

## THE BECKETTIAN ABSURDIST THEATRE OF SILENCE: *WAITING FOR GODOT* THE ENCOUNTER OF MARXIAN AND FREUDIAN PHILOSOPHIES

Hassiba BOUKHATEM

University of Skikda 20/8/1955. Algeria

ORCID ID: [0009-0006-4231-8692](https://orcid.org/0009-0006-4231-8692)

[h.boukhatem@univ-skikda.dz](mailto:h.boukhatem@univ-skikda.dz) // [habikad28@yahoo.fr](mailto:habikad28@yahoo.fr)

**Abstract:** With the inherent assumption that society needs to be revolutionized for updated change, the theatre as a “hyphenated genre” (Cohen-Cruz, 2005, p. 106) has a determined instrumental value that brings together the two distinct worlds of theatre and the social. Obviously, it is possible and essential to find philosophical antecedents starting from Descartes, Kant to Nietzsche, that demonstrate the cords of change to be theatricalized afterwards in this innovative aspect of Drama namely the transformative theatre which meets and endorses all of the theatre of the absurd, the theatre of the oppressed, and the Activist theatre. However, my paper would be confined to study only the **Silent theatre of the absurd** represented by Samuel Beckett’s play “*Waiting for Godot*”. Our essay adopts this kind of drama that is frequently voiced through both philosophical and historical analyses.

**Keywords:** Transformative theatre, change, philosophical foundations, theatrical techniques, silence, revolutionizes.

### THÉÂTRE BECKETTIEN DE L'ABSURDE ET DU SILENCE : LA RENCONTRE DES PHILOSOPHIES MARXIENNE ET FREUDIENNE

**Résumé :** Partant de l'hypothèse inhérente selon laquelle la société doit être révolutionnée pour un changement actualisé, le théâtre en tant que « genre à trait d'union » (Cohen-Cruz, 2005, p. 106) a une valeur instrumentale déterminée qui rassemble les deux mondes distincts du théâtre et du monde social. Évidemment, il est possible et essentiel de trouver des antécédents philosophiques depuis Descartes, Kant jusqu'à Nietzsche, qui démontrent les cordes du changement qui seront ensuite théâtralisées dans cet aspect novateur du Drame, à savoir le théâtre transformateur qui rencontre et avalise tout le théâtre de l'absurde. Le théâtre des opprimés et le théâtre activiste. Cependant, mon article se limiterait à étudier uniquement le théâtre Silencieux de l'absurde représenté par la pièce « *En attendant Godot* » de Samuel Beckett. Notre essai adopte ce type de drame qui est fréquemment exprimé à travers des analyses philosophiques et historiques.

**Mots-clés :** Théâtre transformateur, changement, fondements philosophiques, silence, techniques théâtrales, révolutionne.

### Introduction

In our time, philosophy does not seem to have any intention of dying. It was not absorbed by the sciences, or history. On the contrary, philosophers enjoy a prestige and a top-heavy influence with their means of intervention on the reality of our societies. Hence, today, the philosopher has succeeded in emphasizing among his contemporaries the importance of the philosophical point of view both in the field of knowledge and in that of dramatic art. Among the philosophies emphasized in theatrical art, Absurdism. As a

philosophical concept, continues to be relevant in the 21st century. It embraces the idea that human existence is inherently without meaning and that individuals must create their own meaning in a seemingly irrational and chaotic world.. Absurdism has massively influenced literature, art, and existential philosophy, and its themes are often reflected in contemporary works and can still resonate with many people today. In a world filled with uncertainty and rapid change, the exploration of existential absurdism and the search for personal meaning remain pertinent topics for discussion and contemplation in the different spheres of philosophy starting with Descartes; rarely has an intellectual revolution been as radical and innovative as that of Descartes. At the same time as mathematical physics sets out to conquer the infinite world opened by the Copernican revolution (Copernicus's theory, 1543), human reason becomes at the same time the instrument, the object and the end of philosophical questioning (*The Philosophical Writings of Descartes*, 1985–1991, 3 volumes). But an upheaval of this amount did not fail to arouse reluctance. Descartes helped with his logic prove the existential truth through a simple equation like the idea of God as a truth, saying: the idea of God must be God. The argument does not *show* with *proof*, that because we are existent, *God* too is existent. Similarly, all the existing ideas are real simply because they defacto exist! (Bonevac, 2003). Of the great movements that traversed the 19th and 20th centuries, came directly from Kantism and from Kantian criticism (this is the case in Germany of the schools of Marburg and Baden, in France of Charles Renouvier (1815 -1903) and his disciples), as well as Kantian morality where the entire so-called spiritualist current will confront the categorical imperative of the published Critique of *Practical Reason* (Beck Lewis, 1996, pp. 13–17). Immanuel Kant led the work of a professor. His teaching, begun in 1755, covers the most diverse subjects: geography, theology, law, logic, metaphysics, astronomy, anthropology, history, and metaphysics. The Critique of *Pure Reason* marks a break in Kant's work (we are talking about pre- and post-Critique works), but also in Western thought as a whole. Kant influence over these two centuries is considerable. We usually retain its founding role in the genesis of Marxist philosophy, which definitely all historical reflection draws on it (Marx, Carl, and Angels, Friedrich, 2002).

It is with constant reference to Kant that Arthur Schopenhauer (1788-1860) contributes to the historical importance of classical rationalism. Arthur Schopenhauer was among the first 19<sup>th</sup> century philosophers to contend that the universe is not necessarily a rational place. Inspired by Plato and Kant, Schopenhauer developed their philosophies into an instinct-recognizing and ultimately ascetic outlook, emphasizing that in the face of a world filled with endless strife, we ought to minimize our natural desires for the sake of achieving a more tranquil frame of mind and a disposition towards universal beneficence. (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy). In his attempt - which has been called romantic- he created an impressive system in which human will, freed from space and causality, develops to the dimensions of the universe. Likewise when Schopenhauer poses pity as the foundation of morality, it is based on the Kantian definition of moral action. Charles Fourier (1772-1837) suffered both from the original formulation of his analyses and projects, and from later socialists, notably Marx, who described his socialism as "utopian." It will undoubtedly be necessary to reassess the depth, and the boldness, of its social criticism based on a keen approach to humans. He waited all his life for the capitalist who would give him the means to create his philosophy. Many nineteenth-century European writers suffered from these prejudices, but in his case, they not only seem at odds with many of his strikingly modern ideas, but also probably reflect the sort of *analytical*

*confusion* about capitalism for which Marx and Engels took him to task. In the words of Liza Featherstone inferring about Fourier's confusion about Capitalism:

The idea that Jews are more responsible than other groups for finance and commerce, and are more susceptible to capitalist greed, is bigoted — but it's also just not at all how capitalism works. She continues "Capitalism is a material, not a cultural, phenomenon. Capitalism is a system, not a moral failing on the part of any specific people or groups..."

Liza Featherstone (2022)

In the middle of the 19th century, and in reaction against the rationalism of the German idealist philosophers, first and foremost Hegel, whose Philosophy is assigned the task of a radical change (thesis-antithesis-synthesis dialectic theory), Hegel's primary object in his dialectic is to establish the existence of a logical connection between the various categories which are involved in the constitution of experience. (Richard Dien, 1990, pp. 45–57) Theoretically, this understanding of social change, rests on the teleological idea that history unfolds towards an end or purpose (telos), as manifest in the way that all things undergo processes of change in accordance with a dialectical principle of self-development, fulfillment, destruction, and transcendence. but also sociological and aesthetic values then dominant. This criticism was sometimes undertaken in the name of religious (Sören Kierkegaard (1813-1855) or social (utopian socialists) demands. From this point of view, the philosophy of Hegel (1770-1831), which sets itself the task of constructing a form of knowledge, appears as a total nostalgic art. But it now considers itself a discipline among others and in particular it redefines its position in relation to the sciences. Hegel's dialectics adopts Kant's notion of a self-driving and concept-creating "speculative" reason, as well as Kant's idea that reason aims toward unconditioned universality or absolute concepts. Philosophy then reached a sort of properly philosophical paroxysm with Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900) who was on many levels the continuator of Schopenhauer. Nietzsche's superman is first of all the human freed from everything that dominates him (God, metaphysical entities and even language) and thus becomes the creator of his own values. Prominent elements of his philosophy include his radical critique of truth in favor of perspectivism; a genealogical critique of religion and Christian morality and a related theory of master–slave morality; the aesthetic affirmation of life in response to both the "death of God" and the profound crisis of Nihilism in relation to existentialism. Astonishing posterity that of Nietzsche: his philosophy will be claimed by the slayers of bourgeois values, but also exploited - exploitation of which Nietzsche is innocent - by the Nazi ideologues. This criticism of dominant values takes on a distinctly political colour among Marxist or Marxist philosophers. The revival of Marxism which followed the October Revolution in Russia (Encyclopaedia Britannica) made Marxist critical analysis one of the major players in the philosophical debate. Denouncing the deceits of class discourse which claims to be neutral (ideology), the philosopher's effort then becomes *speech, speaking of liberation: liberation of individuals and peoples.*

Logically, one can emphasize that the philosophical suggestions examined previously, which are perhaps the most fundamental of the Western value system, are those of Karl Marx (1818-1883) and Sigmund Freud (1856-1939), claimed to draw their legitimacy from the fact of being matching, and based on science, political economy for one, psychology for the other. Those values are extensively sought after in drama for the

goal of social and political revolution. This puts our article in the projected boundaries and purpose of the study, offering an important contribution to the critical analysis implemented to Beckettian Absurdist theatre of silence, being still an open multi reading process. Thus, the research will strive to answer the following questions: How, can the critical theory of Marx and Freud Psychoanalysis, which are illustrated in theatrical performances, be practical in the explanation of the various experienced societal and political facts? The Freudian *Psychoanalytical* approach are divided into Id criticism, Ego criticism and the Superego criticism, in his structural model of the psyche, the Ego has specifically an instinctive role of self-preservation against pain leading to its being replaced by the reality. What can this philosophy tell us about men’s everlasting life struggles? Is it the change means strived for? How does the Beckettian Absurd theatre connect to historical ideologies? Why had the Western theatre embraced philosophy as a food of thought without finding yet a solution to the big problem of escapism? How theatre can be a source of change and revolution that can help people devour instead of being devoured by ill destinies?

## 1. Methodology

Methodologically, our hypothesis is based on the combination of only two major philosophical tenets of the absurdist theatre which are the Marxist theory and the Freudian psycho-analysis. The Marxian critical theory on his philosophical concepts is designed to determine the social-political structure of the play under study, its standards and regulations. Accordingly, the Marxist critical theory, with the Freudian psycho-analysis one, pilot the process of the play values; First, the Marxist assumption that identity can never be anything other than the suppression of difference.(Dews 1987:170) The suppression of the bourgeoisie as a social and ruling class became a necessity to bring about social and political change. Moreover, the Marxist ideology, as an articulated theory within the socio-political themes of the play, presents explicitly the theory of alienation in the social hierarchy. Therefore, in a society based on capitalism, alienated labor produces an alienated self as a leading form in the depiction of Master-Slave relationships (Nietzsche), shedding light on class relations and symbolizing economic exploitation of oppressed workers, a part of the exploited and *dehumanized* proletariat.

Second, Freud became one of the foundation stones on which their interdisciplinary program for a critical theory of society was constructed. In addition, it has been observed that the Critical Theorists turned to psychoanalysis to make up for a deficit in Marxian theory, namely, its reduction of the psychological realm to socio-economic factors, then, *even though* Freud’s views on Homo-sexuality has no open concern in this paper, a broader impact of his critique of philosophy – no less than Nietzsche’s and Marx’s – played a major role in his intervention into the history of western rationality, morality, subjectivity, political association, indeed reason itself . Today it is not difficult to spot the connection between Freud and Marx philosophy– or, perhaps more accurately, the “Marxification” of Freud philosophy which is simply the concretization of the idea of material shortage with Freud’s notion of Ananke (reality or necessity). Furthermore, in his essay “Beyond the Pleasure Principle”, Freud defines the pleasure principle as a natural tendency to seek the fulfilment of our instincts and avoid pain. From the point of view of our self-preservation, it is “inefficient and highly dangerous” (Freud, 1961) that is how came about the *Psychoanalytical* approach to critiquing theatrical literature. This approach is divided into Id criticism, Ego criticism and the Superego criticism.

The Id, the Ego and the Superego are the three parts of the psychic apparatus as defined by Sigmund Freud in his structural model of the psyche where the ego's instinct of self-preservation against pain leads to its being replaced by the reality. Now There is no denying that, for Freud, the necessity of wrestling material survival from nature is an important reason for the harshness of life, inevitable loss, physical pain, and death,

Nature will always rise up against us, majestic, cruel and inexorable" and remind us of our "helplessness and weakness, which we thought to escape through the work of civilization. Whatever level of abundance might be achieved – and material well-being is nothing to scoff at –human beings will still be confronted with the "ineluctable, which will always administer an insult to our self-esteem. (Freud, *The Future of an Illusion*, p.16/11)

## 2. Theatre of the absurd of Samuel Beckett: Marxism in *Waiting for Godot* play

Relying on progress in logic, better situated in relation to Descartes, Samuel Beckett, the famous figure of the Theatre of the Absurd eventually criticized the communist regime, contributing to intellectual and cultural movements that in the long run led to political reform; an open example would be that of *Waiting for Godot* play that accentuates the different manifestations of incompatible and clashing meanings within the text. This transcript points toward the late modernist bourgeois ideology directly concerned with the *Marxist theory*, discussed by Louis Althusser and Pierre Macherey (Macherey, 1978). The book is not concerned with the meaning of the work of literature per se, but with the theories that reveal what literature can mean. Samuel Beckett's text "*Waiting for Godot*" reflects on the significance of the Marxist ideology as an articulated theory of and for decentred or disparate people, helps to make speak and vocal the silences and non-saids of the play with conceptual framework. The ideological processes keep the author silent at certain stages in trying to tell the truth in his own way, anticipating that his text would enable the readers to literary reading based on the Marxist theoretical concern (Macherey, 1978). In this play, the two tramps, Vladimir and Estragon, wait hopefully to see a man simply known as Godot, a character who does not make an appearance in the play, despite being the nominal character. The play strangely begins with waiting for Godot and ends with waiting for Godot (Lawley, P., 2008). Marxism refers to the political and economic theories of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, later developed by their followers to form the basis of *communism*. Marxism introduced ideas such as *Dialectical Materialism, Alienation, and Economic Determination*.

Beckett's 'Waiting for Godot' has a minimalist setting, with only two discernible visual objects on stage apart from the actors and their props – a road, and a tree. There is an otherworldly *alienation* in this sparse setting (Bloom, 2008). It could be anywhere, in any country of the world. No visible horizons exist, and no markers of civilization are present. It is this bare bones setting, with a severe absence of resources that enables us to see *Waiting for Godot* and the position of their characters in relation to resources. In the sterile landscape of these characters, the most essential resource becomes that of food, which is why Estragon greedily seeks the waste bones of Pozzo's chicken, (Roberts, J. L. 1980). Therefore, within this social structure, Vladimir and Estragon are treated as outcasts, and have very few resources, especially compared to Pozzo, who has food, better clothing, land, and tragically so – a slave of his own in the form of Lucky. *Both Vladimir and Estragon see themselves lower in the hierarchy of social positions, vis-à-vis Pozzo, as*

they see him and his slave with a sense of curiosity and adoration. Within this social system, if the base of resources were food, clothing and shelter, it is Pozzo who possesses these essential items. It is on this base that the *superstructure of relations is built*. The control over resources places Pozzo at a higher level in the hierarchy of class, giving him the power to commodify Lucky and treat him as a slave, and treat Vladimir and Estragon as outcasts, (Atkinson, B. (1956).

The relationship between Pozzo and Lucky is one of the most important socio-political themes in *the depiction of Master-Slave relationships*, shedding light on class relations and symbolizing economic exploitation. Lucky, who is to be sold at the fair, is a human being reduced to a *commodity*; he can easily be seen as an oppressed worker, a part of the exploited and dehumanized proletariat. His futile task is lugging a suitcase filled with sand, and *when his usefulness has diminished he is deemed as expendable as any replaceable part of a machine*. Pozzo- a member of the landowning class is clearly a *pretentious member of the bourgeoisie*, whose well-being and physical comforts (*the pipe, the stool, the chicken*) depend on the unrelenting subjugation of his burden-bearing servant, (Fadillah, Nur, et al., 2022:66). The relationship between Lucky and Pozzo, despite their tilted power division, is that of interdependence. One can draw parallels with the relationship they share, and the Marxist base and superstructure- with Lucky representing the base and Pozzo representing the superstructure. Pozzo and Lucky create a metaphor of society, not as it is but as the tramps might see it, with the social structure reduced to an essential distinction between master and slave. Without Lucky, Pozzo cannot move forward, sit down to eat or get up. Lucky cannot move either, except in response to Pozzo’s shouted orders and whip-cracks.

### 3. Significance of the Marxist ideology within the Alienation Theory

One can analyze the play using the theory of alienation, which is one of the central concepts of Marxism. Marx argues that in a society based on capitalism, alienated labor produces an alienated self. An individual is no longer a whole human being and is unable to establish full human relationships with other workers who are in a situation much like his own. This is *the human meaning of capitalism* for Marx: people cut off from themselves, others and work. Therefore, the theory of alienation, when analyzed and applied in context to Beckett's “*Waiting for Godot*” becomes one of its major themes. Again, the relationship between Lucky and Pozzo, despite their oblique power division, is that of interdependence. One can draw parallels with the relationship they share, and the Marxist base and superstructure- with Lucky representing the base and Pozzo representing the superstructure;\_Base and superstructure are two linked theoretical concepts developed by Karl Marx, Base refers to the production forces, or the materials and resources that generate the goods society needs. Superstructure describes all other aspects of society. Marx argued that the superstructure grows out of the base and reflects the ruling class' interests.

Pozzo and Lucky create a metaphor of society, *not as it is but as the vagabonds might see it*, with the social structure reduced to an essential distinction between master and slave. Without Lucky, Pozzo *cannot* move forward, sit down to eat or get up. Lucky *cannot* move either, *except in response to Pozzo’s shouted orders and whip-cracks*. There is a *shift* in this dynamic of power in act 2, when *Pozzo becomes blind*, and *subsequently helpless*. Rather than driving Lucky as he did earlier, he is *now* pathetically dragged along by him. *From a position of omnipotence and strength and confidence, he is now at the mercy of the*

people around him. Unquestionably, Marxian philosophical values dictate their actualization in social life in order to be transmitted through reflection of philosophical ideas in social and political spheres. In the course of Marxian critical politization of these philosophical values, Pozzo and Lucky, seem incapable of matching the social structure that evaporates by this time (Lahu, A. S. 2016).

Moreover, Lucky's uncommunicativeness is also an important symbol of the alienation theme in the play, representing the working class's *lack of a voice*. The only time Lucky speaks in the entire play is during an intense soliloquy which is an unfinished question beginning with a claim of the existence of a personal God and ending with a deluge of words by taking off Lucky's bowler hat and saying, "*There's an end to his thinking!*". The inhuman actions and thought of all major characters then, including Vladimir and Estragon, have been affected by the actions of these capitalist structures, going on only to prove Marx's worst fears of a society which has lost its essence and has been alienated from its Humane spirit (Marx, Carl, and Engels, Friedrich, 2002).

#### 4. The "Marxification" of Freudian Psychoanalysis of "*Waiting for Godot*"

Unanswered questions behind the characters behaviour are answered here. We would be looking further to the psychoanalytical approach, Sigmund Freud being the important advocate here. A major focus on the language and how dreams reflect our mental personality are given in his essay, "*Interpretation of Dreams.*" The plot then clearly states that Estragon has nightmares and Vladimir never addresses them and remains unhelpful towards it, being the one who is aware about their sufferings. The nightmares contain flashbacks and images of a gruesome and horrific event that has happened in both Vladimir and Estragon's lives, (Beckett, S. (2011). Recounting to Second World War, the nightmares reflect the post- traumatic stress disorder that Character's play Estragon suffer in the play. "*Waiting for Godot*", being a modernist play focuses on the psyche of the characters of the post - World War II era. Hence, Freud essay talks about sharp thoughts, breaks and pauses, where Vladimir is lost in his thoughts in the play taking long pauses without being capable of completing his sentences. This is a symbol that he is personally, mentally and cruelly affected by the World War II. Vladimir represents a mental decay in the hat and his trauma appears in thinking and trying to remember all that happened (Freud, 1933). Dreams act as defence mechanisms, so one of the important defence mechanisms would be escapism, which means running away from reality and not facing it and ending up dreaming about it literally. Similarly, the nightmares by Estragon show the pain and torture they have gone through and the effects of it, so when Vladimir does not acknowledge Estragon's nightmares, it is his escapism. He clearly mentions that he cannot bear listening to those nightmares. Displacement is another defence mechanism; it is a negative way of transferring your aggression, like a destructive desire. We can see displacement in Estragon when Vladimir ignores listening to him, and when he starts throwing tantrums. He is angry and sulks, behaves in a childish manner whenever his wishes are discontented, (Freud, S. (1920).

Freud's essay '*Anatomy of Mental Personality*' gives a tri-prolonged structure of human personality – the Id, the Ego and the Superego. The Id consists of our desires and needs. The Ego governs the Id according to the reality principle and controls the irrational impulses. The Superego strikes a balance between the two, and works as a moral police. In his essay "*Beyond the Pleasure Principle*", Freud defines the pleasure principle as a natural tendency to seek the fulfilment of our instincts and avoid pain. From the point of

view of our self -preservation, it is “inefficient and highly dangerous”. The ego’s instinct of self-preservation leads to its being replaced by the reality principle, which is the postponement of satisfaction and temporary toleration of the opposite of pleasure as a step on the long indirect road of pleasure. The Id, the Ego and the Superego are the three parts of the psychic apparatus as defined by Sigmund Freud in his structural model of the psyche:

**a-The Id** is “the dark, unreachable part of our nature”, which acts according to the pleasure principle. Freud describes it as a chaos, full of boiling excitations controlled by the instincts. It has no organization, no notion of time, and it contains all our basic instincts.

**b-The Ego** is that part of the Id modified by the direct influence of the external world. *It acts according to the **reality principle***, and is described by Freud as a sort of reason and “common sense” faculty. It is in a constant struggle to satisfy both the Id and the Superego, which results in anxiety and guilt.

**c-The Superego** is the component of personality that delivers mental reward or punishment for a person's actions. It includes the internalized ideals we've acquired from our parents and society and is responsible for producing feelings of pride and satisfaction as well as feelings of shame and guilt, (Freud, S. 1961, Vol. 19, pp. 3 -66).

## 5. Analysis

### *-Marx and Freud Critical Theories*

The ‘*Waiting*’ which is shown throughout the play is equated to man’s permanent waiting for one or the other desired object. Estragon is complaining and sleeping most of the time, Vladimir is also complaining. Man is always complaining and most of the time there is no action on his part to better the situation. Many have linked this drama to Freudian theory of Id, Ego and Superego. Estragon represents Id, Vladimir- Ego and Godot- Superego. There is another way of approaching Ego in this play one can consider Pozzo as the symbol of Ego. Beckett has given us a caricature of God, *the absolute monarchy*. Pozzo is the living symbol of *establishment*. Life is occupied by “*waiting*”. In *Waiting for Godot*, Samuel Beckett presents the suffering of the human condition; the two characters exemplify this condition of suffering through the juxtaposition of inaction and complaining. The term ‘waiting’ categorically well describes the nature of this play, taking part in every component of the play. In the play, the characters work collectively as a mind of their own in proceeding to contradict yet balance out one another’s actions as the course of go on. *Waiting for Godot* is a mere interpretation of Sigmund Freud’s ideology of the mind. Role of Estragon: Go-go is the Ego in the play rather than being a complete mediate between the Id and Superego (The contrasts which make up the ego), he has more of a Superego approach, yet Estragon is still fulfilling his role as the Ego. “The rational Go-go embodies the incomplete Ego, the missing pleasure principle: (e) go-(e) go.” Stated Bernard Dukore when talking about his thoughts on the Freudian interpretation of ego in the play, ‘*Waiting for Godot*’,



This is one way to look at the play the other point of view interprets Pozzo as the keeper of ego. Pozzo appears on stage after the appearance of Lucky. They are tied together by a long rope; thus, their destinies are fixed together in the same way that Pozzo might be a mother figure, with the rope being the umbilical cord which ties the two together.

Hussain, T. (2014)

#### -Silence meaning as a theatrical device

In “Waiting for Godot”, Beckett uses prolonged actions as well as tense stage directions to develop a dismayed mood and atmosphere. This despaired and intimidated mood and atmosphere are created by various stage directions mainly “[Silence.]” (Beckett, pg. 4), “[Pause.]” (Glic, 1970, pp. 166-176) “*Waiting for Godot*” text then reflects the presence of the late modernist bourgeois ideology. *Significant gaps, silences, absences and non-saids* are expected to draw *the absurdity and irrationality* of the situation of the characters that *rises from their hope for a meaningful and different life*. (Deborah, Cage, (2002:249-262). Seen in the past as a non-communicative prototype, now silence is seen differently. In late studies, this view strikes down the belief saying that “a man who is silent says nothing” (Lemak, 2012, p. 5). This belief comes from the fact that not every absence is a lack of action so silence can be considered just like the zero in mathematics; it is an absence with a function. Hence, the value and power of silence is recognized by scholars from different fields who started its study in the field of acoustic linguistics, where pauses of speech between words are significant. Probably, silence is the most ambiguous of all linguistic terms (Jaworski, 2019:24).

Silence is also the absence of voice in political life (Dingli, 2018); it is when an individual or a layer of the social groups like the vagrants of the play, are for some reason silent towards the political injustices and the oppression that they receive. Therefore, silences come as a reaction against somebody or against something (Booth, p.160). This two sided silence is promoted against somebody that marginalized groups such as women, blacks, or the proletariat; the case of the play’s characters -Vladimir and Estragon- and something or actions such as patriarchal behaviors and oppression. Silence is a natural part that co-works with language. According to Picard “There is something silent in every word as an abiding token of the origin of speech. And in every silence, there is something of the spoken word, as an abiding token of the power of silence to create speech” (Picard, 1988:24) It is understood with ease that silence is something meaningful and the absence of speech does not mean the absence of meaning. Moreover, words are not meaningful unless there is a pose of silence that separates it from the previous and the following word. If not, the result is going to be a non-meaningful block of speech. Then, the way by which meaning is extracted from silence is “to listen for the unspoken” (Adrienne, 1966-1978), and that is exactly what Beckett tried to achieve through silence as a theatrical device, in the words of Johannsen (Johansson, (1974), p.25) “*listeners attach meaning to the silence whether the sender wishes so or not.*” Thus, silence is a good and beneficial response as much as it is a bad one; looked at from a positive perspective, it has two different functions which are “*both to shelter power and to reserve against power*” (Brown, p.316).

## 6. Discussion

Seemingly, Marx and Freud fundamentally operate under similar assumptions so that they can be reconciled with ease. The objective world and the subjective life of man

can indeed be studied in their interrelationships; psychoanalysis can brace and deepen Marxist outlook. However, social change is interpreted psychologically, and this imperative turns out to mean incidentally Marxist dialectical materialism, whereby social existence determines consciousness “*psychoanalyzing the impure motives that control the thought and actions of the revolutionary ideologues*” (Charles I. Glicksberg, 1951). A pessimistic view is expressed in a word by Thomas R. Whitaker in a journal article entitled “The Early Yeats and the Pattern of History” (Jun., 1960, Vol. 75, No. 3, pp. 320-328)

Theatre is hell, a sinister conspiracy, a cold mechanism, a hall of mirrors, a closed room, a quicksand of language; and hell is theatre. Or life is theatre, a spectacle of masks, a script of life-lies, an endless regression of plays-within-plays-within- plays, an empty game; and theatre is hell. Play it either way. Play... ...is hell...

This meaning shows the phenomenon of Escapism which is defined as *mental diversion from unpleasant aspects of daily life*, typically through activities involving imagination or entertainment. It is also *a way of avoiding an unpleasant or boring life*, especially by thinking, reading, etc. about more exciting but impossible activities. This very meaning appears in Tennessee Williams (1945) “The glass Menagerie” play, where Tom, one character of the play, flees constantly reality by going extensively to the movies then decides at the end to play his life and fulfill his destiny.

## Conclusion

Beckett’s Play « *Waiting for Godot* » accentuates the entire Absurdist, the Marxist and the Freudian psychoanalysis theories that concerned judiciously people who could not keep pace with the times after the Second World War. Populations could not understand the new realities imposed by the new structures within Capitalism and Communism, as the only formulas of European political expression. Common people symbolized the misery and vanity conjugated by power at that time, that is why “*Waiting for Godot* is a play that can be fully appreciated only by seeing a live performance of it done by a competent troupe. Furthermore, the play as many others, is understood within the ego’s fortress of the human psyche. In addition, what “*Waiting for Godot*” really is, is an examination on silences, a text play that could be performed (perhaps should be read) contemplatively rather than discursively, so that each sentence and word is allowed to work its way through the disturbed signals of our brains into the inaudible notions of our hearts, Each pause between lines is drawn out until the silence becomes unbearable. We have an almost biological need to fill silences and when that need is denied, we can't help but become drawn in. Also, Daydreaming in “*Waiting for Godot*” is an examination on mortality, skepticism and existential reality. Perhaps the most striking thing in the play is when the characters were waiting for a God they *could not define, but needed to believe in!* Beckett appears in this play individually and distinctly different from the other dramatists. He both belongs to the Theater of the Absurd and, differs from the other writers associated with this movement. How? One of his main concerns is the polarity of existence. In *Waiting for Godot*, he shows this characteristic polarities as sight versus blindness, life–death, time present–time past, body–intellect, waiting–not waiting, going–not going, and others more. Beckett uses language to show men isolated in the world and unable to communicate. Because language is a barrier to communication, it is useless and ineffective. So, Beckett’s play, through the silence it depicts, does not fit into the world of profit and utility of the capitalist system; it

seems it has simply no other purpose than the fact that those men cannot be exploited. Conceivably, herein lays the highest applause for this remarkable play.

## References

- The Philosophical Writings of Descartes*, 3 volumes, John Cottingham, et al. (eds), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985–1991.
- Adrienne, Rich, (1966-1978), “On Lies, Secrets, and Silence: Selected Prose”, Reissue Edition.
- Atkinson, B. (1956, April 20). “Beckett’s *Waiting for Godot*”. The New York Times. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com>
- Beck, Lewis, (1996), “*A Commentary on Kant’s Critique of Practical Reason*” (2nd ed.). University of Chicago Press.. ISBN 9780226040752
- Beckett, S. (2011). “*Waiting for Godot*”. New York, NY: Grove Press
- Beckett. Samuel, “*Waiting for Godot*”, *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, vol. 13, no. 1, *Gale Academic*.
- Bloom, H., (2008), Samuel Beckett's waiting for Godot. New York, NY: Bloom's Literary Criticism
- Bonevac, (2003), “*Descartes Deduction, Introductory Symbolic Logic*”, Malden, MA, U.S.A.: Blackwell Pub.
- Cohen-Cruz, (2015), *Engaging Performance: Theatre as call and response*, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Charles I. Glicksberg, (Mar., 1951), *Freudianism v. Marxism*, Australian Institute of Policy and Science, Vol. 23, No. 1), pp. 104-112 (9 pages), The Australian Quarterly
- Deborah ,Weagel and John Cage, (2002), “Silence In John Cage And Samuel Beckett: 4' 33" And "Waiting For Godot", Vol. 12, *Pastiches, Parodies & Other Imitations / Pastiches, Parodies & Autre Imitations* Pp. (14 Pages) 249-262, Published By: Brill
- Descartes’s First Proof of God’s Existence in First-Order Logic (v. 8 n. 1 (2020): Dossiê “*Formas da Razão*”) at: <https://www.vidal-rosset.net/index.html>
- Dingli, Sophia Thomas N. Cooke, (2018), “Political Silence Meanings, Functions and Ambiguity”, E-book published in London Routledge, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315104928>
- Fadillah, Nur, et al., (2022), "The Act of Slavery in 20th Century as Reflected in Samuel Beckett's *Waiting for Godot*.", *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, vol. 13, no. 1, *Gale Academic*.
- Featherstone, Liza, (04.11.2022), At the Dawn of Capitalism, Catalyst, Jacobin journal
- Freud, S. (1920). *Dream psychology*. NY: Feedbooks.
- Freud, S. (1933). *New introductory lectures on psycho- analysis*. London, England: Hogarth Press.
- Freud, S. (1961). The ego and the id. In J. Strachey (Ed. and Trans.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 19, pp. 3 - 66). London: Hogarth Press. (Original work published 1923)
- Glic ksberg, Charles I (1970), “The Literature Of Silence”. *The Centennial Review*, vol 14, no. 2, pp. 166-176. JSTOR, [www.jstor.org/stable/23737709](http://www.jstor.org/stable/23737709) . Accessed 24 April 2021.

- Hussain, T. (2014). Theatre of absurd and Samuel Beckett’s “*Waiting for Godot*” as an absurd drama. *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)*, 3(11), 1479-1480.
- Immanuel Kant Critique of Practical Reason A LIBERAL ARTS PRESS BOO
- Jaworski, (1997), « A. Silence: Interdisciplinary Perspective », Martin Pütz and Neele Mundt (eds.)
- Kern, E. (1954). Drama stripped for inaction: Beckett's Godot. *Yale French Studies*, 14, 41-47.
- Lawley, P. (2008). *Waiting for Godot: Character studies*. London, England: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Lemak, A., (2012), “*Silence, Intercultural Conversation, and Miscommunication*”. Unpublished Thesis, Toronto University of Toronto.
- Marx, Carl, and Engels, Friedrich. *The Communist Manifesto*. United kingdom, penguin publishing group, 2002
- Picard, Max, (1988). “The world of silence”. Paperback
- Richard Dien Winfield, (1990) “The Method of Hegel’s *Science of Logic*”, in *Essays on Hegel’s Logic*, George di Giovanni (ed.), Albany, NY: State University of New York
- Roberts, J. L. (1980). Samuel Beckett’s “*Waiting For Godot*” & other plays. New York, NY: Hungry Minds