

*MY BRECHT: A LOOK FROM 2016*

*Introduction to BRECHT'S CREATION AND THE HORIZON OF COMMUNISM\*/ (7,000 words)*

I can only write this Introduction in the first person singular. It pretends also to a certain general validity.

1. Introductory

My first essay on Bertolt Brecht in a Zagreb periodical 1961, for the fifth recurrence of his death, was titled “Bert Brecht, the First Dramatist of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century” (see the appended Bibliography of my writings on Brecht, #27). This large claim was not only my own – I think it stemmed from Lion Feuchtwanger – but one widely shared by his fans, the Brechtians, however critical, of which I was one. However I do not propose here to defend my title, but instead to explain it today, without explaining it away.

First of all, and constitutive of my horizon, this manifesto-like encapsulation was part of my generation’s belief in the eventual international triumph of socialism and communism. Of course we knew it was one of three possibilities extant (capitalism, Stalinism, and the libertarian communism that we believed was coming about in SFR Yugoslavia) but we only vaguely if at all realised our choice was a kind of Pascalian optimistic bet. My title was a historiosophic position.

Second, the essay’s title does not claim for Brecht exclusivity but it does claim a pioneering, formally and orientationally *bahnbrechend und wegweisend* (groundbreaking and pioneering) status, like to the admiral ship of an icebreaker flotilla. I would today say that, within modernism itself there would be another possible pioneer with his own progeny, Anton Chekhov (understood as a dialectical playwright of deep unease plus sympathies and not as a Stanislavskian pseudo-realist). And at the horizon, but not visible for me until a few years later, was another patriarch: Beckett, probably sounding the knell of self-confident modernism. (Brecht knew of *Godot* and was attracted by it, hoping to perform it in the Berliner Ensemble slyly redone along socio-critical lines; I’m sure not even he realised in those last years of his life how radical a break this dramaturgy represented.)

One could (and many did) object to both of these points that Modernism as well as socialism -- to my mind, ideally and at their best Siamese twins – broke down as a critical and ideological dominant in the mid-70s and the advent of so-called Post-Modernism, which I however consider a world-historical aberration and shall not be discussing here. In theatre it was only possible at the price of destroying the cognitive conduit of living drama theatre: to me, too high a price.

Third, Brecht was of course not only a dramatist. He was first of all a poet, and as I wrote in the essay on Fredric Jameson’s great book about Brecht, had he not been a great poet, one of the perhaps dozen greatest of his time of great poets (say 1918-56), he would have been nothing. All that he wrote had a clearly poetical horizon in the sense of unexpected creative viewing of the rich but confusing and finally bloody reality of human relationships in his -- and my -- epoch, encapsulated by him also theoretically as “the effect or technique of estrangement.” He called it *Verfremdungseffekt* or *V-Effekt* in his hardboiled technospeak of the Leninist 1920s, and to my mind it is a way in which the artwork’s form makes you look freshly, closely, and soberly at your world. It participates of a staunch utopian hope, looking backward at our dark times from the imagined stances of a classless society.

Not least, Brecht was also a considerable prose writer. He was a quite major essayist, so that I would put, say, his *Five Difficulties in Writing Truth* into any anthology of great C20 essays, alongside Woolf’s *Three Guineas* and Lenin’s *How To Ascend a Mountain*. All of his life he was a writer of very interesting prose, in short and long forms. In the short form I wish to stress the

shortest ones, *Stories of Mr Keuner* and *Me-Ti*, inexhaustibly rich mines for understanding people within the existential politics of his time. Again, a few of them, like “If Sharks Were Men,” I would put into any anthology of short-short prose for modern times. The long form includes the great *Threepenny Novel*, which has gone unrecognised in spite of its satirical sophistication, not only worthy of Swift but also to be re-exhumed today that capitalism has thrown us back into the squalor and misery of the 18<sup>th</sup> Century which is the novel’s milieu, with its dastardly ultra-rich and beggarly masses -- but without the promise of Enlightenment, born of our historical 18<sup>th</sup> C and defeated 200 years later, yet still beckoning, not least in Brecht, as our only lighthouse above the shipwreck.

## 2. On the SFRY Milieu for Introducing Brecht

In SFRY, I can see that retrospectively, there was a chasm between us young communists and the opinion-makers in the Communist Party. On the one hand, the climate in SFR Yugoslavia was in the 1950s and right up to the late 60s mainly open to all kinds of neo-Marxism. We young ones were at that time calling it an “open Marxism.” I theorised the openness in theatre by means of Brecht’s “open forms” (also a synonym of Eco’s first theoretical book *Opera aperta*, which I used in my dissertation). Yugoslav socialism seemed at the time a sturdy tree on which you could graft many new things -- the Soviet selectionist genetician Michurin was very popular, also the US Burbank.

On the other hand, the problems on the Communist Party top were different; they had their hands full with economy and foreign policy. Also, culturally speaking the Party was very provincial in Yugoslavia: they just didn’t know what was happening in the world; the great Soviet and Weimar 1920s were erased and tabooed by Stalinism. For example, I was a kind of *protégé* of Marijan Matković, a prominent middle generation dramatist who was editor of the prestigious Yugoslav Academy of Sciences’ periodical *Forum* in Zagreb, a “krležijanac” (disciple of Krleža), as were we all on the Left. He was formally rather a pre-Modernist realist, and an extremely loyal fellow-traveller of socialism. I proposed to him some writings about Brecht, and he made a grimace and exclaimed, ‘Darko, Brecht in Yugoslavia!?!?’. This was ambiguous, maybe we weren’t yet up to Brecht, maybe he was too severe for us, but at any rate he was asynchronous to us (in his opinion; I disagreed).

Matković, a former head of the National Theatre, was of course in a way right: he knew well that there was an awful lot of resistance against Brecht, even visceral hatred, by the staid bourgeois theatre people (and I must say he finally published a long essay of mine on Brecht in 1965). Regardless of whether they were or were not Party members, the theatre people felt that Brecht endangered their whole way of relating to audiences, the whole edifice of what theatre was for. Many of them were either simple *routiniers* or at best more or less Stanislavskians – that is, interested in the psychology of the stage characters, even when those dealt with politics (as Matković’s plays for example did, in admirable antifascist ways). After Brecht became famous in Paris 1954, a few of his plays, usually indifferently translated and -- with a couple of exceptions -- badly directed (of course without any inkling of his directorial practice and views), followed the earlier performed *Rifles of Señora Carrar* from 1955 on, without much echo. A few younger directors, under the aegis of the old lion Gavella, went in for Ionesco or Beckett and equated dealing with supra-individual determinants of people’s behaviour simply with Stalinist brainwashing, which wasn’t true even for the best pieces of Socialist Realism. Now supra- or even non-individualist approaches are not new in theatre, I would argue most theatre up to the epochal break in the middle of Shakespeare was such, in some strange and fertile ways allegorical or parabolical. However, Yugoslav theatre was created in and deeply shaped by the German and French arch-bourgeois – individualistic and illusionistic -- 19<sup>th</sup> Century. And in truth economics is notoriously difficult to deal with on theatre, even Brecht managed to do so only at some of his heights, such as *St. Joan of*

*the Stockyards* – which I therefore analyse at length in this book -- and the “plays for learning”: as he wrote when still young, oil and the stock-market (their political role and economic ups and downs) cannot be accommodated within the pseudo-Aristotelian five-act scheme based on individualist psychology. In other words, the performers would have to deal with episodic situations offered to the audience’s understanding and critique rather than with an ideologically pre-ordained arch of tension through 3 or 5 acts, released in happy or unhappy catharsis.

In sum, since the pre-1950 Zhdanovian accusations of formalism didn’t wash any more in the SFRY, our Ibsenian “solid majority” now accused Brecht of insufficient formalism or of “sociologising” (mostly in bad faith compounded with ignorance, a deadly brew). And the Party top was still inept in dealing with plebeian autonomy from below. The first autonomous periodicals in the beginning and mid-fifties, I remember one at the Zagreb Faculty of Arts and one in Slovenia, were forbidden. Even though at that time first attempts at self-management were made in factory organizations, they were also strongly steered and limited from above, while the cultural attempts were thought of, wrongly, as a bit dangerous. What you don’t understand seems menacing; thus you cling to violent power and ossify. At their very best, my elders and betters implied that first we have to do the job of the Enlightenment, which they interpreted as getting “progressive” – mainly bourgeois – culture into the masses, and maybe after one generation we can get to the Brechtian, that is truly communist, agenda. I disagreed, I thought both agendas overlapped: communicating vessels, or maybe the DNA double helix.<sup>1/</sup>

### 3. Brecht through European Student Theatre

In this situation, how did I manage to get to Brecht, in the fifties still practically unknown in Yugoslavia, except for some Germanists – which I wasn’t, but my parents had gone to Austrian K.u.K. schools -- and the surviving elder Leftists who remembered singing his songs with Eisler’s tunes in prewar workers’ choirs? Indeed, after my 1970 book on him I got a letter from a woman worker with such memories; on my brief visit to Zagreb next Summer I tried to contact her but didn’t manage, there was no telephone (one of the prices expatriation, however gilded, exacts).

So, how could Brecht become my intellectual and artistic horizon in the Yugoslav 1950s? Simple: through the European student theatre movement.

I was deeply engaged in student theatre, which was one of the democratic forms of collective self-expression in socialist Yugoslavia. First I was from 1951 involved in the Zagreb Youth Cultural Society *Ivan Goran Kovačić*, which had its own theatre troupe. Later on that became the famous SEK (Studentsko eksperimentalno kazalište, Student Experimental Theatre), whose main director was for a while my friend Bogdan Jerković.<sup>2/</sup> I was a kind of dramaturge (art director) of SEK, neither nominated from above nor elected from below, just that there was nobody else to do it so I did it. We were part of an international body of Western and Central European student theatres, totally self-managing, which was an exciting space for the ‘68 youth and student movements: those didn’t come out of nowhere, they were incubating since the 50s. So we had four festivals each year, at Easter time in Parma, Italy; in middle of May in Zagreb, in June in Erlangen, West Germany, and in October, we had it first in Istanbul, but the Turkish police didn’t like that, so we shifted it to Nancy, in France (the head of the student theatre and festival in Nancy, Jack Lang, later on became a famous Socialist Party minister of culture). It was called UITU (Union Internationale des Théâtres Universitaires), and many prominent theatre, cinema, and TV shapers of my generation in Europe came together in it. In the “Preface” to my book *To Brecht and Beyond*, I characterised the central attitudes or stances arising out of these formative experiences as follows:

...the sense that the world is radically wrong and must be changed [this of course was Brecht and Marx, note 2016], and thus the acute sense of interaction between dramaturgy and existential or salvational politics, the sense of historical and inter-European heritage, the refusal to separate text and stage, the willingness *de prendre son bien où on le trouve*, be it Aeschylus, Lenin, Brecht, Marivaux, Kropotkin, Stuart Mill, Meyerhold or the Mysteries, the joyous internationalism of the intellectual eros, the deep sense of scale analogies between world and stage (i.e. of stage as world model)....

And I concluded about the essays in that book (from which chapters 1-3 of this book are taken) that any particular dramaturgy, by which I meant the shaping principles of both the play text and its performance, was

explainable by the historical constellation which permeated [it]. Not that I have any ideological commitment to History. Often, I felt like exclaiming with Joyce that history is a nightmare from which I would dearly like to awaken, Simply, ... a generation of intellectuals [between 1945 and 1968], hacking with pain and effort its way through the jungle of cities, in running battles both with capitalism and Stalinism, realised in its most intimate structure of feelings that it had been moulded by historical forces colliding in its flesh. With cool passion, we understood what generations of slower times and places might have disregarded: that history was, like it or not, our destiny.

Beginning with the fifties there was a big Brecht renaissance in two student theatres of West Germany, Frankfurt and Hamburg; this was the time of the maverick SDS (Sozialistischer Deutscher Studentenbund, people who were later demonstrating). They also produced some very interesting discussions, with personalities in Germany such as Karlheinz Braun or Claus Peymann (who much later became head of famous theatres, last of Brecht's Berliner Ensemble), and in France such as the *Théâtre populaire* journal people or Patrice Chéreau, who went on to become a famous director, also of movies and operas. They were focusing mostly on the supposedly peripheral Brecht: not *Galileo*, not *Mother Courage*, but his 1929-34 "plays for learning" (*Lehrstücke*), *Der Tag des großen Gelehrten Wu*, one of his workshop's adaptation in the early 1950s from Chinese, and much early anarchist Brecht. It was a hothouse of creative anarchocommunist: I well remember the shocked embarrassment caused in the staid petty bourgeoisie of Zagreb when the director Fritz Schuster (at whose home in Munich I usually stayed) inserted a character pissing at a corner during the failed revolution into the early *Drums in the Night*. A much huger scandal erupted in Erlangen when Brecht's son-in-law, the great actor Ekkehard Schall, came to recite some of Brecht's most communist poems in 1961 just after the Berlin Wall; right-wing students in the audience booed it with livid hate, a real theatre scandal in a nice 19th-century theatre. After I saw these plays I started reading Brecht.

I was vice-president of and a kind of kingmaker in UITU, an organization consisting mainly of Western Europe countries and Yugoslavia. The Russians were outside that organization; only exceptionally Polish student theatres would come to UITU events. Therefore the Union of Students of Yugoslavia, whose representative I was, forbade me to be president, they were afraid of Russian disapproval; it was part of Tito's balancing policy. Thus, I met Brecht in Germany, Italy or France -- Brecht's greatest world success was with *Mother Courage* in 1954 in Paris, when Roland Barthes and a whole group of intellectuals became Brechtians. After that I was collecting books and publications related to Brecht. I was spending my per diems of 25 DM for buying books while abroad going to these UITU meetings. A prominent feature of its four festivals were debates. I was the organiser of the debate programme of the Zagreb May IFSK meeting (Internacionalni festival studentskog kazališta), with a publication designed by Mihajlo Arsovski, today famous graphic designer, and I was editing the *IFSK Bulletin* with these debates, heavily influenced by Brecht. For us Brecht was anti-Stalinist and anti-capitalist, that is to say totally analogous to socialist Yugoslavia. I was then very naïvely of the opinion (quite wrong) that the revolution had happened, we have solved all antagonistic problems, and we are left only with material difficulties, cultural

backwardness, and remnants of the past that would be solved due to science, our wise leadership, and all that. OK, we've all had to mature – becoming, as Coleridge put it, sadder and wiser. But I do think Brecht was identical to the furthest plebeian horizons of the Yugoslav revolution, that is to say radical refusal of alienation (as discussed at length in *Samo jednom se ljubi*<sup>3/</sup>). *Verfremdung* actually is an epistemological method of denouncing and refusing *Entfremdung* – a technique of cognitive perception by estrangement reveals and potentially counteracts alienation.<sup>4/</sup>

In the student theatre there was a very interesting struggle between formalists and nihilists, say the Brecht wing and the Grotowski wing; creatively and communicatively, Grotowski was in the 60s soundly beaten. Then he went to New York and became world-famous from the 70s on as a guru for hip US theatre people such as Schechner, amid the defeat of the '68 movements and the historical change from Fordism to Post-Fordism. And he beat Brecht worldwide based on US ideological export during the dismantlement of the Welfare State. Of course Grotowski has some interesting things, he is a great director of actors, he knew quite a bit about Asian theatres, and his kind of Catholic existentialist background has its own strengths. But I didn't like that much, all that revelling in Christ's passion – blood, sweat, shit, and snot, no women allowed except as mourners.

#### 4. On What Is Inside and Outside This Book

Why is the present volume not a monograph on Brecht rather? I did this once in my life, as a pedagogical introduction to him for young Yugoslavs (#2 in the Bibliography); however, I tend to use Brecht's "episodic" construction in my own work too (I did so before I knew him, and was thrilled to find a master more modern than Shakespeare or Lope de Vega authorising it). Thus I have difficulties with monographs.

To my mind the essays/chapters in this book<sup>X/</sup> fall into maybe five groups: A/ no. 1, my initial stocktaking for a general approach to and significance of Brecht in "The Mirror and the Dynamo" (the title is a nod to my favourite nostalgic autobiographer, Henry Adams); B/ nos. 2-4, three essays on what I felt were his most urgent particular plays (*Mother Courage and Her Children* would be a fourth such play, and I wrote a little on it in ##15 and 3 of the Bibliography; *The Good Person of Setzuan* would be a fifth, but I didn't manage, and anyway I thought much good stuff had already been written about them); C/ nos. 5-6, two transversal essays about the concept and practice of stance or bearing (the not fully translatable *Haltung*) and the most enlightening use of emotions in Brecht; D/ no. 7, a second overview a third of century later sparked by the magisterial book by Jameson; E/ nos. 8 and 9, dealing with the two supremely important themes of Brecht's life and -- whether we acknowledge it or not -- all our lives: communism, as well as relation (of a male) to women. Chronologically, the fundamental essay no. 1 marks the thunderclap of Brecht's entry into my generation's delighted consciousness in the 1950s-60s, group B probes into particular plays during my teaching of dramaturgy in the 1970s and '80s, the transversal group C searches for points of support and encouragement in the increasingly dark decade of the '90s, attempting to learn from and incorporate the welcome "corporeal turn" of cultural studies. Cognition in general, I have argued in several essays, means a melding of conceptual work with topological work centred largely on emotions, where there is no difference between body and mind. The review article on Jameson at the end of the century as well as at the onehundredth anniversary from Brecht's birth is also an excuse to write at least brief suggestions, in lieu of a new book of mine, incorporating what I learned in the meantime, in the new mean times. The last group E is asymmetrical for reasons independent of my will: I haven't managed to write an encompassing essay or even sufficient probes into the theme of "Brecht and Women" (in his work and his life), but I thought one example is better than nothing at a time when reactionary falsifications of this theme have had some impact on the public perception of

Brecht. Thus, this book proceeds as a series of particular probes plus general sweeps, much as an explorer vessel maps the ocean ground not visible to the naked eye.

Of course, this grouping of mine mainly relies on chronology, which then follows the shifts dictated by our collective history impinging on me. Any reader is welcome to rearrange this grouping in his mind and (I hope) her rereading according to her interests and the new collective history.

What do I regret has not been included here -- either because I haven't managed to write it or because even the generous limits accorded to me by the proposal of Mestno gledališče (City Theatre) Ljubljana and the kind editor Dr. Milohnič are, necessarily, limiting? And what do I therefore hope the really interested readers might look up in my work?

I have remarked above on my failure to work much further on Brecht and women (though see Bibliography #24). The same holds true for work I did on Brecht's and Engel's early silent movie *Die Mysterien eines Friseurladen* (*The Mysteries of a Hairdressing Saloon*), which anyway made it into a lecture held in Germany and USA under the title "A Mute Inglorious Chaplin?". And finally, I had a major project of inquiring into Brecht's collaborations on the model of painters' *botteghe* (workshops) between Giotto and the Romantics, for which I gathered a lot of materials in Firenze and Berlin, but that got scuppered by the NATO war against Yugoslavia. Following it in Berlin, I decided esthetics would henceforth be a luxury for the likes of me and went on to write about political epistemology and ex-Yugoslavia.

One work I did finish was a double-barrelled interpretation of Brecht's *Koriolan* adaptation from the very early 1950s plus the Berliner Ensemble performance of it in the 1970s. I see the first as having a horizon of self-managing Leninism, with Coriolanus as Stalin (not quite adequate from what we know today). But I see the much later performance -- based on what I saw (with Weigel as the mother) and the stills in a black-and-white movie extant -- as a fall into mythical estrangement (Bibliography ##18 and 29). This double essay, however interesting in its trajectory, was just too complex and too long for this volume.

##### 5. A Vanishing Point, as Initial Prospect and Collective Hope

But what about a look forward? What can Brecht tell the readers for their future rather than about my past?

Well, beside and more than the above points, I regret mostly not having worked more on two consubstantial matters: Brecht and Communism, and the *Lehrstücke*, which were his idea of plays for an (at least incipiently and tendentially) communist cognitive audience. I have voluminous notes on the "plays for learning" that await the day when I might perhaps find time to go into them -- basing myself on Reiner Steinweg's insight that they are no interesting and poetic pseudo-radical aberration of Brecht's (as I myself at the beginning believed, but had come to disbelieve much before my 1993 retraction -- both in essay 1 here). It is important to record that due to the Brecht Heirs' refusal to allow performance of the *Massnahme* -- usually but dubiously translated as *The Measures Taken* -- until 1997, nobody could have understood the full intent of this most ambitious *Lehrstück* before that date<sup>5/</sup>: a wonderful example of synergy between anti-communist and "really existing socialist" censorship, in this case not exercised by the much maligned State. The interest and poetry of the "learning plays" lies in their being an independent and (only by reason of *force majeure* combining Hitlerism, Stalinism, and exile) not fully developed path and method of dramaturgy and performance, that deserves our utmost attention today, in ways both found and not found in Brecht. I have written quite a bit only on the first pair of *Jasager/ Neinsager* (*The Yeasayer and The Nay-Sayer*), especially since I have studied -- as much as a benighted foreigner who

has not learned Japanese in elementary school can – the Noh plays and performances, and in particular the source play which through Waley's adaptation and Elisabeth Hauptmann came to Brecht. This is a major essay (at least in length) which proved recalcitrant to this book's limits, although I'm rather proud of it and encourage the reader to look it up. It is identified in the Bibliography #4 and 32, exists only in those two Canadian and one Japanese venue, and so far as I'm aware has sunk without trace in both Japanology and Brechtology (a price paid for transgressions of professional boundary). I believe it throws much light on intercultural transmission and especially on Brecht's use of sources and uncanny understanding of deep structures in areas quite unknown to him (see also my article no. 9 on Hauptmann in this book). Furthermore, it speaks volumes about Brecht's concept of right or correct consenting, surely a key for understanding politics in the last hundred years or more, and to dying well in feedback with living well, surely a key to our individual existences.

I much hope the interested reader might supplement this book's choice with some of these essays, and thus in a small way counteract, in this perfectly sinful age of ours, its (and alas our) form of Destiny, capitalist finances.

As to the direct links between Brecht and communist politics, it is well known that both Brecht and Benjamin thought hard about becoming members of the communist party, but in the end they decided not to formally join a party already rather ossified by 1928/29. Nonetheless, ideologically Brecht considered himself a communist; or, as one of his friends described Brecht in USA in 1941-1947: "a party consisting of one person, closely allied with the communists" -- the best political definition about him that I know. As the early feminists talked about a failed marriage of Marxism and Feminism, his troubles in GDR testify to a failed marriage between Marxist once-upon-a-time avant-garde and artistic avant-garde. This generally had to do with arrogance on both sides: but in this case mostly by politicians who didn't have sufficiently sensitive antennas to understand positions like Brecht's but mainly considered themselves threatened by his propensity towards self-management; I argue in essay 7 of this book that the Berliner Ensemble was a Luxemburgian *Rat* -- council, Soviet -- amid Stalinist oligarchic power (see more also in Bibliography #26).

Last not least: Brecht's transposition of Marx's *Manifesto of the Communist Party* into verse is to me immensely fascinating. To begin with, if you believe in form plus stance (*Haltung*) being meaning, as I do, the two manifestoes are different animals, though obviously of the same family: a direct filial descent, yet with a new, shall we say motherly genome added (which is mainly about communism at the time of World Wars -- that's what Brecht even begins with!). Second, it raises the huge question of the relation between poetry and socio-political history, as I write there: "the history of relationships among people, in different social formations, in the struggles of classes differently shaping each formation." And further, significant poets were for me such followers of a doctrine who reshaped it, cognisers: "Brecht's voice is one of a teacher, no doubt, but of a peculiar one: a Socratic pedagogic facilitator, whose overriding maxim was that the learner is more important than the lesson. In other words: the Law is here for Humanity, not vice versa.... Marx's substance is transmuted in Brecht, as Brecht's ought to be in the reader facing any new situation – keeping however unchanged and constant the central and determining horizon of class liberation, and the vector of desire toward it."

All of Brecht's work, and his stance – most clearly in the estrangement device -- participates of such stubborn utopian desire, coextensive with his cognitive horizons of a refurbished communism as creativity (production) to make life easier for people.

Hence the title of this book.

This is also where a fertile future for Brecht studies and for all of us lies. We can take comfort from two magisterial overviews at the end of the past century, Haug's and Jameson's<sup>6/</sup>, but much remains to be said and above all done. What this work can do is (I hope) to show, always implicitly and sometimes explicitly, a possible future in the past. Go thou, my reader, say it and do it!

Notes

\*/ This is a book of essays being translated into Slovene for publication in 2016, edited by Aldo Milohnič and published in a series of City Theatre, Ljubljana, thus: DS, *Brechtova ustvarjalnost in horizont komunizma*. Ljubljana: MGL, 2016. Chapter titles are:

1. "The Mirror and the Dynamo: On Brecht's Anthropological Stance (1967)" (+ "Note 1993");
2. "*The Caucasian Chalk Circle* and Marxist Figuralism: Open Dramaturgy as Open History (1970)";
3. "Salvation Now, for All Flesh!: Structures of a Slaughterhouse World in *Saint Joan of the Slaughterhouses* (1974)";
4. "*Life of Galileo*: The Parable of Heavenly Food Denied (1986-90)";
5. "On Brecht's Bearings or Stance (*Haltung*) (1989-98)";
6. "Emotion, Brecht, Empathy vs. Sympathy. (1995-2008)";
7. "Centennial Politics: On Jameson on Brecht on Method (1999)";
8. "On Brecht's *The Manifesto* and on Poetry vs. Doctrine (2001-03)": Part 1. *Das Manifest* (402 lines); Part 2. "On Brecht's *The Manifesto*: Comments For Readers";
9. Appendix: "On Brecht and a Female Co-Worker (E. Hauptmann – 1998)."

1/ Much of section 2 and a part of 3 are adapted from "Communicating Vessels: Forms, Politics, History -- Interview with Darko Suvin by Sezgin Boynik. *Rab-Rab* [Helsinki] no. 2 Vol. B (2015): 5-37. Much more about the SFRY cultural climate can be found there, then in my *Memoirs of a Young Communist* 2, "Poslijeratni Zagreb: Cuvier i suhe kosti." *Gordogan* [Zagreb] no. 19-22 (2010): 127-94, and 3, "Poslijeratni Zagreb, književnost, Savez studenata: plodne doline." *Gordogan* no. 27-28 (2012/13): 111-57.

I wish to stress that such sections, dealing with memories, are inevitably coloured by personal and political stances both from the times discussed and from the time of the retrospect. I have written about this in my *Memoirs*, part 4 ("Uokolo Memoara." *Gordogan* no. 31-32 [2015]: 202-19) and assume that all such reminiscences are written under the sign of a hypothetical imperative, valid -- at best -- only so far as their premises are. There is a whole literature on this, of which the peaks are perhaps Maurice Halbwachs, *Les Cadres sociaux de la mémoire* and E. J. Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger eds., *The Invention of Tradition*; on newer writings see the excellent Todor Kuljić, *Kultura sećanja*, Beograd: Čigoj, 2006 (to whom my thanks) and Frida Bertolini, *Gli inganni della memoria*, Milano: Mimesis, 2016.

My thanks also go to the critique of Nenad Jovanović which made me change the ending from retrospect to (a very initial) prospect, and to some additional information about Brecht in F.R. („socialist“) Croatia by Branko Matan, who wrote about this in the special Brecht issue of *Prolog* no. 35 (1978): 91-130. He found out that a Left theatre group planned to perform Brecht's *In the Jungle of Cities* (*Im Dickicht der Stadte*) in 1935 but the group was forbidden and in part jailed by the monarchist police.

2/ See on student theatre and the general horizon within which it evolved my writings at the time, and retrospectively: Suvin, "Einige Überlegungen samt zwei Arbeitshypothesen über den

Horizont des europäischen Studententheaters, 1956-67," in *Liber Amicorum de Dragan Nedeljković*, ed.. M. Joković, Beograd-Nancy: n.p., 1993, 06-13; and on the theatre horizon in SFRY Suvin, "O Bogdanu, o sjećanju, o teatru kao utopijskoj radosti," *Gordogan* [Zagreb] no. 15-18 (2008-09): 197-203; [www.gordogan.com.hr/gordogan/wp-content/uploads/2011/10/2009-Gordogan-15-18-197-203-Suvin-ad-Jerkovic.pdf](http://www.gordogan.com.hr/gordogan/wp-content/uploads/2011/10/2009-Gordogan-15-18-197-203-Suvin-ad-Jerkovic.pdf).

3/ *Samo jednom se ljubi: Radiografija SFR Jugoslavije 1945.-72., uz hipoteze o početku, kraju i suštini...*, translation by M. Mrčela and DS, 2. edn. 2014, available at <http://www.rosalux.rs/bhs/samo-jednom-se-ljubi-drugo-izdanje>; the original but augmented version: *Splendour, Misery, and Potentialities: An X-ray of Socialist Yugoslavia* is forthcoming at Brill 2016.

4/ This is magisterially discussed by Ernst Bloch in "Entfremdung /Verfremdung: Alienation, Estrangement," translated by Anne Halley and Darko Suvin, *TDR/The Drama Review* 15.1 (1970): 120-25, and reprinted in Erika Munk ed., *Brecht*, New York: Bantam, 1972, 3-11. I have been writing quite a bit in these last 15 or so years on epistemology, which I think is where Brecht's *Verfremdung* belongs, see Suvin, "On the Horizons of Epistemology and Science." *Critical Quarterly* 52.1 (2010): 68-101; "Epistemological Meditations On Science, Poetry, and Politics." *Rab-Rab* [Helsinki] no. 2 Vol. B (2015): 39-53; and a number of essays on my site <https://independent.academia.edu/DarkoSuvIn/Papers>.

5/ This four decades' long *Verbot* was joined by Eisler's interdict to use his music for this play, the score of which is still not publicly accessible! *Die Massnahme* was practically co-written line by line by Brecht and Eisler in 1930. It is a very particular "learning play," intended for the workers' organisations of a future self-governing communist State. From the discussion of these last years, see at least Joachim Lucchesi, "Klangraum, Partizipation und Hör-Erfahrung: *Die Massnahme*," *Das Brecht Jahrbuch* no. 29. Madison: IBS – U of Wisconsin P, 2014, 112-24, and the works of Calico and Gellert-Koch-Wassen eds. cited in it.

6/ Wolfgang Fritz Haug. *Philosophieren mit Brecht und Gramsci*. Hamburg: Argument V, 1996 (rpt. 2006); Fredric Jameson, *Brecht and Method*, London: Verso, 1998 (rpt. 2010).

#### **D. SUVIN, BIBLIOGRAPHY OF WRITINGS ON BRECHT**

My records are not complete, especially for articles before 1985. I have been unable to fully collate the various variations, rewrites, reprints, and translations, but the cited publications should be correct, with some repetition between periodicals and books indicated. Titles of translations are indicated for Croatoserbian and for some variants.

For my essays not directly dealing with Brecht but generally with epistemology, emotion, and cognate matters touched upon in this Introduction, see my vita at <http://darkosuvIn.com/> and the papers on the site identified in Note 4.

#### **BOOKS OR IN BOOKS**

## VOLUMES AUTHORED

1. *Dva vida dramaturgije* (Two Aspects of Dramaturgy), essays on theatre. Zagreb: razlog, 1964 (on Brecht in essays: "Jedan pokušaj pučkog teatra" p. 147; #27 below, pp. 164-67).

2. *Uvod u Brechta* (An Introduction to Brecht). Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 1970 (contains my texts and the translations of 49 poems, *Life of Galileo* [with S. Goldstein], *Yeasayer-Naysayer*, and *Little Organon for the Theatre*; *Yeasayer-Naysayer* rpt. as "Onaj koji govori da i Onaj koji govori ne," in Bertolt Brecht, *Dramski tekstovi II*. Zagreb: Prolog, 1982, 171-89)

3. *To Brecht and Beyond: Soundings in Modern Dramaturgy*. Brighton: Harvester P, and Totowa NJ: Barnes & Noble, 1984, available at <http://monoskop.org/log/?p=9663> (contains 5 essays on Brecht, including variants of ##13, 15, and 17-18).

4. *Lessons of Japan: Assayings of Some Intercultural Stances*. Montréal: Ciadest, 1996 ("The Use Value of Dying: Magical vs. Cognitive Utopian Desire in the >Learning Plays< of Pseudo-Zenchiku, Waley, and Brecht (1993)," 177-216).

5. *Darko Suvin: A Life in Letters*. Ed. Ph.E. Wegner. Vashon Island WA 98070: Paradoxa, 2011 (contains "Brecht's *Life of Galileo*: Scientific Extrapolation or Analogy of the Knower? (1988-90)," "Brecht and Subjectivity: Stance, Emotion as Sympathy (1989-2006)," and "Centennial Politics: On Jameson on Brecht on Method (1998)."

6. *In Leviathan's Belly: Essays for a Counter-Revolutionary Time*. Baltimore MD: Wildside P for Borgo P, 2012 (also as e-book; contains essays "On Stance, Agency, and Emotions in Brecht (1989-2000)," "Brecht's *The Manifesto* and Us: A Diptych (2000-01)," and "Brecht and Communism: Reflections..." (2008)."

## VOLUMES EDITED

7. Bertolt Brecht, *Dijalektika u teatru* (Dialectics in the Theatre) -- selected, edited, and translated with notes and Preface. Beograd: Nolit, 1966. 298p.; 2nd augmented edn. 1980. 340p.

8. *Bertolt Brecht: St. Joan of the Slaughterhouses*, programme booklet -- selected, partly written, and edited. Montréal: McGill Univ., 1973. 40p.

9. Co-editor (with M.D. Bristol) of *A Production Notebook to Brecht's "St. Joan of the Stockyards."* Montreal: McGill Univ., 1973. 250p. (includes one essay of mine, "Saint Joan of the Slaughterhouses: Assumptions, Exchanges, Seesaws, and Lessons of a Drama Module," 227-50)

10. *Brecht's Koriolane*, programme booklet -- selected and edited. Montreal: McGill Univ., 1976. 40p.

## IN BOOKS BY VARIOUS HANDS

11. "Brecht, *Život Galilejev*" (introduction and transl. of fragments), in Antun Šoljan ed., *100 najvećih djela svjetske književnosti*. Zagreb: Svjetlost, 1962, 661-63.

12. "Praksa i teorija [Bertolta] Brechta," intro to #2 (rpt. in Tea Benčić ed., *Čuvari književnog nasljeđa 1*. Zagreb: Tipex, 1999, 420-38).

13. "The Mirror and the Dynamo," in Erika Munk ed., *Brecht*. New York: Bantam, 1972, 80-98 (original in *The Drama R.12.1* [1967]: 56-67; Croatian as "O Brechtovom estetskom stanovištu." *Scena* 4.2 [1968]: 155-70: rpt. in Lee Baxandall ed., *Radical Perspectives in the Arts*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972, 68-88).

14. "Brecht – An Essay at a Dramaturgic Bibliography," in Munk ed. (see #13), 229-40.

15. "Brecht's *Caucasian Chalk Circle* as Marxist Figuralism: Open Dramaturgy as Open History." *Clio* (1974): data lacking (rpt. in Norman Rudich ed., *Weapons of Criticism*, Palo Alto: Stanford UP, 1976; Croatian as "Brechtov *Kavkaski krug kredom* kao marksistički figuralizam," *Praxis* no. 5 [1971]: 733-43; German in *Die Pestsäule* [Wien] no. 2 [1972]: 120-34).

16. *Dramaturgy and Communication: The Closed and Open-Ended Models*. McGill University: Working Papers in Communication, 1982 [from a lecture in 1972, rewritten as "Brecht vs. Ibsen: Breaking Open the Individualist or Closed Dramaturgy," in #3, 56-79; Croatian as "Otvorena i zatvorena dramaturgija i komunikacija." *Republika* 29.10 [1983]: 29-41.].

17. "Salvation Now, For All Flesh!: Structures of a Slaughterhouse World (*Saint Joan of the Slaughterhouses*)," in Siegfried Mews and Herbert Knust eds., *Essays on Brecht*. Chapel Hill: U N. Carolina P, 1974 and 1979 (Croatian as "Sv. Ivana Klaonička." *Književna smotra* no. 89-90 [1993]: 3-15).

18. "Brecht's *Coriolan*, or Leninism as a Utopian Horizon: The City, the Hero, the City That Does Not Need a Hero," in Henrik Birnbaum and Thomas Eekman eds., *Fiction and Drama in Eastern and Southeastern Europe*. Columbus: U Ohio P, 1980, pages lacking (rpt. in #3).

19. "Brecht's Parable of Heavenly Food: *Life of Galileo*." *Essays on Brecht. Brecht Yearbook 15* (1990): 187-214.

20. "Heavenly Food Denied: *Life of Galileo*," in Peter Thomson and Glendyr Sacks eds., *The Cambridge Companion to Brecht*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994, 139-52 (Greek transl. in N. Valavani ed., *Bertolt Brecht: Kritikes prosengiseis*. Athens: Stachi Publ., 2002, 341-68, rpt. by Polytropos Publ., 2004).

21. "Sabine Kebir, *Ich fragte nicht nach meinem Anteil*" (review). *Brecht Yearbook 24* (1999): 386-96; shortened German transl. "Über Frauen und Brecht." *Weimarer Beiträge* no. 3 [1999]: 449-58).

22. "Haltung (Bearing) and Emotions: Brecht's Refunctioning of Conservative Metaphors for Agency," in T. Jung ed., *Zweifel - Fragen - Vorschläge: Bertolt Brecht anlässlich des Einhundertsten*. Osloer Beiträge zur Germanistik 23. Frankfurt a.M.: Lang V, 1999, 43-58.

23. "Haltung," entry in *Historisch-kritisches Wörterbuch des Marxismus*, Vol. 5. Hamburg: Argument, 2002, col. 1134-42 (sparked by but not only on Brecht).

24. "Sabine Kebir. *Mein Herz liegt neben der Schreibmaschine*" (review). *Brecht Yearbook 32* (2007): 420-24.

25. „Emotion, Brecht, Empathy vs. Sympathy“, *The Brecht Yearbook 33* (2008): 53–67 (rpt. in *Frakcija* no. 58-59 [2011]: 27-39; Croatian transl. „Emocije, Brecht, empatija naspram simpatije.“ *Frakcija* no. 58-59 [2011]: 14-26).

26. „Reflections on and at a Tangent from >*Bertolt Brecht und der Kommunismus*<.“ *Brecht Yearbook 34* (2009): 267-73 (rpt. in #6; different German version as "Bertolt Brecht und der Kommunismus" [editor's title], *Das Argument* no. 293 [2011]: 539-45).

#### ARTICLES IN PERIODICALS

27. "Bert Brecht, prvi dramatičar 21. stoljeća." *Književnik* no. 27 (1961): 330-32 (with my translations: "Bert Brecht: 4 pjesme," *ibid.* 333-35, and „Bert Brecht: Iz Malog organona za teatar,” *ibid.* 336-42).

28. "Paradoks o čovjeku na pozornici svijeta (praksa i teorija Berta Brechta)." *Forum* no. 7-8 (1965): (rpt. in #7).

29. "Brechtian or Pseudo-Brechtian: Mythical Estrangement in the Berliner Ensemble Adaptation of *Coriolanus*." *Assaph (Theatre Studies)* no. 3 (1986): 135-58.

30. "Brecht's *Life of Galileo*: Scientific Extrapolation or Analogy of the Knower?" *Forum Modernes Theater* 5.2 (1990): 119-38 (rpt. in #5).

31. "Brecht: Bearing, Pedagogy, Productivity." *Gestos* 5.10 (1990): 11-28 (Croatian as "Brecht: držanje, pedagogija, produktivnost." *Frakcija* no. 6/7 [1997]: 98-109).

32. "The Use-Value of Dying: Magical vs. Cognitive Utopian Desire in the 'Learning Plays' of Pseudo-Zenchiku, Waley, and Brecht." *Brock R.* 3.2 (1994): 95-126 (rpt. in #4; somewhat different Japanese version in "Shinu koto no shiyô kachi: Gi-Zenchiku to Burehito no 'kyôiku geki' ni okeru majutsuteki/ ninchiteki ûtopia ganbo (Weirii o zero opushon toshite)." *Hihyô kûkan [Critical Space]* no. 10 [1993]: 110-33).

33. "On *Haltung*, Agency, and Emotions in Brecht: Prolegomena." *Communications from the Int'l Brecht Society* 24.1 (1995): 65-77 (rpt. in #6 and in *Frakcija* no. 8 [1998]: 116-20; Croatian as "O držanju, djelovanju i osjećajima kod Brechta: prolegomena." *Frakcija* no. 8 [1998]: 92-97).

34. "Centennial Politics: On Jameson on Brecht on Method." *New Left R.* no. 234 (March-Apr. 1999): 127-40, available on [www.newleftreview.net/Archive.asp](http://www.newleftreview.net/Archive.asp) (rpt. in #5 and in *Kamen'* [Italy] no. 17 [2001]: 91-109; German transl. in *Dreigroschenheft* [1999] and shortened in *Das Argument* no. 232 [1999]; Croatian transl. "Stoljetna politika: o Jamesonu o Brechtu o metodi." *Republika* no.5-6 [1999]: 173-86; Slovene transl. *Primerjalna književnost* no. 1 [2006]).

35-36. "Bertolt Brecht: *The Manifesto*" (transl.) and "On Brecht's *The Manifesto*: Comments for Readers in English." *Socialism and Democracy* 16.1 (2002): 1-31, <http://sdonline.org/31/the-manifesto/> and <http://sdonline.org/31/on-brechts-the-manifesto-comments-for-readers-in-english1/> (rpt. in #6; second item in different German version as "Brechts Gedichtfassung des Kommunistischen Manifests." *Das Argument* no. 282 [2009]: 607-15).

37. "Brecht's Philosophy of Practical Living: The *Haltungen* (Bearings) of Learning, Producing, Love." (lecture; shortened version transl. into Greek in *He epokhe* [Athens] Jan. 11, 2009, p. 33).