltreatment he underwent, Estragon and Vladimir speaking for him inevitably caters a message of hope for animals. Like Jerry, they notice and voice against the ongoing cruelty. It is made evident through their concern over “a running sore” on Lucky and how they deduct its cause to be the rope that binds him (Beckett, 1952). We soon realize that this awareness of Lucky’s state is able to reach a climax solely due to the human-animal that Lucky is. How Vladimir gets to a point where he shouts that it is a scandal to treat a man in this way and Estragon agreeing that it is a disgrace (Beckett, 1952) show us the peak of influence that the element of human in Lucky’s combined representation has over exposing and voicing against animal abuse. This shows Beckett’s understanding of the capabilities of a human-animal representation over an animal illustration that is also visible in Dragún’s work.

As part-human (and therefore blessed with the weapon of linguistic expression), Actor #1 is able to speak up about the misfortunes that his new life brought. His revelation that he has become used to bones and how he accepted his new abode by saying that it was too big for him (Dragún, 1957) demonstrates the poor nutrition, sanitary and living conditions that the dog before him ought to have experienced whose inability to voice its oppression inevitably made it vulnerable and prone to continuous maltreatment. This shows that the human voice plays a major role in exposing the oppression that the dog must have faced while being in an identical position to Actor #1, all the while not being able to express any of his concerns.

Based on these observations, it is clear that the human-centrism in human-animal characters of each analyzed play is what inherently brings other human characters and possibly the audience to the point of acknowledging the animals to be equals rather than inferiors. In turn, it helps the playwrights to cultivate awareness, sympathy, and understanding towards animal oppression. Thus, the visibility alone that the human-animals bring to the exploited animal is enough evidence of the playwrights’ success and service towards animal rights and liberation.

This identified inseparability of the human and animal further expands when investigating the relationship of the human-animal with the human characters by diving deeper into notions of the Absurd Theatre. In fact, the human characters’ influence in uplifting the

human-animal, which contributes towards exposing its exploitation, can be noted when focusing on its relationship to human degradation, a famous inclusion in the Theatre of the Absurd.

The Downfall of Man as The Animal's Path to Elevation

The lack of moral conscience in men of all three plays was previously exposed indirectly when highlighting the physical and emotional pain they inflicted on the human-animals. Not only were the human-animals neglected for the most part, in both *The Zoo Story* and *Waiting for Godot*, the humans openly expressed how they would kill and sell the human-animal if the need arise (Albee, 1959; Beckett, 1952). Apart from highlighting animal abuse, they revealed the callous nature of humans.

Behavioural and intellectual downfalls that add to the above are part and parcel of the collapse of man, which happens to be a major point of focus in the Theatre of the Absurd. However, its inclusion is not only crucial for the plot but also this study of human-animal representation, as the effects of human degradation on the human-animal bestow them equal temperaments as shall be explored.

“Commonality” is a concept largely studied in animal activism. How upholding likeness or recognizability effectively minimizes difference (Fudge, 2005) and how a likeness in their emotional responses result in similar behavior expressed by men and animals: (Jeffrey Moussaieff Masson, as cited in Simons, 2001) are notable thoughts coming under this notion. Reflecting on these ideas, all three playwrights Dragún, Beckett, and Albee, remarkably highlight similar behavior and situations between men and the human-animals, thereby bringing them to an equal standpoint.

It is no coincidence that in *Waiting for Godot*, both Estragon and Lucky, a man and a human-animal, are very comparable characters. While Estragon reveals being beaten in a ditch (Beckett, 1952), Lucky is beaten by his master throughout the play. An unusual moment of Estragon showing an extreme attraction towards gnawing a bone and proceeding to ask for its

parallels with Lucky being the one who generally gnaws bones (Beckett, 1952). Likewise, Beckett illustrates the fateful conditions of Lucky being tied down with a rope (Beckett, 1952) and in unending service to Pozzo. It is mirrored in Vladimir and Estragon, who wait for Godot (suggesting their enslavement to faith), an event symbolically intensified through references to being tied down (Beckett, 1952). These situations indicate how Beckett has clearly marked parallelism between the human characters and the human-animal, which in itself is a victory for the animal represented. Perhaps Beckett, through this parallelism, also intended to pave another of many paths for the audience to recognize the animal's plight, as its poor conditions are essentially what he reflects through the noted downfall of man. This positive impact that the deteriorating man has over the animal seems to bring us to the recurring notion that man and animal are, in fact, inseparable and perhaps better left that way.

However, despite having gained such commonality, Lucky further prospers by briefly reversing his submissive role when he speaks up and is strong enough to physically evade the grasp of three men (Beckett, 1952). In contrast, Beckett shows how Vladimir and Estragon assure that they are happy while continuously awaiting the arrival of a higher being (Beckett, 1952). Vladimir's inability to think upon command also strikes as a weakness compared to Lucky, who can do so (Beckett, 1952). So, it is clear that though Beckett never directly contrasts man and animal, the common ground he creates between them through parallel situations and conditions makes the reader quickly detect the downfall of one and the succession of the other. So, in this play, the humans' weaknesses clash with Lucky's mental capabilities, thereby lifting Lucky to an intellectual position above them.

The same scenario of elevating the animal after creating a common ground is observed in *The Zoo Story*. However, Albee approaches this by juxtaposing the protagonist's manner of befriending and understanding the dog with the deteriorated intelligence of his acquaintance Peter. Despite the dog not reciprocating his advances, he tirelessly attempts to befriend it and repeatedly calls the dog his friend (Albee, 1959). This pursued friendship is a feature that is not observed in the other two plays of concern, but it nevertheless conveys a sense of desired solidarity between man and animal. It is concretely instilled when he starts to consider the dog his friend: "Yes, Peter; friend. That's the only word for it. I was heart-shatteringly et cetera to confront my doggy friend again" (Albee, 1959). This bond is perhaps reiterated due to the recurring idea of the inseparable human-animal mixture illustrated through Jerry's

interpretation of the dog through his human-centric understanding. Thus, the anthropomorphic details of the dog found in Jerry's narration compliment their friendship and vice versa. This understood commonality at play is reinforced once and for all when Jerry relates the tale of the dog while reflecting on his realization that animal and man are not too dissimilar: "animals are indifferent to me . . . like people" (Albee, 1959).

"It is through the animal that we can begin to think again about our status as human which will, in turn, impact upon our relationship with animals" (Fudge, 2000). This is a message that the encounter of Jerry and the dog also seem to convey. A critical moment of eye contact triggers Jerry's journey of comprehending the dog (Albee, 1959). It lays the foundation for the common ground created between Jerry and the dog, where a sense of mutual understanding eventually develops between them (Albee, 1959). This understanding reaches a height when he comprehends not only the dog but himself: "I had tried to love, and I had tried to kill, and both had been unsuccessful by themselves" (Albee, 1959). As a result, the insight Jerry gains through the dog undeniably influences the relationship between them, as it does not only make him sympathize with the dog's poor condition and comprehend its hostility towards men but also brings them to a point where they can compromise to exist in harmony. The developed lack of desire to possess or overrule returns us to commonality, which as a concept, Jerry attempts to pass down to Peter: "I'll tell you something now; you're not really a vegetable; it's all right, you're an animal. You're an animal, too" (Albee, 1959).

Following Beckett's footsteps to indicate that the animal is a step ahead, Albee too shows man's downfall in the form of his intellectual disposition. Peter does not comprehend Jerry's intention behind demonstrating the senselessness of hierarchy and the importance of relationships through the story of the dog. Instead, he is ready to fight for his place, literally and figuratively, getting aggressive when Jerry sits on his bench and violates his personal space (Albee, 1959). His inability to understand another human is presented in contrast to the meaningful connection that the dog builds with Jerry. Thus, the dog is naturally projected to be of a comparatively higher state of being when viewed along with its human counterpart Peter. The dog's mutual understanding, as noted, also brought about by this intelligence, is another premise that brings the human closer to the animal, thereby creating more ways for humans to recognize the victimized dispositions of animals.

Animal Intelligence Towards Animal Liberation

Despite it being incorporated so strongly within the represented animals of the discussed plays, the human tops the ladder of intellect in the natural world. Therefore, as almost every part of succession in the human-animal discussed so far had to do with its inseparability from a man in representation, the intellect of the human-animal can be realized to be a direct output of human agency created when man and animal were combined in representation.

Past research has studied intelligent animals in fiction to present the need for biological conservation (Root-Bernstein et al., 2013) or simply explore animal abuse in environmental novels (DeVries, 2016). Yet animal intelligence as a tool of progression that elevates the animal to an intellectual position above humans seldom seems to have been explored prior to this study. As the concept of animal intelligence is not easy to accept or represent in a world where Biology, Zoology, and Evolutionary Studies have scientific evidence to prove otherwise, this noted lack of research on the animal intellect in fiction is reasonable.

Therefore, the support behind this study in acknowledging that animal intelligence exists in the plays of concern followed by textual evidence to interpret that it elevates the animal is a thought process developed by John Simons. Though he agrees that it could be challenging to prove that man and animal possess similar emotional ranges, he suggests that anthropomorphic representations can, in fact, creatively construct them (Simons, 2001). The researcher applies this to intelligence and question what stops animals in fiction from being intelligent in its creative form of expression. Having deciphered different methods used by the playwrights to bring the exploited animal to the spotlight, the portrayal of the intelligent animal can possibly be identified as another approach used to give the animal victim its needed visibility and recognition, because, without the noted intelligence, the gap between human and animal understanding would be farther apart. If not for an overall display of intelligence, the human-animals may not have exposed their conditions as accurately as they did by voicing and creating mutual understanding. At the same time, the human characters also may not have been able to identify with the animal as well as they did. This infers that similarly to the downfall of man, the intelligence of human-animals is a large contributing factor towards elevating the animal victim. Together, they mock man-made hierarchies of power by questioning the strengths and capabilities that humans are said to possess over other animals.

CONCLUSION

Re-evaluating the human-animal representation in Absurd Theatre undeniably contributed to foregrounding timeless malpractices on animals that were previously neglected. The conditions under which the animals are exploited and how effectively their exploitation is demonstrated through the spectrum were explored in detail. Thoughts of John Simons and Erica Fudge on animal rights, liberation, and representation were utilized to comprehend the elevation of the victimized animal in fiction through its human-animal representation. Lucky in *Waiting for Godot*, the landlady's dog in *The Zoo Story* and Actor #1 in *The Story of the Man Who Turned into a Dog* were thus recognized as the characters that deviate between man and dog in varying degrees of transformation.

As its main focus, the paper investigated selected instances of animal victimization and the extent of such abuse as projected through the human-animal spectrum. With each focal character, it was understood that the human-animal has a better chance of being acknowledged over other attempted representations of animal characters. By identifying that combining man and animal bestows human-animals with qualities and benefits of man, they were positively noted to be tools of expression that make the conditions of the animal visible. Accordingly, a figurative or literal voice was found in all three human-animals of discussion, which allowed further rebellion against and visibility towards their oppression. The human element in the representation paved the way for an understanding of and an identification with the animal as an equal, which were detected to be positive outcomes of human-centrism in human-animal representations. As a result, observations were made on how effective the human-animal is, highlighting animal cruelty and deriving sympathy and compassion from human characters and possibly the audience. The different manners in which human characters identified with the pain of human-animals were, in fact, recognized to be rays of hope for animal liberation. In contrast, human degradation, a classic feature of the Absurd theatre, was identified to contribute to creating the common ground between man and animal. This downfall of man also acted as an element that, in contrast, highlighted animal intelligence expressed through the human-animal characters, which was identified to be another contributing factor towards the audience's overall understanding of animal victimization.

Though the inability to empower the dog in representation without combining it with a man can be identified as a limitation, this research verifies that their emulsion is what makes the representation all the more powerful, thereby proving the didactic purpose held by the human-animal spectrum. In fact, it is confirmed that the human-animal representation in Absurd theatre can voice the voiceless and atone for the marginalization of animals created in representation. The lack of documentation in animal histories is another limitation that obstructed the creation of a direct connection between the exploited animal and war and focused the study on a more generalized reading of timeless animal victimization and persistent abuse. Thus, as future research, attempts can be made to develop the notion that animal victims of war are precisely the kind of animals that are portrayed through the human-animals of Absurd literature.

That animal ought to be analyzed in their entirety as much as they need to be treated justly is ultimately suggested through this study. Hierarchy and power decided impartially by man are entirely discarded as meaningless concepts due to the levels of understanding and identification that the human-animal spectrum is analyzed to create within the human. Instead, the key message would be to turn away from man-made concepts as such and move towards embracing what is offered by the all-inclusive nature. Accordingly, a general message of animal welfare and animal equality is embedded in the study that emphasizes the need for acknowledging them as beings who act and feel in similar ways to humans and therefore in need of being freed from burdens created by his equal, the man.

References

- Albee, E. (1960). *Zoo Story*. Academia.Edu. https://www.academia.edu/2521985/Zoo_story.
- Baker, S. (2001). Animals, Representation, And Reality. *Society & Animals*, 9(3), 189-201. doi:10.1163/156853001753644372.
- Beckett, S. (1952). *Waiting For Godot: A Tragicomedy in Two Acts*. In G.J. V. Prasad (Ed). Pearson.
- Das, B. & Sarangi, I. (2017) Voiceless Victims Of War: An Absurd Truth. *Rupkatha Journal On Interdisciplinary Studies In Humanities*. 9(1), 217-225. doi:10.21659/rupkatha.v9n1.22.
- Derrida, J., & Mallet, M.L. (2008). *The Animal That Therefore I Am. Perspective In Continental Philosophy* (D.Wills, Trans). Fordham University Press.
- Dragún, O. (1957). *Story of the Man Turned into a Dog* (J. H. Stevens, Trans). Yumpu.Com. www.yumpu.com/en/document/view/9691173/story-of-the-man-turned-into-a-dog.

- Esslin, M. (1960, May). The Theatre of the Absurd. *The Tulane Drama Review*. 4(4), 3-15. www.jstor.org/stable/1124873.
- Few, M. (2013). *Centering Animals In Latin American History*. Duke University Press. books.google.lk/books?hl=en&lr=&id=hElWhu4NH5sC&oi=fnd&pg=PP8&dq=Centering+Animals+In+Latin+American+History&ots=NB2TFnZPkW&sig=RoHPyot1oEwA0wGpo1jU2KXDtBk&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false.
- Fudge, E. (2000). Reading animals. *Academia.Edu*. www.academia.edu/1393834/Reading_animals
- Fudge, E. (2002). A Left-handed Blow: Writing the History of Animals. *Representing Animals*. 4-18. www.academia.edu/1387134/a_left-handed_blow_writing_the_history_of_animals.
- Fudge, E. (2005). Introduction: Viewing Animals. *Worldviews: Environment, Culture, Religion*. 155-165. strathprints.strath.ac.uk/29519/1/Introduction_Viewing_Animals.pdf.
- Kumar, D. (2014, August). Vision of Society in George Orwell's Animal Farm. *International Journal of Research*. 1(7), 89-99. citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.675.6294&rep=rep1&type=pdf.
- Malik, S. (2013). A Study of the Zoo Story as an Absurd and Socially Realistic Drama. *Tjprc.Org*. 140-144. www.tjprc.org/publishpapers/2401370422568ABS%20A%20Study%20of%20the%20zoo.pdf.
- Root-Bernstein, M. et al. (2013). Anthropomorphized Species As Tools For Conservation: Utility Beyond Prosocial, Intelligent And Suffering Species. *Biodiversity And Conservation*. 22(8), 1577-1589. doi:10.1007/s10531-013-0494-4.
- Scott M. & DeVries. (2016). The Beasts Of Ecological Narrative: Intelligent Animals In The Environmental Novels Of Luis Sepúlveda. *Creature Discomfort*. (4), 75-99. brill.com/view/book/9789004316591/B9789004316591-s004.xml.
- Simons, J. (2001). *Animal Rights And The Politics Of Literary Representation*. Palgrave. doi:10.1057/9780230513549.
- Williams, R. (1971). *George Orwell*. Columbia University Press.