

[Radio broadcasting began in Germany in 1923 and spread quickly throughout the country with the systematic installation of public broadcasting stations. Dramatic material was used, beginning in 1924 with 'radio plays' produced for broadcast (*Hörspiele*) and after 1925 with 'broadcast plays' of theatre productions (*Sendespiele*). Brecht's own first broadcast took place in May 1925 when he read live from his works in the Berliner Rundfunk. Other plays by Brecht broadcast on radio included in 1926-7 *The Life of Edward II of England* as well as his radio adaptations of Shakespeare's *Macbeth* and *Hamlet*. In 1932 he adapted his *St Joan of the Stockyards* for radio broadcast.]

Young Drama and the Radio

More important than good living is: living in good times.

For a generation whose passion consists in writing plays it is no joy to be confronted with bad theatres, that is, ones unusable for their plays. But the times are good when the production side, far from supplying obsolete, worn-out and apathetic theatres, decides to eliminate this kind of theatre. Indeed, our production for this theatre is the kiss of death. On the other hand, today's theatre distorts our plays to the point of incomprehensibility, even when it works fairly well. Any other reproduction of our stage plays is better for them than that of the theatre. Even a film version would be more intelligible and persuasive.

Therefore the radio – a technical invention that still must create for itself a mass need rather than subordinating itself to an antiquated, exhausted need – is a grand, productive opportunity for our plays.

What I am trying to say is that I anticipated with much greater excitement the production of, say, *Ostpolzug* on the radio than in the theatre.¹

It is said that our works are only meant for the few or at least they are only suitable for a few. The first is untrue, the second unproven. Our plays are meant for many people, but not for that small elite of snobs who have already 'seen everything' and who claim on every street corner that they are the ones intended. The theatre has too long been the property of a small elite that claims to be the nation. It is no accident that today, when this elite clearly no longer represents the nation, the theatre is in decline and that an invention like the radio, which in a manner of speaking has a long way to go, is simply attending to the art that was previously the theatre's obligation.

It is said that the radio needs courage to take on art. But if these large, unencumbered, new institutions have no courage, who can?

It is obvious that you will get into an argument with someone more quickly in a conversation about present-day concerns, about some topical issue, than if you listen to transcribed conversations from the past. It is in the nature of our plays that they must provoke more opposition than those by people who provoked opposition in other times.

We also hear that the large number of listeners prohibits anything but very general presentations about matters that have already been decided. This sorely underrates the large masses. **Naturally it is easier to displease one person among a million than one among ten.**

But there are also more who are pleased. And in general it is more important and **ethical to please one single person than not to displease one hundred.** Usually the masses are considered to be too stupid. They are not stupid. It is probable that only a small minority of the masses understand, say, the theory of relativity. But does that mean it should be communicated only to a few? 

Whatever else art may have to rely on, it does not rely on aesthetic training. And whatever else may be necessary to make works of art, naive emotion is enough to appreciate them.

[GBFA 21/189–90. Written in late 1926 and published in *Funkstunde: Zeitschrift der Berliner Rundfunksendestelle* 1 (2 January 1927). Brecht wrote this text, his first theoretical contribution on radio broadcasting, as he was preparing his play *Man Equals Man* for radio broadcast, which was programmed on 18 March 1927 (director: Alfred Braun; music: Edmund Meisel). In a related article written several months later, 'On the Performance on Radio' (GBFA 24: 36–7), and printed in the programme magazine *Rundfunk-Rundschau* (Berlin, 13 March 1927), Brecht begins with the comment:

When my generation came on the scene after the War, the theatres by no means rejected us. They tried on the contrary to switch their suppliers immediately. For a time my generation saw in the theatres' strong demand a real opportunity. In reality we were the opportunity for the theatres; they had become old and uninspired and while they were still able to exploit the public's habit of attending the theatre, they were unable to justify it. The theatres were no longer able to exploit this opportunity. They were simply too old. The radio is something else and I believe it is better. It is certainly not too old to practise art, rather it is at most still too young. If the radio is perhaps unable to realize some dimensions of the new plays' impact, then – assuming some imagination and a certain general interest for the times on the part of listeners – the essentials can be grasped . . .

In a note written in 1928 Brecht still considered radio broadcasting to be an improvement over the 'old' theatre:

. . . **The radio is a terrifying, living proof of the bad state of current theatre.** If the theatre were doing its duty, then you would find only one person ready to sacrifice at least half of the pleasure of a play, which consists of seeing and the feeling of immediacy, in order to get the other half, listening, in a really cultivated way. (See 'Frische Stücke für Theater und Radio', GBFA 21/263.)]

Suggestions for the Director of Radio Broadcasting

1. In my view you should try to make radio broadcasting into a **really democratic thing.** To this end you would already achieve much, for example, if you were to cease producing only on your own for this wonderful distribution apparatus you have at your disposal and instead allow it to make productive *topical* events simply by setting it up and in **special cases perhaps by managing it in a skilful, time-saving way.**² It is perfectly understandable that people who suddenly get their hands on such a new apparatus immediately want to organize something to provide material for it and invent a new craft to provide them with artificial material. Already in the cinema I have seen with some distress how the Egyptian pyramids and the Indian Rajahs' palaces move to Neubabelsberg in order to be filmed by an apparatus that a man can comfortably slip into his backpack.³ **In other words I believe that you must move with the apparatuses closer to the real events and not simply limit yourself to reproducing or reporting.** You must go to the *parliamentary sessions* of the Reichstag and especially to the major *court trials*. Since this would be a great step forward, there will **certainly be a series of laws that try to prevent it.** **You must turn to the public in order to eliminate these laws.** The parliamentarians' fear of being heard throughout the entire country should not be underestimated, since it is justified, but they must overcome it, just like the fear that, I believe, various courts will express about having to announce their judgments in front of all the people. Moreover, instead of dead reports you can produce *interviews* right in front of the microphone in which the interviewees have less opportunity to prepare carefully thought-out lies, as they are able to do for the newspapers. *Debates* between recognized specialists would be very important. You can organize lectures with discussions in large or small spaces. But by means of advance announcements you would have to distinguish clearly all of these events from the run-of-the-mill daily programming of family music and language courses.

2. As far as production for the radio is concerned, as mentioned above, it should be a secondary concern but it should be much intensified. One seldom hears of works by really noteworthy composers for your institution. There is no value in having their pieces played occasionally in concerts and using them occasionally as background music for radio plays. Their works must be performed *on principle* for their own significance and works must be commissioned by them exclusively for the radio. As for radio plays, Alfred Braun has indeed undertaken some interesting experiments.⁴

The acoustic novel attempted by Arnolt Bronnen must be tried out and such experiments must be continued by others as well.⁵ For this only the best people should continue to be engaged. The great epic novelist Alfred Döblin lives on Frankfurter Allee 244 in Berlin. I can already tell you, however, that all these recommendations will come to naught because of the laughable, miserable honoraria paid by the 'Funkstunde' for such cultural purposes.⁶ In contrast to the very respectable pay for actors and other speakers, the literary fees are so low that in the long run work intended exclusively for the radio will not be written. In time you will have to create a kind of repertoire, that is, you will have to perform pieces at certain regular intervals, say, annually.

3. You must build a studio. Without experiments it is simply not possible to assess fully your apparatuses or what is made for them.

4. Especially for my last two points it is absolutely necessary that you account publicly for the astronomical sums of money radio broadcasting takes in and show to the last penny how these public monies have been used.

[GBFA 21/215-17. *Berliner Börsen-Courier*, 25 December 1927. Under the title 'How can radio broadcasts become more artistic and topical?' Carl Hagemann, the director of the Berlin Broadcasting Studio, published a contribution under the title 'The Director Himself', followed by Brecht's piece. Brecht's recommendations here were not particularly original but rather shared the concerns of many left-liberal intellectuals involved in discussions about radio in the mid-1920s.]

Radio – An Antediluvian Invention?

I can remember how I heard about the radio for the first time. There were ironic newspaper accounts about a virtual radio hurricane that was in the process of devastating America. Nonetheless one had the impression that it was not just a craze but something really modern.

This impression evaporated very quickly as soon as it was possible to listen to radio here too. First of all, we wondered where these tonal productions were coming from. But this wonderment was soon replaced by another one: we were wondering **what kind of offerings** were coming to us from the spheres. It was a colossal triumph of technology at last to be able to make accessible to the entire world a Viennese waltz and a kitchen recipe. An ambush, so to speak.

A phenomenon of the century, but to what end? I recall an old story in which someone demonstrates to a Chinese man the superiority of Western culture. He asked: 'What do you have?' The answer: 'Railways, automobiles, telephones.' 'I am sorry to have to tell you,' the Chinese man responded politely, '*we* have forgotten those already.' As far as radio goes, I immediately had the frightful impression that it was an unbelievably ancient apparatus, long ago forgotten in the deluge.

We have an old custom of getting to the bottom of all things, even of the most shallow puddles, if nothing better is around. We consume an enormous quantity of things of which we can get to the bottom. And we have very few people who are prepared, under the circumstances, to take a step back. In fact, we usually let ourselves be led around by the nose for the sake of *possibilities*. These cities, which you now see rising around us, undoubtedly come as a surprise to the fully exhausted bourgeoisie, used up by its deeds and misdeeds. As long as the bourgeoisie holds them in its hands, they will continue to be uninhabitable. The bourgeoisie judges them only according to the opportunities it naturally can derive from them. Thus the enormous overrating of all things and systems which promise 'possibilities'. No one bothers with results. They just stick to the possibilities. The results of the radio are shameful, its possibilities are 'boundless'. Hence, the radio is a 'good thing'.

It is a very bad thing.

If I were to believe that this bourgeoisie would live for another hundred years, I would be convinced that it will drivel on about the tremendous 'possibilities' to be found, for example, in radio. Those who appreciate the radio do so **because they see in it a possibility for which they can invent 'something'**. They would be proven right at the moment when 'something' is invented for whose sake the radio – assuming it did not yet exist – would have to be invented.

In these cities every kind of artistic production begins when a man comes to the artist and says he has a hall. At this point the artist interrupts his work, which he has undertaken for another man who has told him that he has a megaphone. For the artist's calling is to find something which later can be used as an excuse for having created the hall and the megaphone without thinking. It is a demanding calling and an unhealthy production.

I strongly wish that after their invention of the radio the bourgeoisie would make a further invention that enables us to fix for all time what the radio communicates. Later generations would then have the opportunity to marvel how a certain caste was able to tell the whole planet what it had to say and at the same time how it

enabled the planet to see that it had nothing to say.

A man who has something to say and finds no one to listen is in a bad way. Worse off are the listeners who can find no one with something to say to them.

[GBFA 21/217-18. Unpublished typescript from 1927.]

On Utilizations

1. The questions of how art can be utilized for the radio and how the radio can be utilized for art – two very different questions – must at some point be subordinated to the much more important question of how art and the radio can be utilized at all.

2. If we are right or are judged to be in the right, then this question will be answered in the following way: art and the radio must be put to **pedagogical purposes**.

3.

The possibility of implementing such a direct pedagogical utilization of art does not seem feasible **today because the state has no interest in educating its youth about collectivism**.

Art must intervene where the defect is to be found.

If seeing is not involved, it does not mean that one sees nothing, but equally that one sees an infinity of things, 'whatever you like'.

The effects would of course have to remain on the acoustic plane, but precisely this, that the lack of sight into . . .

[GBFA 21/219. Unfinished typescript from 1927; part 3 includes no text, while the last two sections are on a separate page and unnumbered.]

Explanations [about *The Flight of the Lindberghs*]

The Flight of the Lindberghs *not a means of pleasure but of instruction*

The Flight of the Lindberghs **has no value if it does not train**. It has no artistic value that would justify a performance not intended for this training. It is **an object of instruction and falls into two parts**. One part (**songs of the elements, choruses, sounds of water and motors,**

etc.) is meant to enable the exercise, that is, to introduce and interrupt it, which is best achieved by an apparatus. The other, **pedagogical part** (the Lindbergh role) is the text for the exercise: the participant listens to the one part and speaks the other part. In this **way a collaboration develops between apparatus and participant in** which accuracy is more important than expression. The participants speak and sing the text mechanically; they pause at the end of each line of verse; they read along mechanically as they listen to the text.

'In obedience to the principles: the state shall be rich, man shall be poor, the state shall be obliged to have many skills, man shall be permitted to have few, where music is concerned the state shall provide whatever requires special apparatuses and special skills, but the individual shall provide an exercise. Unchecked feelings aroused by music, special thoughts that may be conceived when listening to music, physical exhaustion that easily arises just from listening to music, these are all distractions from music. To avoid these distractions, the individual participates in the music, thus obeying the principle: doing is better than feeling, by following the printed music with his eyes and adding the passages and voices reserved for him, by singing to himself or in conjunction with others (school class).'

The radio not to be served but changed

The Flight of the Lindberghs is not intended to be of use to the present-day radio but to *change* it. The increasing concentration of mechanical means and the increasingly specialized education – trends that should be accelerated – call for a kind of *rebellion* by the listener, for his mobilization and redeployment as producer.

The Baden-Baden radio experiment

The utility of *The Flight of the Lindberghs* and the use of the radio in modified form was demonstrated at the Baden-Baden Music Festival in 1929. On the left side of the platform was the radio orchestra with its apparatuses and singers; on the right side with the score in front of him was the listener, who performed Lindbergh's role, i.e., the pedagogical part. He sang his part to the instrumental accompaniment supplied by the radio. He read the speaking sections without identifying his own feeling with that contained in the text, pausing at the end of each line of verse; in other words, in the spirit of an *exercise*. On the back wall of the platform was the theory being demonstrated in this way.⁷

Why can't The Flight of the Lindberghs be used as an object of instruction and the radio be changed?

This exercise helps to teach discipline, which is the **basis of freedom**. An individual will undoubtedly reach spontaneously for means to pleasure but not for an object of instruction that offers him neither profit nor social advantages. Such exercises only serve the individual in so far as they serve the state and they only serve a state that wishes to serve all people equally. Thus *The Flight of the Lindberghs* has no aesthetic and no revolutionary value independent of its application and only the state can organize this. Its proper application, however, makes it so 'revolutionary' that the present-day state has no interest in sponsoring such exercises.

Performance in a flawed concert application

The following example shows how the application determines the text: the figure of a public hero in *The Flight of the Lindberghs* might be employed to induce the listeners at a concert to empathize with the hero and thus cut themselves off from the masses. In a concert performance, i.e., a flawed one, at least the Lindbergh role must be sung by a chorus, if the sense of the whole is not to be completely ruined. Only *collective I-singing* (I am Charles Lindbergh, I am setting forth, I am not tired, etc.) can salvage something of the pedagogical effect.*

[GBFA 24/87-9. Text written in 1929 and signed by Brecht and Suhrkamp. It was first published in *Versuche 1* (Berlin: Gustav Kiepenheuer Verlag, 1930), introduced with the phrase 'parts of a music theory'. Co-author Peter Suhrkamp was involved with school music and school operas at the time and worked with Brecht as well on *The Rise and Fall of the City of Mahagonny*, 1930).

Lindberghflug: Ein Hörspiel (Lindbergh's Flight: A Radio Play) opened at the Festival for German Chamber Music in Baden-Baden on 27 July 1929. The final rehearsal was broadcast on the Silesian Radio Hour (Breslau) on 27 July, followed by broadcasts on stations in Frankfurt am Main (28 July) and Cologne (29 July). Ernst Hardt (Manager of Western German Radio Broadcasting in Cologne) directed the production, and Kurt Weill and Paul Hindemith composed the music, played by the Frankfurt Radio Orchestra. The radio play was developed as a report on the topical event of Charles Lindbergh's pioneer flight over the Atlantic Ocean in May 1927, documenting the event as the struggle of technology against nature (personified in the elements fog, snow and ice) and as the achievement of a collective rather than the triumph of an individual, heroic adventurer. Brecht conceived of the radio play at the festival with the speaker and the

*See *Versuche 2, The Mr Keuner Stories*, 'Suggestion, if the suggestion is not heeded' [the reference is to a Keuner story in the first volume of Brecht's *Versuche* (1930)]

listener (playing the role of Lindbergh) entering into a conversation for the radio audience. In other words, the fictional listeners were modelled as active participants by demonstrating how they should listen to the radio. He was not only thematizing the radio in a broadcast presentation but suggesting how the medium itself can transform social communication through its technological advantage: the ear is to become a voice.

Brecht revised the play for publication in 1930 and altered the title to *Der Flug der Lindberghs: Radiolehrstück*; for republication in 1950 he once again changed the title to *The Ocean Flight (Der Ozeanflug)* and the name of the character Lindbergh to the Flier owing to Charles Lindbergh's expressions of sympathy with National-Socialism.]

The Radio as a Communications Apparatus

Lecture on the Function of the Radio

Our social order is an anarchic one, if one can imagine an anarchy of orders, i.e., a mechanical and unconnected disarray of systems of public life that are themselves to a large extent already ordered. Our anarchic social order in this sense enables inventions to be made and further developed, which must then conquer their markets, justify their existence, in short, they are *inventions that have not been prescribed*. Thus there was a moment when technology was far enough advanced to bring forth the radio, while society was not far enough advanced to accept it. The public was not waiting for the radio, but rather the radio was waiting for the public. To characterize more precisely the situation of the radio: the raw materials were not waiting for methods of production based on public needs, but rather production methods were looking around anxiously for raw materials. *Suddenly there was the possibility to say everything to everyone, but upon reflection there was nothing to be said. And who was everyone?*

In the beginning one got by without thinking. One looked around where somewhere something was being said to someone and simply tried to **butt in and compete by also saying something** to someone. This was the radio in its first phase, as substitute: a **substitute for theatre, opera, concerts, lectures, coffeehouse music**, the local pages of the newspaper, etc.

From the beginning the radio imitated practically every existing institution that had anything at all to do with the distribution of speech or song. In this Tower of Babel cacophony and dissonance came forth that could not be ignored. In this acoustic department store it was possible to learn to breed chickens in English,

accompanied by the strains of the 'Pilgrims' Chorus' and the lesson was cheap as tap water.⁸ This was the gilded youth of our patient. I am not sure if it is finished yet but, if so, then this stripling, who needed no certificate of competence to be born, will have to start looking at least retrospectively for a *purpose in life*, just as a person will ask himself in more mature years, after he has lost his innocence, what he is actually doing in the world.

As for the radio's *purpose in life*, I don't think it can consist merely in prettifying public life. For that it has not only shown little aptitude, but unfortunately our public life as well shows little aptitude for being prettified. I am not against the idea of installing receivers in the refuges of the unemployed and in prisons (apparently someone thinks this will prolong cheaply the life expectancy of these institutions), but it cannot be the radio's main task to place receivers under the bridges as well, even if that represented an elegant gesture to provide those who wish to spend their nights there at least with the minimum, i.e., with a performance of the *Meistersinger*.⁹ Tact is necessary. Nor is radio in my view an adequate means of bringing back cosiness into the home and making family life bearable again, whereby it might rightly remain an open question whether what it cannot accomplish is even desirable. But quite apart from its dubious function (he who brings much, brings no one anything) the radio is *one-sided* when it should be two-sided. It is only a distribution apparatus, it merely dispenses.

And now to say something positive, that is, to uncover the positive side of the radio with a suggestion for its re-functionalization: radio must be transformed from a distribution apparatus into a communications apparatus. **The radio could be the finest possible communications apparatus in public life**, a vast system of channels. That is, it could be so, if it understood **how to receive as well as to transmit**, how to let the listener speak as well as hear, how to bring him **into a network instead of isolating him**. Following this principle the radio should step out of the supply business and **organize its listeners as suppliers**. Hence, any attempt by the radio to give a truly public character to public occasions is absolutely positive. Our government needs the activity of the radio as much as our court system does. If government or justice resist such activity, they are afraid and suitable only for the times prior to the invention of the radio, if not even prior to the invention of gunpowder. I know as little as you about the obligations of the Chancellor. It is the radio's responsibility to explain them to me, but among the obligations of the state's highest official is the job of informing the

nation regularly by means of the radio about his activities and their justification. The task of the radio does not end, however, with the transmission of these reports.

Beyond this it must organize the collection of reports, i.e., it must transform **the reports of those who govern into answers to the questions of those governed**. **Radio must make exchange possible**. It alone can organize the major discussions between business sectors and consumers about the norms for consumer goods, the **debates about raising the price of bread, the disputes in municipalities**.

Should you consider this utopian, then I ask you to reflect on the reasons why it is utopian.

Whatever the radio sets out to do, it must strive to combat the *lack of consequences* that makes almost all our public institutions so ridiculous.

We have a **literature without consequences**, which not only sets out to have no consequences itself, but also does all it can to **neutralize its readers by depicting every object and situation stripped of their consequences**. We have **educational establishments without consequences**, working frantically to provide an education which has no consequences at all and is itself the consequence of nothing. All our institutions that formulate **ideology see their main task in maintaining without consequences** the role of ideology, corresponding to a concept of culture in which the evolution of culture has already ended and culture needs no ongoing, creative effort. We will not examine here whose interests are served by having these institutions remain without consequences, but when a technical invention with such a natural aptitude for decisive social functions is met by such anxious efforts to maintain *without consequences* the most harmless entertainment possible, then the question unavoidably arises as to whether there is no possibility to confront the powers that exclude with an organization of the excluded. The slightest advance in this direction is bound to succeed far better than any event of a culinary kind. Any campaign with a clear consequence – that is, any campaign really aiming to intervene in reality, taking as its goal the transformation of reality, even if at the most modest points, for example, in the awarding of public construction contracts – any such campaign would secure the radio a quite different, incomparably deeper impact and endow it with a quite different social meaning from the current decorative attitude. As for the *technology* that needs to be developed for all such undertakings, it must work according to the principle that the audience is not only *be instructed* but also must instruct.

The radio's formal task is to give these instructional undertakings a degree of interest, that is, to make the interests interesting. One part, especially the part oriented towards youth, can even assume an artistic form. The radio's attempt to give instruction an artistic form would support efforts on the part of modern artists to give art an instructive form.

I explained an example of such possible exercises that can use the radio as a communications apparatus at the Baden-Baden Music Week in 1929 with *The Flight of the Lindberghs*.¹⁰ This is a model for a new application of your apparatuses. Another model would be *The Baden-Baden Lesson on Consent*.¹¹ Here the pedagogical role that the 'listener' assumes is both that of the airplane crew and of the crowd. It communicates with the role of the trained chorus provided by the radio, of the clowns, of the announcer. I will limit myself deliberately to an explanation of the *principles* because the confusion in the aesthetic domain is not the cause of the unparalleled confusion about the functional principle but rather its mere consequence. The error – for some a very useful error – about the radio's actual function cannot be rectified by aesthetic insight. I could tell you, for example, that the application of theoretical insights about modern drama, i.e., about epic drama, could bring about extraordinarily fruitful results in the domain of the radio.

Nothing is less appropriate than the old opera, which aims at the production of an intoxicated condition because it hits upon the individual at the radio receiver and of all the alcoholic excesses none is more dangerous than solitary tipping.

The old drama with Shakespearean dramaturgy is also hardly usable for the radio because at the receiver the lone, isolated individual rather than the integrated crowd is encouraged to invest emotions, sympathy and hopes in intrigues whose only purpose is to give the dramatic individual an opportunity for self-expression.

Epic drama, with its episodic nature, its separation of the elements, that is, its separation of the image from the word and the words from the music, but especially its instructional attitude, would provide many practical tips for the radio. But a purely aesthetic application would lead to nothing more than a new fashion and we have enough old fashions! If the theatre were to capitulate to epic drama, to pedagogical, documentary representation, then the radio could furnish a completely new form of propaganda for the theatre: real information, indispensable information. Such a commentary, closely allied to the theatre, an

adequate, worthy complement to the play itself, could lead to completely new forms, etc. Furthermore, direct collaboration between theatrical and radio performances could be organized. The radio could send choruses to the theatres, just as it could transmit to the public from the meeting-like collective performances of the learning plays the decisions and productions of the audience, etc.

I won't develop this etc., deliberately not speaking about the *possibilities* of separating opera from drama and both from the radio play or of resolving similar aesthetic questions. I know that you probably expect it from me because you intend to market art by means of your apparatus. But in order to be marketable, art must today first be purchasable. And I preferred not to sell you something, but rather to formulate the fundamental suggestion that a communications apparatus for the general benefit of the public should be made out of the radio. This is an innovation, a suggestion that seems utopian and that I myself admit to be utopian. When I say the radio or the theatre could do so-and-so, I am aware that the large institutions cannot do all they could, not even all they want. They want us to supply, to renovate, to keep them alive through innovations.

But it is simply not our task to renovate the ideological institutions on the basis of the existing social order through innovations. Instead our innovations must get them to abandon this basis. So: for innovations, against renovation! *By means of constant, never-ending suggestions about better applications of the apparatuses in the interest of the many*, we must shake up the social basis of these apparatuses and discredit their application in the interest of the few.

These suggestions, unrealizable in this social order but realizable in another, are nothing more than the natural consequence of technological development and serve the propagation and formation of this *other* order.

[GBFA 21/552-7. Typescript written in summer 1932, partially published in extracts and together with other fragments from Brecht's 'Explanations' about *The Flight of the Lindberghs* (see above) in *Blätter des Hessischen Landestheaters* 16 (Darmstadt, July 1932): 181-4. The typescript has handwritten notations that indicate Brecht had prepared it for oral delivery, but there is no record of when or where.

By this point Brecht's ruminations on the broadcast medium had meshed with his reflections on experiments in other media. The analysis of his radio experiments sustained his conclusions about the functioning of cultural institutions in a class society. The indifference of bourgeois artists to the changing modes of production contradicted the increasing

importance of technology for the maintenance and rationalization of capitalist society. His unsuccessful engagement in the filming of *The Threepenny Opera* provided the occasion to examine the implications of this attitude in another medium (see 'The *Threepenny* Lawsuit' in Part IV.)]

PART III

Early Screenplays *

(1921)