Revue de Traduction et Langues Volume14 Numéro 02/2015, pp. 7-15
Journal of Translation and Languages **مجلة الترجمة واللغات**
ISSN (Print): 1112-3974 **EISSN (Online): 2600-6235**

Existentialist style and ethics in Armah's fragments and Why Are We So Blest?

Dr. Bouahadiba Malika
University of Oran1 Ahmed Ben Bella – Algeria
mfbouhadiba@yahoo.fr
Laboratory of Languages, Literature and Culture, History in Africa LLCHA

To cite this paper:
Bouhadiba, M. (2015). Existentialist style and ethics in Armah's fragments and Why Are We So Blest? *Revue Traduction et Langues 14 (2),* 7-15.

Abstract: *This paper attempts to explore the existentialist dimension of Armah's two novels. It particularly aims at demonstrating Armah's indebtedness to Sartre and Camus. It draws a comparative study between Fragments and Sartre's Nausea, and between Armah's Why Are We So Blest? and Camus's The Outsider. It argues that though Armah has used these works as models, he has himself brought a significant contribution to the Existentialist novel by Africanising it and blending two styles and philosophies of life, Western and African.*
Keywords : *Armah, Sartre, Camus, Existentialism, existentialist alienation, Absurd.*
Résumé : *Le but de cet article est de démontrer l'influence des œuvres de Sartre et de Camus sur Ayi Kwei Armah. Pour ce faire, une étude comparative est dressée entre le roman La Nausée de Sartre et celui d'Armah, Fragments ; et entre le roman de Camus, L'Etranger et celui d'Armah, Why Are We So Blest ? L'argument principal de cet article est que bien qu'Armah ait utilisé les romans existentialistes comme model, il a lui-même apporté une importante contribution à ce genre littéraire, car il l'a Africanisé, en incorporant deux styles de philosophies, Occidentale et Africaine.*
Mots clés : *Armah, Sartre, Camus, Existentialisme, aliénation existentialiste, Absurde.*

1. Introduction

Unlike the other African Anglophone writers, Armah came under the influence of the French rather than the English literary tradition.[1] Though his indebtedness to French

[1]Besides Sartre and Camus, Armah seems to have come under the influence of Existentialism via Richard Wright, one of the first Negro-American protest writers to achieve world-wide recognition. The similarity between Wright's *Native Son* (1940) and Armah's *Why Are We So Blest?* Lies in that they both make statements about the plight of the Negro in a white society. Modin, like Bigger, experiences existential alienation as a consequence of racial segregation. Both novels are protest novels and they both express their writers' Negro Nationalism. Both writers deal with the white liberals and their attitude to the Blacks.

Corresponding author : Bouhadiba Malika

literature is obvious in his early writings, Yunga Teghen fails to notice it. He contends that 'many of Armah's works appear to be devoid of any French-backed theories and ... show little or no connection with Francophone writing' (THENGEN. Y, 1982: 227). Ode Odege, on the other hand, considers those who point out Armah's indebtedness to Sartre, Camus, and Fanon as foolish. (ODEGE. O, 1969: 4). In another essay he also notes: 'Many have been foolhardy enough to level charges about what they consider to be the direct influence on Armah of such writers as Albert Camus, Jean-Paul Sartre, Frantz Fanon, and others' (ODEGE. O, 2000: 178). This seems to be a nativist response, which negates the European literary pattern, even if it is so glaringly evident.[2] This response is suggested by Odege's praising Jackson's work who, as he puts it: 'urges the reader to see each of the writers as a very gifted artist' (ODEGE. O, 2000: 179). In fact, Armah is a gifted writer and to shed light on his borrowing from Universal literary patterns is by no means an attempt at putting into question his artistic merits.

Without being the work of a 'Larsonist', a term coined by Armah to refer to the critics who concern themselves with the influence of Western literature on African works, this essay will focus on such an influence.[3]As Ode Ogede remarks in his review of Tommie Lee's book on the influence of Existentialism on Armah: 'The project of tracking literary affinities is a most arduous undertaking that has been recognized as such by writers and their critics alike through the ages'. (ODEGE. O, 2000: 178). Armah forcefully condemns such an approach. He is more particularly hostile to the critics who point out his own indebtedness to Western writers. He does so in his 'Larsony or Fiction as Criticism of Fiction', (ARMAH. A.K., 1978: 11-14), where he attacks Larson for pointing out, in his *The Emergence of African Fiction* (1971), the influence of James Joyce on him. He, further, denies that he is indebted to the Existentialists, saying: 'A white South African woman has suggested influences from the French Existentialists, and I've heard that hunch echoed by African pseudo-scholars' (ARMAH. A.K., 1978: 11). Still, no matter how hard Armah attempts to make his case about his non-indebtedness to the existentialist literature, he cannot convince the naivest critic about it. The impact of this literature is striking in his early novels, more particularly in *Fragments* and *Why We Are So Blest?* The common features of *Fragments* and Sartre's *Nausea* (1938) and those of *Why Are So We Blest?* and Camus' *The Outsider* (1942) cannot be fortuitous. Armah cannot pretend, as he does as regards James Joyce's influence, that if ever Sartre and Camus influenced him, they did so 'on occult wavelengths' (ARMAH. A.K., 1978: 12).

2. Existential dimension in Armah's writing

The existentialist dimension of *Fragments* has been broached by Shelby Steele, in his article 'Existentialism in the novels of Ayi Kwei Armah'. (STEELE. S, 1977: 5-13). He, however, merely records some of the existentialist characteristics of the novel. He does not assess the extent of the influence of the philosophy of Existentialism on Armah. Neither does he note the literary importance of the existentialist writer to whom Armah is

[2] In fact, there is nothing disgraceful in acknowledging the Western literary sources of African works, because these sources form part of cultural patterns that have been imposed on African writers through their Western education.

[3]This is, however, not done with the purpose of belittling the originality of African fiction, but it is done with the intention of demonstrating the syncretism of stylistic devices.

indebted, namely, Jean-Paul Sartre.[4] Unlike Steele, Tommie Lee Jackson has provided a detailed study of the existentialist dimension of the novel in *The Existential Fiction of Ayi Kwei Armah, Albert Camus, and Jean-Paul Sartre* (1997). Jackson, however, is careful not to point out any direct influence from these French existentialist writers on Armah.[5]

The Sartrean influence on *Fragments* is both literary and philosophical. Armah's novel shares common literary features with Sartre's *Nausea*, and fits the intellectual paradigms of Existentialism, e.g., hopelessness and a pessimistic view of life. The feelings of hopelessness and nothingness are overpowering. Juana finds her life meaningless. Armah writes: 'She searched herself for something that might make sense, but there was nothing she could believe in, nothing that wouldn't just be high flight of the individual alone, escaping the touch of life around him. That way she knew there was annihilation' (ARMAH. A.K., 1970: 190-191). This desire to flee reality is a symptom of existential alienation, the major motif of existentialist writing. In *Fragments*, the influence of Existentialism is noticeable in Baako's use of writing as self-therapy. Like the existentialist heroes, Baako finds temporary relief from his psychological torment in self-expression. The episode where he feverishly spills out his thoughts about the cargo cult, on paper (156-157), is a case in point. After finishing his writing, Baako experiences a relaxing feeling: 'he could not stop writing till he had caught the fugitive thought and put it down, and then he relaxed thankfully on the bed ...' (158).

The use of writing to flee reality and the painful awareness of its futility is, again, expressed in the statement: 'A fractured thought crossed his mind. The urge to trap it before it disappeared made him forget the general pain in his body' (156). Similarly, to the adepts of Existentialism, Baako records his thoughts haphazardly. He attempts to record them before reason intervenes to classify them in a logical sequence. This technique expresses the existentialist paradigm that 'Existence', i.e., anxiety, precedes 'Essence', i.e., thought. The existentialist principle of the individual's freedom of choice is adopted in *Fragments*. Ocran advises Baako to choose what he wants to do regardless of other people's judgements (191-192). The basic thesis of Existentialism which maintains that Man creates his essence through his act is reproduced in *Fragments* in the inscription that Baako notices on a wall in Paris. It reads :

> TOUT HOMME CREE SANS LE SAVOIR
> COMME IL RESPIRE
> MAIS L'ARTISTE SE SENT CREER
> SON ACT ENGAGE TOUT SON ETRE
> SA PEINE BIEN AIMEE LE FORTIFIE (51).[6]

[4] The importance of this French writer and philosopher to Armah is twofold. Firstly, because he provides him with a literary mode that helps him depict the general mood of despair that overwhelms the Ghanaian intelligentsia. Secondly, because he supported the Negritude movement, the movement that worked towards the cultural rehabilitation of the Negro values. This rehabilitation has become Armah's prime concern in his later novels.

[5]Jackson considers that Armah's concern for Existentialism was motivated by the dire socio-economic conditions and the political climate of Ghanaian society at the time the novels were written.

[6] A literal translation of this inscription is as follows: "Every man creates without knowing it, as he breathes. But the artist feels created. His act involves his whole being, his loved labour strengthens him".

This idea of the artist creating his essence through his act is one of the motifs of Sartre's novel *Nausea*. Roquentin, who thinks that the singer and the composer have justified their existence through their art, comes to the conclusion that art is the only remedy to Man's existential alienation. He decides to write a novel to redeem himself from his 'sinful' existence and to acquire the 'essence' he lacks.

This attempt to acquire an 'essence' through art is made by Armah's protagonist in *Fragments*. Baako writes film scripts. Structurally, Sartre's *Nausea* and Armah's *Fragments* have much in common. In both novels, indented writing is used, e.g., the songs. In *Nausea* the rhythm of the song is:

> Some of these days
> You'll miss me honey. (SARTRE, J.P., 1965: 22).

In *Fragments*, it is echoed in:

> If you didn't looove me dear
> Why didn't you leeet me know? (93).

In both novels, the stream of consciousness technique is used, and in both, there is a mixture of different modes: realism, surrealism and modernism.

Besides similarities in technique and structure, *Nausea* and *Fragments* have protagonists who share character traits and predicaments. Similarly, to Roquentin, Baako is alienated from his society and is assailed by a loneliness that causes him a great psychological torment. Like him, he is often overcome by nausea, and keeps a diary in which he records his thoughts and feelings to avoid psychic degeneration. Again, like Roquentin, Baako gets moral support from his girlfriend, and relies on her to save him from neurosis. Their girl-friends experience the same feeling of nothingness as them, but they are less vulnerable. On thematic grounds, the similarity between Sartre's novel and Armah's lies in their condemnation of the bourgeoisie. Roquentin despises the bourgeoisie for their ill-faith. He maintains that their moral values, which he finds hypocritical, have been established by them to mask the emptiness of their existence. Similarly, Baako scorns the bourgeoisie of his country. He remarks that they attempt to make up for the emptiness of their lives by an 'outward show of power' (62), particularly, by displaying their luxurious material acquisitions. In the main, the major thematic similarity between *Nausea* and *Fragments* is existential alienation.

Still, though these two novels bear major similarities, they also bear sharp discrepancies. The two novels, firstly, differ in their structural pattern. *Nausea* has the form of a diary, whereas *Fragments* has the structure of a novel. Besides, the former is divided into blocks according to time sequence, using the days of the week or the time of the day as headings to these blocks. The latter is divided into sections that form its numbered chapters. The two novels, further, differ in their use of language. The language used by Sartre in *Nausea* is relatively less complex and abstract than the language used by Armah in *Fragments*. Armah's language in chapter One and Thirteen, and that of Baako's scripts is densely packed with symbolism.

Most importantly, the two novels differ in their protagonists' attitudes to certain issues. Their attitude to the past is an important point of difference. Roquentin thinks that the past does not exist, and that it is irrelevant to the present. This is his reason for giving up his research on Robellon. Baako, on the other hand, lays emphasis on the importance

of the past and its relevance to the present. He wants to recreate the past in his script, 'The Root'. Again, Roquentin and Baako differ in their attitude to art. The former considers works of art as ideal since they transcend existence, i.e., reality. His concern is for their aesthetic value. The latter, on the other hand, wants art to be rooted in reality, and to be functional. Thus, the one is for 'art-for-art's sake'[7], whereas the other is for committed art. Moreover, Roquentin and Baako's attitude to existence is different. Roquentin rejects existence, which he considers as sinful. He wants to write a novel that will make people ashamed of their existence. Baako, on the other hand, works for the betterment of existence. He wants to teach people how to improve their life.

Humanism is yet another issue about which the two protagonists are at odds. Roquentin rejects humanism, since he considers it as an ineffective remedy to Man's alienation. Baako adopts it and undertakes a humanitarian task when he attempts to arouse the masses' awareness of their socio-political predicament. This is a task that Fanon expected the African intellectual to assume. On the whole, these ideological differences between the two protagonists indicate Armah's departure from the Sartrean Existentialism of *Being and Nothingness* that *Nausea* embodies. Again, whereas Sartre[8] overlooks the impact of social reality on Man's consciousness and holds him responsible for his own alienation, Armah considers Man's social conditions as the major cause of his alienation. Like Fanon, he sees Man's existential alienation as a consequence of historical and social determinism. He lays emphasis on the social causes of Baako's alienation. He suggests that Baako undergoes alienation, not because of some flaws inherent in his own personality, but because of the defects of his society, notably, greed and corruption.

This deterministic view of alienation has a Marxist connotation. In fact, the alienation Baako experiences both at home and in his office can be explained in terms of the Marxist concept of estrangement. At home, he experiences alienation through exploitation, by his own family. His home is, thus, a microcosm of capitalist exploitation. Both his mother and sister exploit him by collecting the harvest of his toil, a case of capitalist expropriation. Baako confesses to Juana that his family has 'real demands' (102). His mother expects him to finance the building of the house she has started before his return. In his work circle, he experiences two forms of alienation that can be defined in Marxist terms as: alienation through 'commodity fetishism' and class alienation. As regards the former, Marx maintains that the worker, in a capitalist economy, experiences alienation because his product appears alien to him, once it is finished. The films made out of Baako's scripts seem alien to him, since, through censorship, they undergo some modifications. Baako experiences class alienation in his work, because he is rejected by his middle class colleagues.

[7] One has to bear in mind that this attitude towards art endorsed by Roquentin is that of Sartre in his pre-Marxist era. It is only after embracing Marxism, and being involved in the French Resistance that Sartre had revised his views about the function of art. From then on, Sartre had campaigned for engagement in literature. His views on committed literature are summed up in his book: *Qu'Est- ce- Que La Literature?* (1948)

[8] This refers to the Sartre of *Being and Nothingness*, rather than to the Sartre of *Critique of Dialectical* Reason. In the latter work, Sartre has blended Existentialism with Marxism.

3. The philosophy of absurd in Armah's writing

In *Why Are We So Blest?* as in *Fragments*, the existentialist influence is noticeable in the protagonists' personal experience. Like the existentialist hero, they are unable to indulge in social relations and are, therefore, overwhelmed by loneliness. Solo says that there is 'no contact' (ARMAH. A.K., 1972: 11). Another existentialist feature appears in the recurring references to the absurdity and futility of life. Solo remarks: 'at the end of each effort there is only futility' (13). The emptiness of life is referred to through terms like 'barren' (84), and 'hopelessness' (85). The existentialist dimension of the novel appears from the very first lines of the novel. Solo says that he has become 'a ghost, wandering about the face of the earth, moving with a freedom [he has] not chosen' (11). This is a reference to the existentialist ethics of freedom of choice. He feels he is like a 'ghost' since he has been deprived of the freedom to choose. He remarks that even the pace of his 'walk is never something [he is] free to choose' (15). Like the existentialist hero, Solo is aware that to acquire the essence he lacks, a fact due to his deprivation of freedom of choice, he should 'do the work of his life'. Like Sartre's Roquentin, he wants to achieve an 'essence' by writing a book.

Solo resembles Roquentin in many respects. Like him, he is in a state of total 'despair' (55) and experiences 'fever and nausea' (55), a nausea caused by *angst*. Again, like Roquentin, Solo does not know how to overcome his personal crisis. Both Roquentin and Solo are aware of the worthlessness of their existence. Modin experiences such a feeling as well. He says: 'for the last four days a sense of utter futility has been wearying me' (235). Like Solo and Roquentin, Modin experiences *angst* and is subject to nausea (103). But his response to the existential alienation he undergoes is different from theirs. He attempts to react against the forces that have contributed to his plight. In the main, Modin and Solo represent, as Shelby Steele puts it, the external and the internal dimensions of 'existential entrapment'. She remarks: 'The story of Modin, the character who carries dramatic action, dramatizes the destructive power of the external reality while the story of Solo illustrates the paralysing effect of internal emptiness' (STEELE.S, 1977: 6). Whereas Solo resembles Roquentin, Modin resembles Meursault, the protagonist of Camus' *The Outsider*.

Camus' influence on Armah's novel is both ideological and literary.[9] Camus' influence further appears in the reference to the myth of Sisyphus. Aimée remarks: 'I guess that's why I never had the slightest difficulty understanding the Sisyphus situation' (185). In Camus' view Sisyphus' predicament illustrates the experience of the 'Absurd'.[10]The omnipresence of death during the Second World War had made Camus and many of his contemporaries, for instance Sartre, experience the 'Absurd'. This experience results from one's 'consciousness of inevitable death' (THODY.P, 1961: 50), and consequently of the futility of one's effort to cling to life. Still, though Camus points out that life is absurd, he contends that it is worth living. This was one of the major differences between Camus and Sartre. They also differed in their response to nihilism. Sartre considered self-annihilation or nihilism as possible solutions to resolve the personal crisis that modern life generates

[9] The use of Camus' name in the novel is a hint to this influence. There is an 'ex-Camus' farm in Afrasia.
[10]The philosophy of the 'Absurd', which rests on the assumption life is absurd, was propounded by Camus in *The Myth of Sisyphus* (1942).

in man, whereas Camus opposed nihilism. They, further, disagreed as regards revolutionary violence.[11]

The philosophy of the 'Absurd' informs Armah's novel. Armah hints at the inevitability of death through the title of the book that Solo reads: *He Who Must Die* (18). The title of the book foreshadows Modin's death. The 'Absurd' is experienced by Modin, who is constantly aware of his approaching death (31). The influence of Camus' philosophical thoughts is particularly evident in Modin's remarks: 'The real question is not whether to commit suicide but how best to invest my inevitable destruction. Since death is all-pervasive, the fear of death loses some of its sense (31). Still, Modin, and by extension Armah, departs from Camus in that he chooses revolutionary engagement as a solution to the experience of the 'Absurd'. Camus considered revolutionary violence as murder. He, however, did not oppose revolt against all forms of oppression.[12] Modin has, however, chosen revolutionary engagement out of a self-destructive urge on account of his experience of existential alienation. He remarks:

> What is the meaning of my manic pushes to the point of danger but a search for self-annihilation? I know suicide is childish, but why go looking for it by different paths? The suicidal impulse is well hidden […] I have wanted to destroy myself, but so well hidden has the desire for suicide been, its temptations have always looked like extreme pleasure offered, taken, tasted (158).

Camus' *The Outsider* and Armah's *Why Are We So Blest?* have common characteristics. They have a similar mood; despair is pervasive in both novels. They also have similar characters' plights and a similar concern for 'La Condition Humaine'. Besides, both novels are autobiographical.[13]Camus, like Meursault, was a clerk in Algiers.[14]Armah, like Modin, studied in America[15] and like Solo, he worked in Algiers. The two novels have a common setting, both are set in Algiers and they both have a racial dimension. In Camus's novel the racial division is between the French and the Arabs, in Armah's it is between the Blacks and the Whites. Again, in both novels violence is used by one race against the other. In *The Outsider*, Raymond beats the Arab woman and

[11] Camus's condemnation of revolutionary violence in *The Rebel* triggered off a polemical debate with Sartre and other French left-wing scholars.

[12]Camus expresses his views on revolt and revolution in *L'Homme Révolté* (*The Rebel*) (1951). There he maintains that rebellion against social injustice is legitimate but not at the expense of human life. In other words, he opposes violence and bloodshed which result in the death of other human beings. He opposes revolutionary action in the name of life, for he considers life as sacred. Again, it is because of such a view of life that he opposed the Death Penalty.

[13] Among the autobiographical elements in *Why Are We So Blest?* there is Modin's friendship with rich American liberals. Armah, like Modin, was taken on a trip by the parents of his wealthy white friend. See Bernth Lindfors, (1997) *African Textualities: Texts, Pre-texts, and Contexts of African Literature*, Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press, 64.

[14] See Conor Cruise O'Brien, (1970) Albert *Camus*, New York: Penguin, 18.

[15] Like Modin, Armah has been selected, on account of his distinctive performances, to benefit from a scholarship in America. See Bernth Lindfors, *African Textualities*, op. cit., 54.

Meursault kills her brother. In *Why Are We So Blest?* Mr Jefferson stabs Modin and the French soldiers torture him to death. In both novels, the motives violence are race-conditioned. Meursault's shooting of four more bullets into the Arab's inert corpse is but the expression of racial hatred, and so is Mr Jefferson's infliction of a severe punishment on Modin, whom he stabs several times.

The protagonists of Armah's novel, Solo and Modin, resemble Meursault to a certain extent. Like him, they both experience existential alienation and like him, they are not involved in social relations. Meursault feels an outsider in his society, Modin feels an outsider in America. Like Meursault, Solo is guilt-ridden. Both Meursault and Solo are ambitious when they are students, and they become despondent and indifferent to the fate of their society after finishing studies. Meursault's lack of ambition appears in his refusal to be promoted to a better job in Paris and Solo's appears in his decision to be a mere translator. Modin resembles Meursault in that he is aware of his 'inevitable destruction' (31). Meursault thinks that since death is inevitable, dying now or in twenty years makes no difference. Modin holds a similar view. He remarks that 'since death is all-pervasive, the fear of death loses some of its sense' (31). Another similarity between Meursault and Modin is that they both have no emotional ties with their girl-friends, Marie and Aimée respectively. Yet Meursault and Modin, differ in some respects. They, for instance, react differently to their experience of the 'Absurd'. Meursault, '*L'homme absurde*' *par excellence*, is committed to life. Though he realises that his past life was 'absurd', he is ready to live it all over again. Modin, who knows that his death is inevitable and imminent, attempts to hasten its occurrence by going to the Congherian battlefield. This act, as Manuel and Ngulo point out, is suicidal. Suicide is, however, a solution that Camus rejects. Again, unlike Meursault, Modin is not an 'absurd' hero, since he is unhappy, whereas according to Camus, '*L' homme Absurde'* is happy, as is Sisyphus in *The Myth of Sisyphus*.

Besides their difference as regards the reaction to the experience of the 'Absurd', Camus and Armah also differ in their attitude to the function of art. Whereas Camus favours the 'art-for-art's sake' position, noticeable in his detachment in his novel, Armah privileges openly committed literature, as it appears from his intrusions with polemical statements. This is particularly the case when he tackles racial issues. A case in point are Modin's remarks about the Thanksgiving article which maintains that the Americans are the 'blest'. He tells Mike: 'Everyone who can write a whole article on Thanksgiving and leave out the mass murder of the so-called Indians is a street-corner hustler, nothing better' (99), and he adds: 'America may have been a paradise when the Indians ran it, but it's shambles now. What the European riff-raff –your great ancestors – brought with them was the European genius for destroying everything – in an exaggerated form' (100).

4. Conclusion

On the whole, through his two major protagonists Armah expresses his hatred of the Whites and expects the African artist to be committed to 'the destruction of the destroyers' (231) and to express his hatred of the latter, as he, himself, does in *Why Are We So Blest?* Camus, on the other hand, expects a compromising attitude. He says: 'No great work of genius has ever been founded on hatred or contempt. In some corner of his heart, at some moment of history, the real creator always ends up reconciling' (Quoted in BREE. G, 1964: 239).

In the main, Armah's indebtedness to the French Existentialist writers is demonstrated, in this essay, to prove the point that his novels are syncretic works, and that it is all to his credit to have managed to give Existentialism an African touch.

References

[1] ARMAH, A. K. (1969), *The Beautyful Are Not Yet Born. Boston*. London: Heinemann Educational Books Ltd.
[2] ARMAH, A. K. (1970), *Fragments.* London: Heinemann Educational Books Ltd.
[3] ARMAH, A. K. (1972), *Why Are We So Blest?* London: Heinemann Educational Books Ltd.
[4] ARMAH, A. K. (1978), Larsony or Fiction as Criticism of Fiction, *Positive Review (1),* 11-14.
[5] ARMAH, A. K. (1969), 'Power and Principle. Fanon: The Awakener', *Negro Digest (18),* 4-9, 29-43.
[6] BREE, G. (1964), Albert Camus, New York: Columbia University Press.
[7] CAMUS, A. (1971), The Rebel. (Translated by Anthony Bower), Middlesex: Penguin Modern Classics.
[8] CAMUS, A. (1983), *The Outsider, Middlesex:* Penguin Books Ltd, Harmondsworth.
[9] CAMUS, A. (1955), *The Myth of Sisyphus and Other Essays,* New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
[10] JACKSON, T. Lee. (1997), *The Existential Fiction of Ayi Kwei Armah*, Albert Camus, and Jean-Paul Sartre, Lanham: University Press of America.
[11] LINDFORS, B. (1997), *African Textualities: Texts, Pre-texts, and Contexts of African Literature,* Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press.
[12] O'BRIEN, C. C. (1970), *Albert Camus,* New York: Penguin.
[13] OGEDE, O. (2000), *Review of The Existential Fiction of Ayi Kwei Armah, Albert Camus, and Jean-Paul Sartre,* by Tommie L. Jackson, Research in African Literatures, Vol. 31, N°. 3, 178-179.
[14] OGEDE, O. (1969), *Fanon the Awakener, Negro Digest (18),* 4-9 and 29-43.
[15] SARTRE, J. P. (1965), Nausea, (Translated from French by Robert Baldick), Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books Ltd.
[16] STEELE, S. (1977), Existentialism in the Novels of Ayi Kwei Armah, *Obsidian (3),* 5-13.
[17] THEGHEN, Y. (1982), The Novels of Ayi Kwei Armah by Robert Fraser, *Présence Africaine (123)*, 3rd Quarterly, 226-228.
[18] THODY, P. (1961), *Albert Camus: A Study of his Works,* London: Hamish Hamilton.