

Game Theory and Its Application to John Osborne's 'Look Back In Anger'

Ravindra D. Hajare,

Assistant Professor, Shri Shankarrao Bezalwar Arts and Commerce College, Aheri,
Distt. Gadchiroli.(M.S.)India.442705, Maharashtra, India

Abstract

Human life in general is always not what it appears to be. When we talk about human behaviour it is not what it may be in the mind of person. In every walk of life , people have different strategies from which Game theory has emerged to be applied as a branch of critical study. Having its origin in the disciplines like mathematics, economics, psychology and political science, it has also been applied to literature since it hold mirror to life. Dramas of Shakespeare and Osborne have been found and considered suitable to apply Game theory. This paper specially takes into account Osborne's Look Back in Anger and attempts to apply the Game Theory in new light. The characters are no doubt the products of the author but taken them as individual human being, everyone seems to be a player motivated by some strategy.

KEYWORDS: Minimax theorem, zero sum game, mixed strategy equilibrium, angry young man play, notorious moiety

Introduction:

It is a known fact that everyone has his own strategy in the play of life. At every moment one is thinking of some strategy while doing certain work or undertaking certain tasks wherever they are. It is not easy to identify real character of a person from his appearance. Everything is taken for granted without probing into the mind of the person. What one may see may not be the reality; reality may be something different and hidden feelings, different. Clever players always hide their thoughts and feelings. It is said that face is index of heart but it may not be true about clever players as they don't allow their face to express their true feelings .While taking decisions in life at every moment we have a different strategy and if one has to hide something, then he is not what he appears to be. His real self is different. The other side may or may not identify this and hence it results into win or loss of either side or vice versa.

Based on this general predominating and age long assumption and human behaviours that scholars, out of curiosity and a practice, have formulated a theory called Game Theory and found out its relevance in many disciplines like **mathematics, economics, psychology and political science** in which human behaviours are found to be striking and vivid and it becomes possible to formulate theories on the basis of similarity or differences and also to weigh human behaviours to be able to come to certain conclusions and make predictions.

Human life has always served as an open book of behaviours to researchers and scholars of all disciplines right from Plato to recent time. As a result several scholars of different disciplines have found the relevance of particular strategic behaviour in their respective disciplines and thus contributed to develop and formulate what is known as Game theory and its models.

Literature being the reflection of life in general has been the most important and significant source of most of the theories. Literature holds mirror to life and life is a source of social sciences. All types of human behaviours have found expression in literature. Hence literature has also been a favourite area for scholars of game theory to look for and apply different models of game theory though they differ in their opinion.

Dramas of Shakespeare and Osborne are such major sources in which the models of game theory can be applied. The plot and characterization of Shakespeare's dramas could be accounted for application of the theory since many of his tragedies, comedies and tragicomedies deal with problem and some strong human emotions. Similarly **John Osborne's 'Look Back In Anger'** is the epitome of it. Hence the present paper is a sincere and systematic attempt to explicate the drama by applying the models of game theory and draw certain conclusions.

Game Theory: Definition.

Game theory is the study of strategic decision making. Specifically, it is "**the study of mathematical models of conflict and cooperation between intelligent rational decision-makers.**" An alternative term suggested "as a more descriptive name for the discipline" is **interactive decision theory**. Game theory is mainly used in economics, political science, and psychology, as well as logic, computer science, and biology. The subject first addressed zero-sum games, such that one person's gains exactly equal net losses of the other participant or participants. Today, however, game theory applies to a wide range of behavioural relations, and has developed into a term for the logical side of decision science, including both humans and non-humans (e.g. computers, animals).

Modern game theory began with the idea regarding the existence of mixed-strategy equilibrium in two-person zero-sum games and its proof by **John von Neumann**. Von Neumann's original proof used theorem on continuous mappings into compact convex sets, which became a standard method in game theory and mathematical economics. His paper was followed by the 1944 book **Theory of Games and Economic Behaviour**, co-written with **Oskar**, which considered cooperative games of several players. The second edition of this book provided an axiomatic theory of expected utility, which allowed mathematical statisticians and economists to treat decision-making under uncertainty.

This theory was developed extensively in the 1950s by many scholars. Game theory was later explicitly applied to biology in the 1970s, although similar

developments go back at least as far as the 1930s. Game theory has been widely recognized as an important tool in many fields. With the **Nobel Memorial Prize in Economic Sciences** going to game theorist **Jean Tirole in 2014**, eleven game-theorists have now won the economics Nobel Prize. **John Maynard Smith** was awarded the **Crawford Prize** for his application of game theory to biology.

Game Theory And Literature

Application of game theory to literature is not a new area of literary study It has been applied since a long time but as it was not completely theorized, it did not get complete status as a theory to be applied in literature and its myriads forms. Originally the Game theory has its origin in the theory of economics and political science but it has also been applied to many other sciences like biology and psychology and hence many theorists find the glimpses of it in some of the literary woks influenced by psychology.

Application of game theory to the humanities have grown over the years in such disciplines as **history, religion, and linguistics**. Ethical issues in business and law have also been analysed using game theoretic models. It is fiction; however that has provided most fertile ground for humanities application of games theory. **Novels, short stories, plays, opera librettos, a narrative poem-** all have been subjects to game theoretic exegesis.

Game theory has definitely provided a particular framework and an important set of tools for the literary analysts. Although there are no rigorous tests to determine what is right interpretation of a work of fiction is, some interpretation are more tenable than others. Game theory, according to **Stevens J Brahms** (Dept. of Politics, New York University, New York, 10003, 1997) has proved useful in explicating the strategic choices of characters by making the linkages between motifs and actions in plot construction. It is also useful in addressing certain interpretative questions, such as whether the ordinary calculations of fictional characters can help to explain their extraordinary actions in some literatures like great tragedies.

It's History:

The review of application of game theory to literature has critical dimension. It is an attempt to gain an understanding of how and why the application evolved. Many researchers have tackled with a particular literary work and have brought game theoretic perspective to the understanding and interpretation of that work. These works have stimulated other game theorists to probe new theoretical questions.

The fictional works of *Conan Doyle, E. A. Poe, William Faulkner, Harold Pinter, Shakespeare, Snow, Puccini(Tosca) Goethe (Faust)* and a medieval narrative poem like *sir Gawain and the Green Knight* have been analysed and many other researchers have surveyed the analysis in their respective works. Faulkner has been

able to capture the spirit of Minimax theorem, even involving a fictitious player to make seemingly random choices.

Minimax Theorem: Fundamental Insight.

A number of conflicts in the literary works assayed can be viewed as constant sum in which what one player, the Fundamental theorem of Game theory or Minimax Theorem proved **in Von Newman** (1928) 16 years before the first edition of Von Neumann and Morgenstern (1944) establishes that both players can choose strategies that guarantee themselves values for the game (a positive quantity for one player but negative for the other in a zero- sum game) however these strategies may be mixed.

Mixed strategies introduce an element of uncertainty into the play of a game, that they guarantee a certain expected value, however offers no assurance of what will occur in any single play of the game. The scene in C. Doyle's Sherlock Holmes in which S. Holmes is pursued by a notorious moiety is analysed.

Look Back in Anger: Angry Young Man Play

Look Back in Anger (1956) is a play by John Osborne that garnered him reputation as a dramatist and also a representative of post war angry generation of young men. Because of Look Back in Anger and many other subsequent plays he became widely known as an 'angry young man'. It was the success of these plays that made other young dramatists to write in the tradition. The play was a success on the London stage, and spawned the term "angry young men" to describe Osborne and those of his generation who employed the harshness of realism in the theatre in contrast to the more escapist theatre that characterized the previous generation.

It deals with a realistic story in a non realistic context. Written in 17 days in a deck chair on Morecambe Pier, Look Back in Anger was a strongly autobiographical piece based on Osborne's unhappy marriage to actress Pamela Lane and their life in cramped accommodation in Derby. While Osborne aspired towards a career in theatre, Lane was more practical and materialistic, not taking Osborne's ambitions seriously while cuckolding him with a local dentist. It also draws from Osborne's earlier life; for example, the wrenching speech of witnessing a loved one's death was a replay of the death of his father, Thomas.

On surface level it concerns a love triangle involving an intelligent and educated but disaffected young man of working-class origin (Jimmy Porter), his upper-middle-class, impassive wife (Alison), and her haughty best friend (Helena Charles). Cliff, an amiable Welsh lodger, attempts to keep the peace.

What it is best remembered for, though, are Jimmy's tirades. Some of these are directed against generalised British middle-class smugness in the post-atomic world. Many are directed against the female characters, a very distinct echo of Osborne's uneasiness with women, including his mother, Nellie Beatrice, whom he describes in his autobiography *A Better Class of Person* as "*hypocritical, self-absorbed,*

calculating and indifferent". Madeline, the lost love Jimmy pines for, is based on Stella Linden, the older rep-company actress who first encouraged Osborne to write. After the first production in London, Osborne began a relationship with Mary Ure, who played Alison; he divorced his wife Pamela Lane to marry Ure in 1957.

A Short Summary

Act 1 opens on a dismal Sunday afternoon in Jimmy and Alison's cramped attic in the Midlands. Jimmy and Cliff are attempting to read the Sunday papers, plus the radical weekly, "*price nine pence, obtainable at any bookstall*" as Jimmy snaps, claiming it from Cliff. This is a reference to the New Statesman, and in the context of the period would have instantly signalled the pair's political preference to the audience. Alison is attempting to do the week's ironing and is only half listening as Jimmy and Cliff engage in the expository dialogue.

It becomes apparent that there is a huge social gulf between Jimmy and Alison. Her family is upper-middle-class military, perhaps verging on upper class, while Jimmy is decidedly working class. He had to fight hard against her family's disapproval to win her. "Alison's mummy and I took one look at each other, and from then on the age of chivalry was dead", he explains. We also learn that the sole family income is derived from a sweet stall in the local market—an enterprise that is surely well beneath Jimmy's education, let alone Alison's "station in life".

As Act 1 progresses, Jimmy becomes more and more malicious, offensive and abusive transferring his contempt for Alison's family onto her personally, calling her "*pusillanimous*" and generally belittling her to Cliff. The tirade ends with some physical horseplay, resulting in the ironing board overturning and Alison's arm getting a burn. Jimmy exits to play his trumpet off stage.

Alison and Cliff play a tender scene, during which she confides that she's accidentally pregnant and can't quite bring herself to tell Jimmy. Cliff urges her to tell him. When Jimmy returns, Alison announces that her actress friend Helena Charles is coming to stay and it is entirely obvious that Jimmy despises Helena even more than Alison. He flies into a total rage, and conflict is inevitable.

Act 2 opens on another Sunday afternoon, with Helena and Alison making lunch. In a two-handed scene, Alison gives a clue as to why she decided to take Jimmy on—her own minor rebellion against her upbringing plus her admiration of Jimmy's campaigns against the dereliction of life in post-war England. She describes Jimmy to Helena as a "*knight in shining armour*". Helena says, firmly, "*You've got to fight him*".

Jimmy enters, and the tirade continues. If his Act 1 material could be played as a joke, there's no doubt about the intentional viciousness of his attacks on Helena. When the women put on hats and declare that they are going to church, Jimmy's sense of betrayal peaks. When he leaves to take an urgent phone call, Helena announces that

she has forced the issue. She has sent a telegram to Alison's parents asking them to come and "rescue" her. Alison is stunned but agrees that she will go.

After a scene break, we see Alison's father, Colonel Redfern, who has come to collect her to take her back to her family home. The playwright allows the Colonel to come across as quite a sympathetic character, albeit totally out of touch with the modern world (as he himself admits). "*You're hurt because everything's changed*", Alison tells him, "*and Jimmy's hurt because everything's stayed the same*".

Helena arrives to say goodbye, intending to leave very soon herself. Alison is surprised that Helena is staying on for another day, but she leaves, giving Cliff a note for Jimmy. Cliff in turn hands it to Helena and leaves, saying "*I hope he rams it up your nostrils*". Almost immediately, Jimmy bursts in. His contempt at finding a "goodbye" note makes him turn on Helena again, warning her to keep out of his way until she leaves. Helena tells him that Alison is expecting a baby, and Jimmy admits grudgingly that he's taken aback. However, his tirade continues. They first come to physical blows, and then as the Act 2 curtain falls, Jimmy and Helena are kissing passionately and falling on the bed.

Act 3 opens as a deliberate replay of Act 1, but this time with Helena at the ironing-board wearing Jimmy's Act 1 red shirt. Months have passed. Jimmy is notably more pleasant to Helena than he was to Alison in Act 1. She actually laughs at his jokes, and the three of them (Jimmy, Cliff, and Helena) get into a music hall comedy routine that obviously is not improvised. Cliff announces that he's decided to strike out on his own. As Jimmy leaves the room to get ready for a final night out for the three of them, he opens the door to find Alison, looking like death. Instead of caring for her he snaps over his shoulder "*Friend of yours to see you*" and abruptly leaves.

After a scene break, Alison explains to Helena that she lost the baby—one of Jimmy's cruellest speeches in Act 1 expressed the wish that Alison would conceive a child and lose it—the two women reconcile but Helena realises that what she's done is immoral and she in turn decides to leave. She summons Jimmy to hear her decision and he lets her go with a sarcastic farewell.

The play ends with a sentimental reconciliation between Jimmy and Alison. They revive an old game they used to play, pretending to be bears and squirrels, and seem to be in a state of truce.

Interpretation: Application of Game Theory.

It is the significance of this game that compels the game theorists to apply it to this play. Though out of anger, the tirades of Jimmy has an element of game theory. His tirades have both political and economical relevance. The post war conditions in Britain were unfavourable for the poor as well as the middle class young educated men like Jimmy. In the World War II though Middle Powers won, England was one of the war worn nations that had to bear huge loss that culminated into the loss of

economy and political imbalance. The young men who aspired for a better life were completely disillusioned, frustrated and deprived of it. It naturally gave birth to conflicts between the rich and poor, the favoured and deprived. Due to fall of economy the educated young were not getting what they deserved. On one hand there is aspiration of getting something deserving but on the other hand there is frustration and hence anger for those who are wealthy but indifferent to the deprived. Since Alison belongs to both becomes the target of Jimmy's angry tirades full of sarcastic and abusive language. They reflect ambition, conflicts, emotions and hence irrationality which are the bases of game theory. Jimmy is no doubt ambitious of rising in life but has to manage with the sweet shop being a victim of the post war conditions. His uncontrollable emotions result in irrationality; expresses his seeming conflicts as a representative of middle class young men aspiring to rise in life.

Though all the scenes take place in Jimmy's small room and conflict is expressed through the tirades of Jimmy towards his wife, it is a sort of conflict against the upper class giving it shape of a class struggle. Jimmy's conflict is not against only the rich but also against all those who live for trifling like Cliff. His conflict is against all that is false, unreal and full of vanity. He abuses Alison only to make her speak so that he could outpour his anger on her but her cold behaviour makes him more angry, which proves indifference towards the poor of the rich as she belongs to a rich upper class family and fails to understand Jimmy's sentiments who represents poor but educated and ambitious young men of his generation.

Game theory, as stated earlier, has proved useful in explicating the strategic choices of characters by making the linkages between motifs and actions in plot construction. It is also useful in addressing certain interpretative questions, such as whether the ordinary calculations of fictional characters can help to explain their extraordinary actions in some literatures like great tragedies. As far as *Look Back in Anger* is concerned, the reference to the game is symbolic of the conflict, motifs and actions and emotions and irrationality. The most striking character is of Jimmy whose tirades reflect all these features of game theory. His conflict on the surface level is against his weak wife but on the deep level it is against the contemporary political, economic and social conditions. Alison, being the representative of such conditions becomes victim of Jimmy's tirades. As in game strong player overpower the weak player, Alison is completely dominated by Jimmy. The reason she gives to marry Jimmy despite being lower in status, homeless and jobless is self explanatory.

The play concerns the triangle of Jimmy, Alison and Helena and the fourth is here but he is only a mute spectator to what happens around him in the flat of Jimmy.

The biggest game is played by the fate. The fate of the post war generation is completely controlled by the conditions created by the war and other political, social and economical upheavals in the world. The play voices the resentment of the youth of the post war atom bomb world. The hero or non hero of this play is Jimmy Porter the product of this world. His father like many other had died in the war. Jimmy feels

himself condemned to mediocrity. Justly or unjustly he feels himself better than, but helpless under the conditions he sees thrust at him in the rat race conscious press and radio. He is nihilistically critical of self righteous religion and of bland, non comprehending moralism and he sees all this around him. He talks but remains passive and inert. He cannot direct his relationship with his young wife Alison who has come from the liberal better of class and has married Jimmy against her parents' opinion. Many critics blame Jimmy for doing nothing, but no one has thought about the condition of which he was a peculiar product. Fate stricken, educated young man cannot compete in the rat- race though he wants much to. He is intellectual, clever and has guts but to no avail. Fate proves to be dominating in the game of his life and he has but to surrender himself before the fate and destiny. In his life '**the sun does not rise**' hence there is no light but darkness. This is a conflict between Jimmy and his unsporting and unfavourable fate. This conflict is the very basis of the game theory.

Two Levels of Conflicts

The play is full of life and vitality and conflicts are the unfailing parts of life. No one can gain anything without struggle. There may be two different levels on which the conflicts seem to be occurring: one on the surface level and the other on the deep level. The surface level conflict is evidently against Alison and all those around him.

Let's first discuss the second level of conflict which has not been discussed in the available critical works. We know that Jimmy is the product of the post war atom bomb world. His anger is against all those things that accounted for his present condition. He lost his father when he was only ten. He suffered much being fatherless. The political and economical conditions brought about a drastic change in the world. England as a country lost too much though she was in the winning side of the Nations. Her economy completely collapsed giving birth to new financial and social problems. Political unrest could not be brought under controlled by the government. And the poor or middle class educated youths, who were aspiring to rise in their life, could not but suffer frustration and depression. In the rat race the weak could not survive; either they had to surrender before their fate or quit the game. Very few are there who continue the play and somehow keeps on their struggle. It is also a fact that when one cannot do anything out of frustration, one has to embark on such tirades as Jimmy as he cannot do any damage to others. Only thing is that one has to understand such a person entangled in the duality and harsh truths of life. Resultantly, Jimmy becomes nihilistically critical of self righteous religion and of bland, no comprehending moralism and he sees all this around him. He talks but remains passive and inert. Even he cannot direct his relationship with his wife. He suffers mentally and physically. Thus there is conflict between the political and economical post war conditions and ambitious youths like Jimmy.

On the surface level the conflict seems to be occurring between Jimmy and Alison particularly as she is the target of most of his angry and sarcastic tirades. Even

the self respective woman like Helena is shocked by his abusive and offensive language. Game theory of constant sum game and inconstant sum game can be applied here. In this conflict jimmy appears to be winning what Alison losing; but it is not the fact. Here both of them seem to be winning and losing. It gives birth to the mixed strategies in which it becomes difficult to make prediction of future. It will be really interesting to see how it functions.

Jimmy Porter the protagonist is a brilliant young intellectual adrift. Since he can find no other way of using his intelligence, he is employing it to punish himself and everyone around him. In this sense there is inner and outer conflict. The way he does is so dazzling and he knows it but he cannot stop going with it. He has seen through all the tricks of self deception by which people persuade themselves that life is worth living and he debunks them in a brilliantly funny series of tirades. He is genuine modern voice, witty relentless pitiless and utterly without beliefs in anything. Since he cannot find a place, he must compensate by making fun of all those who can, and his wit is stinging.

Jimmy's denunciations are offensive and abusive and someone must suffer most, the one who is nearest to him. She is none but his wife Alison. She has the misfortune that she is better born socially than he makes use of this act incessantly. All she can do is to suffer the assaults as if they are at war, though she is helped to some extent by ever passive Cliff, Jimmy's dumb and loyal friend who is always the necessary third in this kind of game. In this play of two party games Cliff is such player who sides with both but remains constant and true to both and hence suffers at the loss. Alison has come from a well to do upper class family and knows no poverty and hence is unable to understand Jimmy's problem. Jimmy expects his wife to understand him and his problem but she remains indifferent and passive. Unfaithful, he drives her to abortion. Alison loses both –her child and husband. Her loss is gain to Jimmy in a sense. And thus there is constant sum game or zero sum game. What Jimmy gains is the mental satisfaction of winning over some who represent the upper class. Alison leaves Jimmy but Cliff remains with him; he does not change his side. He suffers at both. Here, it can be said that the Jimmy's strategies work and he wins but Alison fails to counterattack and hence fails. But the ending of the play is suggestive of something different mixed strategy and hence inconstant game or non zero sum game. The truce between the two suggests that no one wins and no one lose. Both lose for some time but later their understanding each other's dilemma and side make them forget the harshness of life and become children. He leaves his anger and tempted to look back in past how they used to play and love each other in the game. The reference to the game of bears and squirrel is both symbolic and suggestive. It suggests that though they are in truce there are also constant conflicts because bear and squirrel cannot live together. It reveals the truth of life that **'life is a struggle'** and one cannot run away from it.

The playwright has applied many symbolic devices in this play with an aim to give the play a lasting effect. The bears and squirrel game is such a game that

represent the conflict as well as concord between the two ends. Different critics have found different symbols in this game.

The Bears-and-Squirrels Game: Symbolic Device

The bears-and-squirrels game in **Look Back in Anger** occupies a special place. It is a symbolic device which serves an important dramatic purpose. According to a critic, this game is a brave attempt by Jimmy and Alison to compensate themselves for the failure of their marriage. While another critic takes it as a "statement of the nature of human love." There is another critic who says that the game symbolises "a refuge from the world" and a way of forgetting the actual reality. It also symbolises "the fleeting happiness provided by this game on occasions," especially when they made love to each other. Jimmy and Alison used to imagine themselves as a bear and a squirrel respectively and thus become oblivious of their human character, their rationality, and their social prejudices. Jimmy calls Alison a "*beautiful, great-eyed squirrel*", "*Hoarding, nut-munching squirrel*", "*With highly polished, gleaming fur, and an ostrich feather of a tail*". This almost poetic description affords great joy to Alison and relieves the tension from which she has been suffering as a result of Jimmy's verbal assaults on her. She then begins to produce the sound which a squirrel produces, and she calls him a "**jolly super bear, too**", "A really marvellous bear", "**Marvellous and beautiful**".

Finally, it may be pointed out that in *Look Back in Anger* Osborne was chiefly concerned to make people feel, to give them lessons in feeling admitting that there was time enough to think afterwards.

Conflicts between Alison and Helena: Inconstant sum Game.

The exegesis of the game theory cannot be complete without the reference to the game between Helena and Alison. Helena is responsible to some extent for the separation of Alison from Jimmy. Helena plays an important role in the two player inconstant sum game. This is obviously between Helena and Alison. Helena seems to be playing a game of deception on Alison in which she seems to be winning but at the end loses. It is Helena who is responsible for Alison's decision to go away with her father and leave Jimmy alone with his predicament when he comes to take her home in response to the telegram sent by Helena secretly.

Helena is described as a very attractive woman having an obvious sense of authority which makes most men anxious to please her and to impress her. She represents middle class womanhood which feels secure in its inherent rights. Her general behaviour shows her sense of her own importance, power and dignity. Such a woman is one of hostility. She has been helpful to Alison. Their conversation reveals different opinion about Jimmy. Alison thinks that Jimmy's trumpet blowing gets the neighbours annoyed. But Alison knows that he is thinking of restarting his old band to make fortune. But Helena tries to poison her ears by telling her that he is intended to kill Alison in particular, to torment her mentally. Helena says that she has

never seen such a hatred for in any body's else's eyes. It is slightly horrifying for, she says with reference to the hatred in Jimmy's eyes for Alison. Helena like a cunning player starts sowing seeds of parting. She not only sows seeds but also clears her way by sending a telegram to Alison's father informing him about Alison's plight. She knows Alison is pregnant and she would reveal this news to Jimmy. But Helena does not care for her. She makes a show that she is with her and telling her to feel free and have break up with Jimmy. But Alison does not bow.

Helena is inquisitive about the relationship between Cliff and Alison. Alison out of innocence and faith reveals all embarrassing behaviour of Jimmy to Helena. Helena has formed a very unfavourable opinion about Jimmy whom she thinks to be really a savage. She regards Jimmy's flat as a 'madhouse' and calls it a 'menagerie' (a place where animals live) In her opinion, Jimmy does not know what love or anything else means. She urges Alison to fight Jimmy or get out of that place. Otherwise he will kill her.

Thus, Helena produces on us a somewhat mixed impression of being a well-meaning, and at the same time, a somewhat self-important and conceited person. But her intentions are not good. She, in fact, deceives Alison by sending a telegram to Alison's father secretly and causes their separation. She has no right to interfere in their family matters and conjugal life when Alison never thinks about it. She also rebukes Cliffs for sitting quietly and doing nothing as if she is the mistress of the house. Helena finds Alison a passive sufferer. Alison love story with Jimmy like a knight in shining armour' her romantic effect on Helena. Alison taking Helena into confidence reveals all sordid life of poverty that she spent with jimmy. Alison also tells Helena about their world of animals love, a kind of affection which animals love in their cosy zoo, a kind of silly symphony for people who could not bear the pain of being human beings any longer." When Jimmy out of rhetorical denunciation of Alison from her mummy's guarded castle in which Alison was a prisoner. Helena influences Alison to go to church. Even Jimmy asks Helena why she has not left when her assignment in the town is over. He realises that Helena is interfering in their life but innocent Alison walks into her trap like a crud player. Still Helena does not move rather stay in that 'madhouse' even in absence of Alison. She becomes mistress of Jimmy and thus wins the constant sum game. However, she does not enjoy longer. When rightful Alison comes back with the loss of her child, weak and submissive, Jimmy slaps Helena and Helena has to leave. She admits that she is guilty of immorality. It is not moral to live like a mistress. It shows that what Helena wins also soon loses. The wheel of fortune takes another turn and winner becomes loser again. This is an inconstant sum game.

The Role of Motive in the Play:

Motive is also another feature of game theory. It is found in the marriage of Jimmy with Alison. According to Alison's father Jimmy's possible motive behind marrying Alison was taking revenge. Perhaps jimmy married her in order to take

revenge as he opposed their marriage as he was not a perfect match for his daughter. At one time we are compelled to believe it when we find Alison's plight living with Jimmy and his angry tirades in which he always abuses her father, mother and brother. Similarly Helena also has motive of snatching Alison's position by showing feigned sympathy. In both the cases the first player wins giving scope for applying game theory.

To conclude, it can be said that *Look Back in Anger* has been highly praised for expressing new voice of angry young men generation and ushered in a new morning in the post war modern drama. Several theories have been applied to it including game theory. It has received varied opinions from reviewers and critics. In addition to the post war sentiments of young generation its plot and characterization gives scope to probe into it and helps to find elements of game theory and its various features. Human emotions coupled with strategies, motives, conflicts, are strong in this play. Therefore the models of game theory like constant sum game, inconstant sum game or minimax theory developed by theorists are applicable.

References:

1. Myerson, Roger B. (1991). *Game Theory: Analysis of Conflict*, Harvard University Press, p. 1. Chapter-preview links, pp. vii–xi.
2. R. J. Aumann ([1987] 2008). "game theory," Introduction, *The New Palgrave Dictionary of Economics*, 2nd Edition. Abstract.
3. Eric Rasmusen (2007). *Games and Information*, 4th ed. Description and chapter-preview.
4. Colin F. Camerer (2003). *Behavioral Game Theory: Experiments in Strategic Interaction*, pp. 5–7 (scroll to at1.1 What Is Game Theory Good For?).
5. Osborne, Martin J. (2004), *An introduction to game theory*, Oxford University Press, ISBN 978-0-19-512895-6. Undergraduate textbook.
6. Osborne, Martin J.; Rubinstein, Ariel (1994), *A course in game theory*, MIT Press, ISBN 978-0-262-65040-3. A modern introduction at the graduate level.
7. Von Neumann, John; Morgenstern, Oskar (1944), *Theory of games and economic behavior*, Princeton University Press.