

CHAPTER FOUR

CONCLUSION

After analyzing the portrayal of the protagonists of *Happy Days* and *The Chairs* in previous chapters, I will now provide a number of conclusions. As I have stated in the beginning, the purpose of the analysis is to show how the authors portray the protagonists and what the purpose of the authors are in creating such characters.

The first character that I analyze is Winnie in *Happy Day*. In this play, Winnie is physically stuck in a mound of a desert where her body, from her neck to her feet, is buried to the ground. She is a static character with independent, frank, and optimistic as her major traits. Instead of being sad and disappointed with her hard condition, she tries to always think positively and see everything from a positive viewpoint. In this play, Winnie lives together with her indifferent husband named Willie, who is always beside her but never helps nor console her. Thus, Winnie tries to console herself without relying on him as she is an independent woman. Besides being an independent, she is also a frank woman; she frankly speaks her thought and feeling, so there are no feeling left unsaid inside her. Winnie always expresses her thought and feeling towards him whenever she needs to be heard and heeded. Although her life is hard, she does not give up hope to get better days ahead, instead she wants to be optimistic; she

believes that tomorrow will be better than today and she believes that someday she will be freed by the earth and so she will not be buried anymore. By being frank, independent, and optimistic, Winnie can console herself for a while.

Next, in *The Chairs*, we follow a story of an old man who lives in an island, in the middle of the sea. He is a static character portrayed as an unconfident, cynic, and pessimistic person. As an unconfident person, he does not think that he can do a job that is destined for him, that is, to deliver an important message to mankind. Fortunately, he lives with his faithful wife who always accompanies him. His wife always encourages him to do something and to console himself from his boredom. She also reminds him to do something valuable for his future. Later on, his wife successfully makes the old man do his sacred duty, i.e. delivering his message to the mankind. However, he still believes that he cannot do it because of his unconfidence. Then, the old man invites an orator whom he believes is able to deliver his message. Unfortunately, the message itself is not revealed until the end of the story because the orator does not come. Besides being an unconfident man, he is also a cynic toward people because in his past, he was always rejected and ignored by his friends. The way people treat him in his past makes him see himself as a failure and he believes that he will not be successful in the future. Moreover, being a cynic also drives him to be so pessimistic as he believes that there is nothing he can do to have a good future. Because of his pessimistic characteristic, the old man also decides to commit suicide by jumping out of the window. Eventually, suicide is the way that he chooses to get him out of his boredom.

I believe that both authors have the same purpose in creating their protagonists. The purpose of the author in making such characters is to show that every human may

look for a diversion in order to escape from their boredom in life. I refer to the theories by Blaise Pascal and Kierkegaard regarding individual existence as a background of my analysis as to help me understand of the purpose of the authors in both plays as the plays are absurd plays. Blaise Pascal mentions that every human may look for a diversion in order to escape from their boredom (“Blaise Pascal: On Diversions”). In addition, Kierkegaard says that every individual is responsible for themselves, each individual is solely responsible for making their life meaningful and living it authentically (Case). I am of the opinion that every human may look for diversion in order to escape from their boredom and there is no right or wrong in choosing the diversion because every individual is responsible for their actions. Both stories show how the protagonists are stuck in the boredom and choose their own diversion to overcome it. In both plays, the diversions are reflected in the characteristics of two protagonists. On the one hand, Winnie chooses to be optimistic in her life as her way to divert herself from boredom. On the other hand, the old man chooses to be pessimistic as his way to divert himself from boredom. There is no right or wrong kind of diversion because every human is responsible for their decision. Thus, the diversion that Winnie and the old man choose fit for them because they can overcome their boredom by doing so. However, since human life is meaningless, the diversion that both protagonists take will be in vain. Therefore no matter how hard both protagonists try to escape from their meaningless life, it would be in vain. The diversion that both protagonists choose are only some ways to give meaning to their life which only lasts for a moment in their absurd life.

Happy Days and *The Chairs* share some similarities. Both plays talk about individuals who are stuck in boredom. In *Happy Days*, Winnie is physically stuck in

the ground and stuck in the same routine every day. In *The Chairs*, the old man is stuck in his routine every day and he cannot forget his past life which makes him always depressed and regretful. Another similarity is both protagonists choose a diversion to escape from their boredom and both protagonists are successful in overcoming the boredom.

Besides similarities, there is also a contrast between the two plays. The contrast lies in how both protagonists choose their diversion. In *Happy Days*, Winnie chooses to be optimistic as to divert herself from her boredom. In *The Chairs*, the old man chooses to be pessimistic as to divert himself from his boredom; he chooses to commit suicide.

Finally, in my opinion, *Happy Days* is better than *The Chairs*. In terms of the diversion that they choose, I personally prefer the optimistic way that Winnie chooses. I believe that both protagonists live in a meaningless life and Winnie's optimism in overcoming her meaningless life is better than the old man's way. I consider Winnie's way is better than the old man because she can be happy by her optimism even only for a moment. Different with the old man, who lives his life pessimistically, he cannot be happy for the rest of his life because the only thing the old man has is only regrets. Since life is meaningless, I think it is better if people can make themselves happy so they can feel happiness even for a moment. To conclude my opinion, happy life is worth fighting.