

**LESSONS FROM BRECHT: a Brechtian approach to drama, texts and education.**

Anton Franks (Music and Drama, Institute of Education, University of London) and Ken Jones  
(Department of Education, Keele University)

Correspondence to: A. Franks, Institute of Education,

20, Bedford Way, London WC1H 0AL

email: for anton franks — [a.franks@ioe.ac.uk](mailto:a.franks@ioe.ac.uk)

for ken jones — [eda51@cc.keele.ac.uk](mailto:eda51@cc.keele.ac.uk)

## **LESSONS FROM BRECHT: a Brechtian approach to drama, texts and education.**

### **Abstract**

In this piece the authors seek to re-read Brecht in terms of his contribution to drama education and pedagogic thought, rather than viewing him in conventional terms as a cultural icon and ‘great practitioner’ of theatre. The authors believe that a Brechtian conceptual framework, with its emphasis on critical production and critical audiences, is still pertinent to the conditions of contemporary cultural production. A Brechtian framework is seen as a way of taking drama education beyond the conventional polarities where on the one hand it is seen as a process of moral and social education dealing with universal truths, or on the other hand, as a set of formal and critical techniques.

## **LESSONS FROM BRECHT: a Brechtian approach to drama, texts and education.<sup>i</sup>**

### Why return to Brecht?

In what follows we want to take another look at the work of Bertolt Brecht and examine its relevance to contemporary debates around education and culture. It is appropriate to make a return to Brecht's work at this stage in history because we feel that an engagement with his ideas can still raise productive questions about the connections between a critical perspective, cultural production and education. In looking for the more specific relevance of Brechtian ideas to drama education, we note that, although Brecht still appears as an object of study, as an icon of theatre history and as the originator of certain formal techniques and conventions of drama, there is little acknowledgement of the impact of his thinking and theatre practice on the political ideas which underlie the pedagogy of the drama classroom. In this project, therefore, we seek to operate on two connected levels. First, at the broadest level, the ways in which Brechtian ideas about cultural production in general and theatre production in particular can be read beside, or against, developments over the past two decades in the broader domain of cultural politics and education. Second, the ways in which Brecht's writings on theatre have a direct bearing on the politics of classroom practice.

The analysis of the broad context of cultural politics as it affects education serves as a 'back-drop' to this paper. We have not found it easy to choose the relative weight we should give to each level of analysis — that is, broad political currents on the one hand and, on the other hand, specific classroom practice — so ideas around the relevance of Brecht to the broad level of cultural policy and education are more fully developed elsewhere.<sup>ii</sup> The main purpose here is to examine the ways in which questions raised by engaging with Brechtian ideas might inform the politics of classroom practice. This is particularly relevant to those subjects which seek to engage students *in* and *with* forms of cultural production — particularly focusing on drama education, but with an understanding that this analysis has implications for English and Media education.

### The broader context of analysis

At a broad level, in examining successive moves to formulate and reformulate the National Curriculum in England and Wales over the past five years, we see that culture has become the focus of an explicitly political project in education. In the orders for the teaching of English, for example, the teaching of 'standard' English has been made a principal core, laid down as a measure against which to set the use of other kinds of (non-standard) English. In the teaching of literature, we are

directed to pay attention to a specific and prescribed canon, setting this beside a non-specified array of ‘non-literary’ and ‘popular’ forms of published and broadcast texts (DFE, 1995, *English in the National Curriculum*). Drama, albeit somewhat ambiguously and ambivalently, has remained as part of the ‘core curriculum’ under the legislated Orders for English in the UK, where it is treated either as a mode of learning in the development of language repertoire, or as a sub-section of literary studies. At the same time, we have seen it survive and flourish as a separately timetabled subject outside of the National Curriculum, where it has increased its popularity as an optional subject for public examination at both GCSE for students aged sixteen years-old and over and at Advanced Level for students aged eighteen and over.

Behind the particular and pragmatic measures to exclude it from the curriculum officially sanctioned by central government, there is a political current which draws impetus from a concern to return to ‘traditional values’. It is possible to see this as a reaction to a world of rapid technological innovation alongside social instability and fragmentation. The conservative cultural project, therefore, seeks to re-establish the value of traditional forms of representation (a ‘standard’ form of language, a canon of ‘great literature’) in an attempt to forge social and cultural cohesion, a shared sense of ‘audience’, or a ‘common culture’.<sup>iii</sup> This conservative project in the politics of culture and education continues on its course even after the election of the New Labour government in the UK.

### How we make use of Brecht

As an intellectual and as a practitioner, Brecht was particularly concerned with issues of learning and teaching, pedagogy and didacticism. He was as much concerned to teach *through* forms of theatre as *about* them. As a dramaturg, Brecht was at once a political theorist and a practitioner of politicised theatre — his theatrical art was intended to be educative, a source of aesthetic pleasure, and a basis for political argument and action. There are two broad factors, then, which make Brechtian thought attractive to us and which make a re-examination of his work particularly salient to current conditions in the educational field, especially to those subjects which might fit into the category of ‘cultural education’. First, his elaboration of a large-scale, coherent, political framework, based on the “vast precepts” through which he insistently situates cultural production within a broader social and political context (Brecht, 1977, p. 82). This breadth of vision is currently necessary, we feel, to answer moves from political and cultural conservatives in the field of education, moves which are conceived of in terms of large-scale, political concepts. Second, and of crucial importance to us here, is Brecht’s insistence on the inextricable relationship between

critical theory and critical practice, especially in dramatic forms and modes of production. The predominance of dramatised forms in contemporary, global and broadcast ‘mass media’, that have been pointed to by Raymond Williams (see, for example, 1965 & 1975), and his successors and elaborators, such as Paul Willis (1990), means that those involved in drama education and allied disciplines face a heavy responsibility to maintain a critical reflexivity when teaching through and about dramatic modes and forms of production. Despite the multiplicity of forms and their multifarious nature, the processes of ‘mass’ production and distribution in the broadcast media tends to paint a gloss over the difference between the various social interests that are represented — our intention is to use Brechtian ideas as the basis of a critical framework that might allow the possibility of critical reflection.

From re-reading Brecht’s writings on theatre and cultural production drawn from different sources, we identify his major concern with *audiences* and the ways that they are situated in relation to the *forms* and *traditions* in cultural life. He developed ideas that we can employ to challenge, or at least to throw into question, the ways in which conservative, cultural projects affect education. At this level, then, we are taking a broad and critical view of the prominent features of the educational field, especially the ways in which currents in the politics of culture and the politics of education have merged together to transform this landscape.

In the main body of this piece, we shall begin by looking at some of the problems of using ideas derived from Brecht when we transpose and apply them to the condition of contemporary cultural life. After this, we will be using the concepts of *tradition*, *form* and *audience* to elaborate some strands of a conceptual framework which, we suggest, might be used as a basis for critical reflection and analytical thought in approaching the complexity of contemporary cultural life. In thinking about tradition and form we shall be concerned with *what* and *how* we teach. There are questions which our re-examination of Brecht raise about the resources we deploy and the content of our lessons, and then the kinds of processes, forms of pedagogy that we teach by. The sense of audience is useful when we come to consider *why* we should be teaching about dramatic forms of cultural production. This is in an attempt to come to terms with the resources young people might need to use and apply in an age when we are immersed in a variegated and multi-formed culture, a culture that is significantly constituted by many and various forms of dramatic representations — film, television (terrestrial, satellite and cable), videos (pop music, commercial and illicit film, ‘home-movies’), advertisements and so forth.

Let us try to be clearer about the level on which we are operating. We are not discussing the details of pedagogy, nor anything that has happened in actual classrooms (see, for example, Winston's and Cabral's papers, 1996). We are not suggesting a new way of doing Brecht in the classroom as it is quite clear that particular Brechtian techniques are part of current educational practice in drama — techniques such as 'thought-tracking', 'tableaux' and 'montage' derive their strength from Brechtian theatre. Neither are we writing an analysis of the current curriculum debate. We are making an argument for locating Brecht's technique in the context of his overall social project. That is why we want to concentrate here on the conception and role of audience, because Brecht's formal innovations related to his conception of the social interests of those whom he hoped to address.

We are turning to Brecht because we want to re-open the question of cultural form and social interest. We want to promote a discussion of pedagogy and curriculum from a point of view which sees education as a site where the formal curricula encounter student culture. The present National Curriculum in the UK does not frame things in these terms. But when learners, conceived as active social beings, are placed in the centre of the frame, then the questions of pedagogy are concretely reposed. Hence the value of returning to Brecht, looking at him from a new angle, not as a *meister* playwright but as someone involved in a cultural dialogue out of which comes experimental work. In this respect, theatre practitioners writing on Brecht have provided us with some suitably instructive aphorisms — Edward Bond states in reply to an article by Peter Holland, "We should begin with Brecht but we shouldn't end there" (*Theatre Quarterly*, 3/30, 1978, p. 34), and in a similar (if a somewhat declamatory, Maoist) style, Heiner Müller writes "To use Brecht without criticising him is to betray him" (*Theater*, Spring 1986, p. 31). Following in the spirit of these calls for revaluation (and transformation) of Brechtian ideas, we shall proceed by noting the problems and adjustments that need to be made to the Brechtian framework in applying his ideas to the contemporary field of education and culture. Through this, we shall also be acknowledging some of the criticisms of Brecht that have emerged in the writings of theatre critics and practitioners over the past twenty years.

### Some problems of using Brecht

The problems involved in our use of Brecht are essentially problems of transposition. There are two subsections to this: first, the problem of transposing his writings on theatre and making them relevant to classroom settings in the broad sphere of education; second, the problem of transposition through history, updating ideas laid down through the mid-century to the social, economic and cultural conditions that prevail in the late part of this century.

Although we have noted that Brecht was concerned with issues of pedagogy and didacticism, his chosen medium was dramatic and his enterprise was located in the institution of theatre, not the institution of schooling. We can neither simply substitute the teacher for the actor, nor the students for audience. If we penetrate deeper into this problem, however, we find that the traditional boundaries between different institutions and the defining relations between, for example, performers (and performance) and audience are brought into question.

In order to transpose Brecht into a classroom context we need to make adjustments in, for example, his definitions of performance and audience and the relationship between them. We say “adjustment”, rather than full-scale reinterpretation, because we find in Brecht’s writing on the *Lehrstücke* a basic principle which can be extended towards educational settings.

Writing for the *Left Review* in 1936, Brecht, translating the term *Lehrstücke* into English as “the learning-plays” (1964, p. 79), went on to say that they “were meant not so much for the spectator as for those engaged in performance. It was, so to speak, art for the producer, not art for the consumer” (1964, p. 80). Here we have a notion of a dynamic interaction which fits more easily with the relationship between teacher and learner in a subject like drama, where both parties are claimed to be active producers of meaning, mediated through conventionalised patterns of interaction (introduction and discussion of lesson content, instruction for activity, comment and analysis etc.) and conventions of form (the exploratory role-play, the improvised scene, the textual study and so forth). Although it’s not a term that Brecht would have used in his time, what we might now call the ‘*animateur*’ functions of the theatre — writer, director, actor — are conflated and concentrated in the role of teacher, providing the structure for activity and, dependent on particular purposes and circumstances, the teacher may make opportunities for students to take the *animateur* functions for themselves.

Earlier in the same article, Brecht refers directly to the dynamics of power in the economic and institutional functions of schooling which place a complexity of restraint around learning (1964, p. 72). Prominent in current political discourses around the function and meaning of education and schooling, we find a spectrum of overlapping arguments. Nick Tate, the Chief Executive of the curriculum and assessment authority in the UK, for example, sees schooling as the engine of social responsibility, as the ‘glue’ that binds together a common, coherent, cultural heritage in the face of cultural and economic changes brought about through technological innovation and a revolution in

global communications and economic globalisation. These changes have led to more culturally and ethnically diverse societies and have been brought about by geographical and social mobility, shifting patterns of employment and changes in family structures.<sup>iv</sup> Education, curriculum and the institution of schooling are seen to mitigate against the tendency towards fragmentation. Now, we find New Labour reinforcing these arguments and continuing to stress the importance of education as a training and preparation for new kinds of workplace and new of kinds leisure.<sup>v</sup> These positions take little account, however, of the ways that the institution of schooling, through its formal curricula, meets with the culture that students bring with them into school.

This is not to argue that layeredness and complexity are contemporary phenomena of ‘late modern’ culture — Brecht, in his time was also alert to the complexity of the relation between cultural production and audiences and the implications of cultural circulation. His critique of conventional theatre led to a conception of a new relationship between cultural event and audience which, in turn, demanded a new conceptualisation of audiences — of their interests, demands and conditions of life. In *Appendices to the Short Organum*, for instance, he reflects on the “contradiction between learning and enjoyment” — under prevailing social arrangements, it is mistaken to think that audiences can ever take simple pleasure in a theatre which seeks to be simply didactic (1964, p. 276). What emerges from this is a notion that there is a complex and sometimes difficult set of relations between texts, how they are produced, who produces them and how they are ‘consumed’. Boredom, the rejection of intended meanings, the refusal to find pleasure in a text, are not so much signs of an audience’s cultural incapacities, as of the mismatch between the sense that literature contains of its own value and how this is set against the needs and attitudes arising from the everyday experience and interests of its potential readers.

Notions of the diversity of interest represented in audience groups, of the complexity of relationship between audience to the circulation of cultural artefacts, brings us to consider the ways in which Brecht conceived of the formation and constitution of audience. Brecht’s adherence to a definition of the people as an inclusive and essential category, derived from his involvement with ‘popular front’ politics, sits at odds with contemporary perspectives that deal with the diversity of social groups and interests in the late twentieth-century. Current critical perspectives tend to frame questions around issues of marginality, difference and position in order to account for the complexities in relative positions of power and powerlessness, differences of interest and so forth. Central to current critiques of Brecht is the way in which he conceives the issue of social, economic and cultural differences in terms of class. His inclusive and essential categories of ‘the people’, or



‘the broad masses’ are viewed as sharing common interests and pursuing common goals. Take, for instance, the peculiarly pastoral and idyllic colour of the following description of the working people, appearing in his most sustained theoretical work, *A Short Organum for the Theatre*—

Our representations of human social life are designed for river-dwellers, fruit farmers, builders of vehicles and upturners of society, whom we invite into our theatres and beg not to forget their cheerful occupations while we hand the world over to their minds and hearts, for them to change as they think fit. (1964, p. 185)

In reading such pronouncements, we need to be alert to the edge of practised irony in Brecht’s representation of the masses, yet if we take a look around classrooms of the late ’nineties, it is nevertheless difficult (if not impossible) to identify the children of working people engaged in “cheerful occupations” as sharing common interest or pursuing common goals. Now, more even than in Brecht’s time, we are forced to re-define the more traditional approaches to social class when we are faced with groups of school students differentiated and divided by gender, culture, geographic derivation, and prospective employment status.

Brecht’s tendency to view the masses as pursuing common interests needs modification, then, if we are to take into account the diversity of cultural interests represented in contemporary classrooms. In the poly-cultural context of contemporary schooling, taking note of ‘post-colonial’ critique, we ought to raise some general questions around the use of non-European forms to expand, enliven and establish new theatrical traditions in the West (see, for example, Spivak, 1988 & Bharucha, 1990). In Brecht’s notes on Chinese acting, for example, it becomes clear that he is developing a notion of ‘making strange’ — *Verfremdungseffekt* — achieved as a technique of acting (as distinct from the use of placards or music to interrupt the flow of action) derived from the Chinese aesthetic of performance (1964, pp. 91-99). Whilst he acknowledges the problems of transposition and raises criticism of its association with mysticism and mystification in the Chinese context, he has little problem in studying and applying it “for quite definite social purposes” in his epic theatre (1964, pp. 95-96). Taking this point about cultural eclecticism and transposing it to take a view of the place of tradition in poly-cultural classrooms, we ought to raise critical questions about the ownership, appropriation and expropriation of cultural traditions in the increasingly trans-national and global mainstream of ‘mass culture’. What does this kind of appropriation of cultural forms, drawn from diverse traditions, mean when we consider the relationships between forms of representation, the producers of the forms and the position of various members of an audience? In short, how do students from diverse cultural backgrounds position themselves in relation to the

prevalent dramatic forms they encounter in everyday life, forms mediated, for example, through television and video? In looking at the National Curriculum, how do they view the ‘canonised’ forms that they are required to engage with within the current curriculum, Shakespeare, for example, and other forms of pre-twentieth century literature?

Gender issues also come into play here. From a feminist perspective it is not sufficient that Brecht adopts the traditional Marxist line of eschewing ‘woman’s double burden’ — the burden of waged labour in the workplace, and the burden of unwaged labour and sexual exploitation in the home.<sup>vi</sup> In *The Mother* and *Mother Courage*, for example, the oppression and exploitation of women is not raised as a substantive and explicit issue in its own right, but is subsumed under an overarching concern with class struggle. In her article ‘Brechtian Theory/Feminist Theory’, Elin Diamond deals concisely with these issues —

Brecht exhibits a typical Marxian blindness towards gender relations, and except for some interesting excursions into male erotic violence, he created conventionally gendered plays and too many saintly mothers (one is too many).

(1988, p. 83)

These critical notes notwithstanding, it is also important to say here that there has been much in the way of productive engagement with Brecht’s work and Brechtian approaches from feminist theatre critics and practitioners.<sup>vii</sup> In her article, for example, Diamond (1988) proposes “an intertextual reading” of key points of Brechtian theory with contemporary feminist theory.

Despite his tendency to present the mass of the working people as a unified group, Brecht, writing against Lukács (1977, pp. 79-81), argues for a complex conception of a *popular form* of art-making, informed by a sense of the complexity of the mass audience —

It is precisely in the so-called poetical forms that ‘the people’ are represented in a superstitious fashion, or, better, in a fashion that encourages superstition. They endow the people with unchanging characteristics, hallowed traditions, art forms, habits and customs, religiosity, hereditary enemies, invincible power and so on.

(1977, p. 80)

A bit further along, Brecht defines the popular audience as an active force, ‘...a people...who make history, change the world and themselves. We have in mind a fighting people and therefore an aggressive concept of what is *popular*’ (ibid.). He sees, therefore, a popular audience united by

common interest, active in opposition to prevalent and dominant forces of control in domains of cultural production.

Taking a global view of changes in the forms of cultural production, their accessibility, impact and distribution, we shall conclude this section by gathering a few explicit points about changes in mass communications that Brecht would not have been able to predict.<sup>viii</sup> First, changes in the ways that cultural forms are made in this age of electronic production make Brecht's formulation of 'art-as-production', his emphasis on the artist as artisan, seem curiously anachronistic and nostalgic. A second, connected point, is that, in parallel with the emergence of new technologies, the cultural field is now hugely associated with and implicated in the commodification of culture, the creation of a global market-place of cultural artefacts. Third, this entangled relationship between cultural, economic and political structures has created an encompassing, web-like structural process in which critical, or oppositional forms of cultural production have been taken up more rapidly into what appears to be a 'mainstream' culture. This notion of a unified, mainstream culture is, however, largely illusory and derives from the fact that broadcast media appear to be able to make seamless links between quite diverse (and sometimes counterpoised) forms and representations. A power of transformation is exerted in this process — the power to incorporate, absorb, accommodate, diffuse and, ultimately, to defuse the sting of critical gesture.<sup>ix</sup>

The overriding purpose of the Brechtian project in theatre was “to render reality to men [*sic*] in a form that they can master [*sic*]” so that they might discover “the causal complexes of society” (1977, pp. 80-81). These are principles that are not alien to the purposes of education. However, the complexities of contemporary society and culture in the complex distribution of diverse cultural forms, the variety of audiences, differences of need and interest for different 'audience' groups, the demands of the cultural economy, all these factors have huge implications for shaping the field of education and culture. In promoting and protecting the social, cultural and economic interests of our students in subjects such as drama, we should be aware of the ways that, of necessity, students have to be active producers of meaning so that they are in a position to be both a critical audience and makers of their own forms of representation.

#### Drama educators and their use of Brechtian ideas

As one of the major, innovative theatrical figures of this century, one might expect that writers on the theory and practice of drama education would have a lot to say about Brecht. Our exploration of Brechtian ideas has revealed that, in the field of theatre and cultural studies, there has been

considerable attention to Brecht, to his plays, poetry and to his more theoretical works. It is true that he is given his place as a theatre practitioner in the A-level Theatre Studies syllabus (AEB). It is surprising to find, however, that relatively thin use is made of Brecht's ideas around social interests and the role of the audience in the writing of drama educationalists. Furthermore, where the philosophy and practice of drama education clearly derives from Brecht's work, there appears to be little acknowledgement of this. Before we move towards outlining a Brechtian framework for classroom practice in drama, we shall devote some space to a critical overview of the work of prominent writers in the field, concentrating on the work of Bolton (1984), Heathcote (1984) and Hornbrook (1989).

In order to balance our criticisms of prominent figures in the field of drama education, we should begin by noting that there are aspects of their work which chime with Brechtian principles. In the work of Bolton and Heathcote, for example, we find a Brechtian emphasis on active and experiential processes of learning and on the affective and pleasurable aspects of learning.<sup>x</sup> Of central importance to Hornbrook (1989 & 1991) is critical attention to theatrical forms and the dramatic forms of the mass media. Hornbrook, in drawing his critical framework from work in the field of critical cultural studies, also makes emphases which intersect with Brecht's concerns. From the work of Raymond Williams (1965 & 1975), for example, he takes the overarching concept of the 'dramatised society', making it a key part of his argument for raising the status of drama in schools. Furthermore, after Williams, he emphasises that an important role of drama education is to allow students to make social and historical readings of dramatic forms. In tackling the issues of mass culture, Hornbrook uses concepts of "common culture" and "the grounded aesthetic", similar to those used by Paul Willis (1990).

In his most sustained theoretical work, *Drama as Education* (1984), Gavin Bolton makes two direct references to Brecht. In the first, Brecht is bracketed together with other theatre practitioners such as Diderot, Stanislavsky, Artaud and so forth (rather in the manner of the A-level syllabus), and this is followed by the assertion that Brecht and the assorted others in the list, "tend to be interested in a particular theatrical style" (1984, pp. 115-116). This, for two reasons, is a puzzling move. First, apart for the fact that they were all involved in theatre, there are so many dissimilarities and discontinuities between the various practitioners cited, it is difficult to conceive of them as being members of a single, undifferentiated group. The "particular theatrical styles" are both very particular and very *different*. Second, as we hope that our arguments so far have illustrated, although Brecht's centre of action was the theatre, it would be simple and reductive to suggest that

all he was interested in was a “particular style of theatre” — he was interested in a politicised and critical aesthetic, pedagogy and, most significantly, in using the medium of theatre as a catalyst to social action and cultural making, a making that extends beyond the auditorium as the audience leave. The second reference to Brecht in this volume is where Bolton likens Dorothy Heathcote’s work to Brecht in that, in her work, she increasingly recognises “the double valency of experiencing and reflecting on the experiencing of dramatic action”. This has taken priority over her former adherence to the idea of learning in drama by “living through” the dramatic experience (1984, p. 142).

If we move to look at Heathcote’s *Collected Writings on Education and Drama* (1984), there is only one paper, ‘From the Particular to the Universal’, in which Heathcote explicitly refers to Brecht’s work, connecting Brechtian practice to Erving Goffman’s analytical framework from *Frame Analysis*, (1975). Alongside Goffman’s ‘interactionist’ perspective, she draws on Brecht and suggests that the dramatic and theatrical experience is like “visiting another room”, a room which makes the construction of an “as if”, or potential world possible. At the end of the article, she enters into a written commentary on a Brecht poem ‘The Playwright’s Song’ (1976, p. 257-260), through which she draws the parallel between the responsibilities of the playwright and the responsibilities of the drama teacher (1984, pp. 108-110). Here, we feel, Heathcote reveals a fundamental misunderstanding of Brecht’s purposes and a misinterpretation of his writing. First, she accepts the potential for drama and theatre to distance us from everyday life, to see it afresh, to employ *Verfremdungseffekt*, to reveal gestic moments, to reveal the potential mutability of both dramatised and everyday life, so that the student, the actor and the spectator can employ their powers of reasoned reflection. The second move, however, purges the critical power and ‘sting’ from the Brechtian approach, sanitising and de-politicising the dynamic of the work. In brief illustration of this, against Brecht’s lines —

I studied the representations of the great feudal figures  
Through the English: of rich individuals  
Who saw the world as space for their freer development...

she writes simply —

*The recognition of the past as a model*  
(1984, p. 109),

Here we would like to ask: what kind of model is the past and how does she value it? There is an unmistakably critical, biting edge to Brecht’s assertion that “rich individuals” see the world as a

space for their “freer development” for, of the times Brecht is referring to, the Elizabethan and Jacobean age, there is little in recorded history of the greater mass of the population. In the same stanza, Brecht refers to the English and the Spanish, invoking the brutalities of colonisation. But the working people and those who were colonised are silenced in their presence. In short, far away from wanting to model the present on these representations of the past, Brecht wants to *historicise* these representations in order to reveal sets of power relations between social and dramatic actors.

From another side of drama education, David Hornbrook is quick to point this out (1989, p. 17). He cites an interview between David Davis and Dorothy Heathcote in which Heathcote admits to never having read or seen Brecht’s work.<sup>xi</sup> Later, in a similar vein, Hornbrook again invokes Brecht, but only as a kind of stick with which to beat Heathcote (1989, pp. 76-77). Thereafter, references to Brecht seem to be used mostly to reveal Hornbrook’s theatrical credentials. Interestingly, Hornbrook draws most of his citations from Brecht’s poetry. Through this, however, he tends to allude to Brecht’s ideas in a somewhat oblique style. The two notable exceptions to this, where he applies Brecht to the form and content of drama teaching, are, firstly, when he writes about “Brecht’s deliberately antagonistic use of form *inappropriately*” to draw out teaching points about the relationship between form and content — for instance, in the use of a ‘sentimental’ tune to accompany a hard-hitting ballad about economic exploitation (1989, p. 106). This allusion to Brechtian technique, however, is brief and lacking in any specific or detailed reference to Brecht’s writings. Hornbrook’s second reference to Brecht’s impact on his notions of teaching and learning in drama is similarly oblique. In a section headed “The teacher as critic”, he cites a Brecht poem from *The Mother* (1978) to support an argument about the need for the teacher to take the role of ideological critic, a ‘hard-edged’ role for the teacher, contrasting this role to what he labels as the “teacher/facilitator” role in the ‘process’ approach to drama education (1989, pp 122-124). Again, though, as with Bolton and Heathcote’s work, Hornbrook does not appear to engage deeply with Brecht’s large-scale ideas about the connections between art and social interests. This despite the fact that much of Hornbrook’s argument, promoting a critical and didactic approach to drama education, could have been derived directly from Brecht’s work. But, in the main, what there is of Brecht’s influence is unattributed and filtered through secondary sources.

From our point of view, what is more serious is that Hornbrook may have absorbed much about Brecht’s famed ‘didactic’ method to support his case around the form and content of teaching (a reductive perspective in any case, as, unlike the English definition of the term with its strong emphasis on teaching, the German term holds a sense of both teaching *and* learning), but he has

entirely neglected the pedagogic slant to Brecht's perspective, wherein dramaturg (or teacher), text, performance, performers and audience (or students) interact in dialogic and developmental relation. At worst, though, Hornbrook appears to use Brecht as figure in the pantheon of theatre practitioners.

The emphasis on pleasurable, productive and transformative learning found in the work of Bolton and Heathcote and, on the other hand, the concern for critical reflection and innovative, cultural production that Hornbrook's work focuses on, can be found in a single coherent and large-scale framework in Brecht's writing on theatre and politics. These can be modified and elaborated through a reinterpretation of Brecht's work which both takes account of conditions in the late part of this century and is open to current critical perspectives which intersect with Brechtian ideas.

### Strands of a Brechtian framework for drama in education: tradition, form and audience

In the final part of this paper we want to elaborate some key points drawn from Brecht's work which might serve to locate particular classroom practices within a wider structural approach. These can be applied to drama education and the allied disciplines of English and media studies. This is of the greatest importance, as we have argued, because of the pre-eminence and impact that dramatised forms have in contemporary culture (locally and globally), both at the level of the politics of education and culture and at the level of everyday social practice and interaction. In order that we may be relatively brief in this exposition, fitting within the confines of this paper, we shall return to the three categories of *tradition*, *form* and *audience* in order to organise our argument.

First, in an approach to the notion of *tradition* we shall elaborate on the Brechtian concept of *historicisation*. This is a complex concept which, as well as providing a framework for critical examination of 'aesthetically valued' texts from the past (the 'canon' of pre-twentieth century drama and literature, for example, enshrined in the National Curriculum Orders for English), can also be applied to contemporary and innovative forms of dramatic production and distribution (television, video and multi-media computer products).<sup>xiii</sup> Second, in approaching issues around dramatic forms, we shall concentrate on Brecht's *Verfremdungseffekt*, which he developed in order that audiences might maintain a critical distance from the forms and modes of representation.<sup>xiii</sup> The *Verfremdungseffekt* is, again, a complex concept which, as a formal approach, is designed simultaneously to draw the attention of audiences *both* to acts of representation *and* to the act of reading. In order to achieve this 'distanced' and reflexive attitude towards 'performed' texts, Brecht employed the technical devices of *gestus* and *montage*.

Finally, in examining the role of audience, we shall be concentrating on how Brecht wanted the audience to work actively and critically to make meanings from the dramatic texts they engage with. At the same time, he placed great emphasis on the role that pleasure has to play in activating the audience (1964, pp. 204-205). This is not, however, the pleasure derived from immersion, empathy, or 'passive' spectatorship, even an appreciation of the perfection of aesthetic form. Brecht had in mind the pleasure derived from the opportunities that the drama provides to present social action and the complex structure of social relations as the object of scrutiny and the subject of interrogation and analysis (1964, p. 82).

Central to this approach to audience, exemplified in the *Lehrstücke*, is the exhortation that audience to make changes and interventions to the world as represented through theatre, and then to carry-over this power of intervention through social action in the wider world beyond the auditorium. This process is to be realised in part (as we understand it, particularly from our reading of Brecht's approach to the *Lehrstücke*) by encouraging the audience to produce their own (dramatic) texts to set beside and against other texts in the world.

Let us again try to clarify what we are trying to say about the application of the categories of tradition, form and audience in the drama curriculum. The argument is not that there has been a failure to apply Brechtian approaches in the classroom — as recent papers in the field testify, the interest in Brechtian theatre and technique continues to develop and to maintain its currency.<sup>xiv</sup> Our concern here is rather to promote the commitment to social interests that provides the rationale and structure to support the Brechtian aesthetic. As we hope to have shown earlier, it is not a matter of simply transposing Brechtian principles to this period of late modernity, as this is fraught with a complexity of problems. What is most important for us in Brecht's work is the breadth of the social and cultural perspective that allows the possibility of constructing a coherent, flexible and dynamic framework through which we might approach current concerns and problems in the overlapping fields of education and culture. The prevailing political climate is one which discourages a socially radical usage of the new forms, partly because there has developed an ingrained habit thinking about technological and cultural forms *in separation* from the needs and interests of their users. The Brechtian aesthetic, on the other hand promotes the reciprocity of art and life, of uncovering the points of connection between dramatic techniques, dramatic action (in thought and deed) and social action and leading towards the possibility of transformation and development in social and cultural



life. These are the themes which we want to identify in Brecht and revive in contemporary educational practice.

### Curriculum, tradition and historicisation

In approaching the category of tradition, we return to the problem of how National Curriculum Orders for English prescribe to a great extent the content of our lessons, both in regard to a ‘canon’ of literature as well as a standardised definition of language. The imposition of standardised testing, including questions on Shakespeare plays, at the end of Key Stage 3 (Year 9 students, aged fourteen-years-old), has had a major impact on both the content and pedagogy of many aspects of the curriculum, including drama lessons. Drama teachers have been asked to play their part, alongside their colleagues in English, to prepare students for these tests. By no means could it be asserted that Brecht was averse to the study of Shakespeare; indeed there is evidence from *The Messingkauff Dialogues*, for example, that Brecht derived some of his techniques of the *Verfremdungseffekt* from a study of Shakespeare’s works.<sup>xv</sup> He was very aware, however, of the ways in which the ‘canonisation’ of Shakespeare’s work has lent it a universal and timeless quality of greatness, which naturalises the sense of greatness intrinsic to the work itself through a process of de-historicisation. Writing in *A Short Organum for the Theatre*, he insists that —

...we must drop our habit of taking the different social structures of past periods [represented in dramatic literature from history], then stripping them of everything that makes them different; so that they all look more or less like our own, which then acquires from this process a certain air of having been there all along, in other words of permanence pure and simple. Instead we must leave them their distinguishing marks and keep their impermanence always before our eyes, so that our own period can be seen to be impermanent too.

(1964, p. 190)

The implications for classroom practice that arise from this orientation towards tradition operate on two levels. At the level where the politics of culture and education merge together, we can use this Brechtian emphasis to place the study of Shakespeare within the context of the current political climate. In such times, for instance, the executive agents of government make it a clear imperative that students are inducted into a “common culture” and a “national identity”, irrespective of their cultural background, to forge “a sense of place, belonging and tradition”. This is so that they may retain “a sense of meaning in a world which is in a state of constant social, economic and technological flux.” Central to these purposes is the necessity of introducing them to “the English literary heritage”, in which Shakespeare is made a key ‘iconic’ figure — a representative and

carrier of cultural values.<sup>xvi</sup> These moves towards establishing a common cultural heritage through the school curriculum has to be placed in a historical context. That is, we should make students explicitly aware of why, in particular phases of history, the study of Shakespeare might be laid down in legislation, and how governments, through the activities of their executive agents, might intend the study of Shakespeare to be used as a kind of ‘cultural glue’. Although, from one point of view, this might be seen as a potentially critical, even subversive, move, from another point of view, it will offer students a rationale as to why and how, in standardised testing, they are expected to come up with particular answers to particular questions about the interpretation of Shakespeare.

When it comes to the close textual study of plays, the animation of Shakespearian texts through active drama sessions, provides the opportunity to explore the historical differences between our own times and Shakespeare’s. This would include an exploration of the historical context at the time the plays were written and the references to be found in the plays to historical conditions of Jacobean England. Understanding would further be enhanced through a practical exploration of the relationship between the performance of the text and its audience, both as it was in Shakespeare’s time and as it is now. We believe it is a complex historicising approach such as this which Brecht was referring to in the poem quoted by Dorothy Heathcote — not simply, as she would have it, “the recognition of the past as a model”. The historicising method does have, as we have already noted, much in common, though, with the model of drama education proposed by David Hornbrook, but additionally, with a double focus on the relationship between the present and the past.

Before we leave the notion of historicisation, it is worth noting that this form of dynamic analysis should, in Brechtian terms, be directed as much towards contemporary forms of production and distribution as it should to the forms from the past. Writing on the need for a new aesthetic in his essay against Georg Lukács, Brecht states that it should “not [be] linked to the good old days but to the bad new ones” (1977, p. 69). Writing in the period that saw the rise of Nazism, he recognised how new technologies, giving rise to new media (radio and film) and new appropriations of ancient forms of theatrical spectacle (the Nuremberg rallies), could be used for nefarious, propagandising purposes. In contemporary drama classrooms, we find students recreating scenes the resources for which are often drawn from television (soap opera), film (horror, thriller, ‘action movies’ and the like) and adventure games (‘virtual reality’ computer games). As Brecht pointed out, these forms of representations also carry “distinguishing marks” which carry echoes of past ages and point to the impermanence of our own age. In reflecting on these scenes and their sources, the technique of

historicisation should be an aid to interpretation and critical reflection, revealing the ways in which social relations are reflected, promoted or glossed over, both in terms of the forms of representation and in terms of the content they carry. Overall, operating through the ‘filter’ of historicisation allows us to pose questions like, ‘In whose interests are we studying, or producing these plays?’, ‘What interests (and whose) are represented within these texts?’ and ‘What best serves our own interests through the production and study of these plays?’

### Dramatic form and innovation: *Verfremdungseffekt*, *gestus* and montage

In turning our attention to matters of form, we want to elaborate on the grand Brechtian concept of *Verfremdungseffekt* and the way it is supported through the formal techniques of *gestus* and *montage*. These are elaborate and complex approaches which Brecht referred to many times in different ways, making it difficult to separate them out and give them precise or succinct definition. At the broadest level of definition, *Verfremdungseffekt* is a key concept for understanding Brecht’s ‘epic theatre’ which is designed to draw attention to the essential artifice of the theatrical event, to ‘alienate’ the audience in order to mitigate against the powerful and potentially limiting effects of empathy, firmly setting the portrayal of events the pattern social history. In ‘What is Epic Theatre?’, Walter Benjamin tells us that “Brecht’s drama eliminated the Aristotelian catharsis, the purging of the emotions through empathy with the stirring fate of the hero” and “instead of identifying the with the characters, the audience should be educated to be astonished at the circumstances under which they function” (1973, p. 152).

To the material features of dramatic action Brecht gives the name *gestus*. Patrice Pavis has pointed out that Brecht’s formulation of *gestus* should be seen as a concept which evolves throughout the span of Brecht’s writings (1982, p. 39). But perhaps the most concise and clear definition of the concept is given in *A Short Organum for the Theatre* —

The realm of attitudes adopted by the characters toward one another is what we call the realm of *gest*. Physical attitude, tone of voice and facial expression are all determined by a social *gest*: the characters are cursing, flattering, instructing one another, and so on....These expressions of a *gest* are usually highly complicated and contradictory, so that they cannot be rendered by any single word and the actor must take care that in giving his image the necessary emphasis he does not lose anything, but emphasises the entire complex.

(1964, p. 198)

*Gestus*, then, is not so much concerned with the organisation and structure of the theatrical text, but is more about how meaning of the text is realised in performance, through the bodies of the actors and their style of acting in close relation to thematic concerns. Not only is it realised at specific and isolated points in the performance, but is likely to be repeated in different permutations by individuals and groups of performers as a kind of *motif* throughout the play. In his exploration of the concept of *gestus*, Pavis notes that *gestus*, imbued with the strongly mimetic aspects of dramatic performance (1982, pp. 39-40). It refers simultaneously to the corporeal figure of the actor, or the ‘morphology’ of dramatic performance, and to the articulation of the figures in performance. In the processes of rehearsal and performance, a double set of reciprocal relations are established which, in great part, enforce and reinforce the *Verfremdungseffekt*. First, the relationship between the actor and the role she is playing, in which *gestus* is the ‘self-conscious’ realisation of the tensions, contradictions and juxtapositions between the role of the socially committed actor and the dramatic role. Second, in the relationship between the performance, the performers and the audience, where the intention is that the audience witnesses and experiences the contradictory forces at work within the text and its dramatic realisation. For both actors and spectators, *gestus* simultaneously draws attention to the actions of the body as signs *and* to the act of reading the body.

Brecht’s use of montage techniques in constructing the whole text of his plays was not innovation of form (or art) for form’s sake, it was a committed choice of technique which he saw as the most appropriate for the modern age — “...new institutions which shape individuals today are precisely...the products of montage, quite literally ‘assembled’ ” (1977, p. 79). Brecht constructed his plays by consciously combining different modes of representation — writing, speech, gesture, image, music — and ‘knotting’ these forms together in juxtaposition, so that, at all times, the audience is aware of the construction — “the individual episodes [of the play] have to be knotted together in such a way as the knots are easily noticed” (1964, p. 201). As a technique of *Verfremdungseffekt*, then, montage is a construction of text which is not designed as a seamless, integrated ‘work of art’, but counterposes ‘antagonistic’ forms to create a theatrical text, drawing attention to its own form as well as to references to other forms and texts.

The powerful and pervasive forms of representation and mediation we have referred to previously (advertisements, television programmes, films, multimedia computer games and so forth) are, most often, assembled products, combining and incorporating a diversity of forms and modes of representation. Although these forms draw attention to their construction in terms of their ‘inter-textuality’, the reference to other texts and forms, what they do not show is the relationship of the

form to particular social and economic interests. In terms of conducting critical analysis and reflection on forms presented both inside and outside the boundaries of schooling, we can ask questions like, ‘How can we maintain a distance from this piece to discover how it is put together?’, ‘How is this piece of drama knotted together to form a whole text?’, ‘What particular forms have been used, either in complementarity or juxtaposition?’. In terms of *gestus*, we can examine how themes of social relations are represented and realised in corporeality through the complex modes of dramatic production, including gesture, movement, groupings in space, the use of music, lighting and so forth.

What is most attractive to us, however, is that these concepts not only serve as tools of analysis, or as aids to critical reflection, but are also powerful tools of production, which students can use to construct their own texts out of the resources at their disposal. They can be applied (as Brecht did) as much to ‘deconstruct’ and ‘demystify’ historically and aesthetically valued dramatic texts as well as to contemporary forms of representation. In employing these techniques to explore the construction of improvised and scripted pieces, the production process becomes an active mode of entering into critical analysis. What caption, for instance, would you make to introduce the audience to the burial scene in *Julius Caesar*? Who is represented here—aristocratic factions and the urban masses? Who are the masses and how are they depicted? How would you place the actors on stage to construct the *gest* which reveals the social relations between the characters? In making an episode of soap opera, how might one act a particular part through movement, gesture, voice, proximity to reveal the actor’s understanding of the character within the context of the social relations portrayed?

### Social interest, critical production and design in contemporary culture

These points about the ‘productivity’ of a Brechtian approach, particularly one which employs the concepts of *Verfremdungseffekt* and *gestus*, are working towards a discussion connecting with the recent work of Gunther Kress. In our day-to-day work in education, both practical and theoretical, we have engaged with his work on social semiotics (see Hodge & Kress, 1993). Through the application of his work in the sphere of education, Kress, like Brecht, registers the need to account for changes in culture which are of epochal significance — globalisation, technological innovation in the area of mass communications. In the rapidly changing environment of the late century, Kress rejects ‘nostalgia-driven’ attempts to reinstate tradition, especially those used to redefine the boundaries of independent and atomised nation-states (1995a). There are some key terms which Kress has developed which are helpful when brought into use alongside a Brechtian approach to

‘critical production’: *transformation, interest and design*. In much of his recent work, Kress emphasises the notion that social actors do not simply use and reproduce the forms and meanings of representation that surround them, they *transform* and remake these resources of representation, of meaning-making, through using them. In common with Brecht, Kress insists that communication is always motivated by the particular *interests* of social actors and that this interest always shapes the processes of communication and, ultimately, gives substance to the ‘semiotic landscape’ which emerges from these processes (1993 & 1995b). Kress has developed the idea of ‘design’ as a concept in curriculum and pedagogy— that the curriculum should be concerned with developing a sense of agency, the ability of social actors to shape resources of representation in their own interests and for their own purposes (1997).

There is not the space here to pursue a detailed discussion of how Kress’s approach to social semiotics intersects with, or differs from, the Brechtian approach we have outlined so far. But it should be clear that in both Kress’s and Brecht’s work, there is a strong sense of a state of social ‘becoming’ and being, formed in a complex social and semiotic ‘landscape’, and that social actors are implicated as agents of their own ‘becoming’ in this landscape. Whilst it is clear to us that social semiotics provides us with a powerful tool for analysis, for ‘reading’ the world around us, it is not clear how students might apply a social semiotic framework as a ‘tool for production’ in their school work. In terms of pedagogic purpose, we feel that a Brechtian approach might provide us with a move towards a solution of this problem — a coherent framework that combines an approach to both critical analysis and production.

Already, with the combined emphasis on reflection, analysis and production, we have slipped towards our ideas around audience derived from Brecht’s work, so here we want to gather these notions together and summarise them. The first point is about pleasure. “Nothing,” writes Brecht, “needs less justification than pleasure” (1964, p. 181). However, as we read on through *A Short Organum*, we find that this sentiment is not expressed without irony and qualification. The more sophisticated pleasures of theatre, according to Brecht, are not experienced without being tempered and transformed by reason. Stronger, more complex pleasures “are more intricate, richer in communication, more contradictory and more productive of results” (ibid.). Although human susceptibility to emotion is acknowledged, Brechtian theatre seeks to work against an audience position from which spectators are encouraged to immerse themselves in a stultifying tide of empathy in reaction to the events represented on stage. Pleasure in the scientific age, processed through distance and reason, allows spectators to see how it is possible to make themselves through

a realisation of their place in history and their potential to change it, what Manfred Wekwerth (a successor of Brecht's in the Berliner Ensemble) refers to as "the production of newness" (1990).

In classrooms too, we reject the notion of pleasure in learning at our peril. We need an understanding of approaches which will motivate students to learn. For Brecht, as it should be in school-learning perhaps, there is an immediate, almost sensual level of pleasure, but there is also a higher order of responses which derive from understandings of complex forms and issues, leading towards the pleasure of 'mastery' [*sic*] and the ability to take action. Audiences need to maintain their sense of detachment from that which is represented in order to capture this pleasure of mastery and for this — "[s]ome exercise in complex seeing is needed — though it is perhaps more important to think above the stream than to think in the stream" (1964, p. 44). This exercise of "complex seeing" is supported through a distance, an 'estrangement' from acts of representation achieved through *Verfremdungseffekt*.

There is a further point here which refers back to our points about the *Lehrstücke* and the need for students to be productive alongside reflection and analysis. It is an assertion of an *entitlement* for students not only to be able to 'read' the world, but also to be able to make their own texts to set beside or (in critical stance) against other texts in the world. This is a notion of representation in a double sense, which underlines previous points about the use of *gestus* in drama lessons: the sense of making signs and meanings, *as well as* the sense of taking a position which advocates particular interests.

In conclusion, we ought to point out that, at a broad level, we realise that aspects of the Brechtian framework we have outlined above are not new to drama education, or to the fields of English and Media education.<sup>xvii</sup> It is also clear to us that many Brechtian practices and techniques are woven into the practice of drama teaching.<sup>xviii</sup> This is no cause for objection in itself, for they are effective techniques for teaching and learning. The difficulty, from our position, is that they are removed from their context, dislocated, stripped of the power to combine in a coherent framework, sanitised of their social and political purposes and turned towards more individualised psychologistic (the exploration of character, Heathcote's "man in a mess", for example), or formalistic purposes (Hornbook's principal concern). A coherent framework, rooted in Brechtian principles, informed by current critical approaches, would promote critical reflection and emphasise learning processes which are productive and transformative. With modification to account for the particular conditions of contemporary life, an approach founded in Brechtian principles allows for the most attractive of

possibilities — a cultural and educational practice in drama and related subjects which is, in equal measure, intellectual, critical, productive and innovative.



- i The ideas in this paper were first presented at the Third Domains of Literacy Conference at the Institute of Education, University of London in September 1996
- ii See Jones & Franks (forthcoming) ‘Productive Questions: Bertolt Brecht, Globalisation and Cultural Change’.
- iii Nick Tate, *Speech to Shropshire Headteachers’ Association*, July 1995. Although Tate’s views clearly tend towards the Right, there is no clear evidence that he is a member of the Conservative Party; thus, in this instance we have not capitalised “conservative” in this particular context.
- iv Nick Tate, *Speech to Shropshire Headteachers Association* July 1995
- v Tony Blair ‘The Power of the Message’ in *New Statesman and Society* 29 September 1995
- vi See, Engels, 1884, *The Origins of the Family, Private Property and the State*, cited in Goldman, 1993.
- vii See for example, Reinelt & Herrman, in *Performing Feminisms*, ed S-E Case, John Hopkins UP, 1990, Laughlin and Möhrmann in *Re-interpreting Brecht: his influence on contemporary drama and film*, eds Kleber and Visser, Cambridge UP, 1990, Diamond ‘Brechtian Theory/Feminist Theory, Towards a Gestic Feminist Criticism’ in *The Drama Review*, Vol. 32 No. 1, MIT Press, Spring 1988: pages 82 - 94
- viii Although in *A Short Organum for the Theatre* §16, page 184, BoT he does seem to recognise the exponential rate of technological change.
- ix See Bourdieu, 1993, ‘The Market of Symbolic Goods’ in *The Field of Cultural Production.*, pp. 112-141.
- x See, BoT, 1964, pp. 72 & 73, *A Short Organum for the Theatre* (ASO) §75 p204: appendices for ASO §3 page 276.
- xi *2D*, 4:3, Summer 1985.
- xii The phrase “aesthetically valued” is a reference to a classificatory framework of texts valued in different ways laid out by Gunther Kress in his professorial lecture, ‘Making Signs and Making Subjects’, Institute of Education, London, 1995.
- xiii We prefer to use the full German term, rather than substituting its usual translation into English as ‘alienation’. The definition of alienation in English, we feel, has too many connotations which detract from the Brechtian use of the term.
- xiv See again, e.g., Cabral 1996.
- xv 1965 (trans. Willett), pp. 57-63.
- xvi Nick Tate, *Speech to Shropshire Headteachers’ Association*, July 1995.

xvii Many of the ideas we have taken and developed from Brecht are to be found in the work of the theatre practitioner Augusto Boal (1979), who developed a 'liberation' approach to drama and literacy education working alongside Paulo Freire in South America (more recently, however, Boal has been more interested in the psycho-therapeutic aspects of theatre work). He has been an influential figure in the world of educational drama and his notion of a new relationship between performance and audience — the active audience and the "spect-actor" — owes a clear debt to Brecht and Brechtian techniques, especially the approaches developed in the *Lehrstücke*.

xviii These are techniques such as montage theatre, 'thought-tracking', caption-making and so forth. See, Neelands, 1992 as a handbook of such devices.

### References

- ADORNO, T., W. BENJAMIN, E. BLOCH, B. BRECHT & G. LUKÁCS** (1977) *Aesthetics and Politics* R. TAYLOR (trans. ed.) (London, Verso)
- BENJAMIN, W** (1973) *Illuminations* (London, Fontana)
- BHARUCHA, R.** (1990) *Theatre and the World: Performance and the Politics of Culture* (London, Routledge)
- BOAL, A.** (1979) *Theater of the Oppressed* (London, Pluto Press)
- BOLTON, G.** (1984) *Drama as Education* (London, Longman)
- BOND, E. (1978) 'On Brecht: a Letter to Peter Holland' in *Theatre Quarterly*, Volume III No. 30, Summer 1978: pp34-35
- BOURDIEU, P.** (1993) *The Field of Cultural Production.* (Cambridge, Polity Press)
- BRECHT, B.** (1962) *Mother Courage and Her Children* (London, Methuen)
- BRECHT, B.** (1964) *Brecht on Theatre* J. WILLETT (ed.) (London, Eyre Methuen)
- BRECHT, B** (1965) *The Messingkauf Dialogues* WILLETT (trans) (London, Methuen)
- BRECHT, B.** (1976) *Poems 1913-1956* J. WILLETT & R. MANHEIM (eds. & trans.) (London, Methuen)
- BRECHT, B.** (1977a) 'Bertolt Brecht Against Georg Lukács' in T. ADORNO, W. BENJAMIN, E. BLOCH, B. BRECHT & G. LUKÁCS *Aesthetics and Politics* R. TAYLOR (trans. ed.) (London, Verso): pages 68 to 85
- BRECHT, B.** (1978) *The Mother* S. GOOCH (trans) (London, Methuen)
- CABRAL, B.** (1996) 'Signs of Post-Modern, yet Dialectic, Practice' in *Research in Drama Education Vol. 1, No. 2* 1996 (Abingdon, Carfax): pp 215-220
- CASE, S.-E.** (Ed) *Performing Feminisms* (Baltimore, The John Hopkins University Press)
- DFE** (1995) *English in the National Curriculum* (London, HMSO)
- DIAMOND, E.** (1988) 'Brechtian Theory/Feminist Theory: Toward a Gestic Feminist Criticism' in *The Drama Review (TDR)* Vol. 32 No. 1 Spring 1988: pp82-94
- HEATHCOTE, D.** (1984) *Collected Writings on Education and Drama* L. JOHNSON & C. O'NEILL (Eds) (London, Hutchinson)
- HERMAN, A.** (1990) 'Travesty and Transgression: transvesticism in Shakespeare, Brecht and Churchill in S.-E. CASE (Ed) *Performing Feminisms* (Baltimore, The John Hopkins University Press)
- HODGE, R & G. KRESS** (1993) *Social Semiotics* (Ithaca N.Y., Cornell University Press)
- KLEBER, P. & C. VISSER** (eds) (1990) *Re-interpreting Brecht: his influence on contemporary drama and film*, (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press)

- KRESS, G.**(1995a) 'Making Signs and Making Meanings', Professorial Lecture, Institute of Education, London.
- KRESS, G.** (1995b) *Writing the Future* (London, NATE publications)
- KRESS, G.** (1997) *Before Writing: rethinking paths to literacy* (London, Routledge)
- MÜLLER, H.** (1986) 'To Use Brecht Without Criticising Him is to Betray Him, in *Theater*, Spring 1986: pp31-33
- NEELANDS, J.** (1992) *Structuring Drama Work* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press)
- PAVIS, P.** (1982) *Languages of the Stage* (New York, Performing Arts Journal Publications)
- REINELT J.** (1990) 'Beyond Brecht: Britain's New Feminist Drama' in S.-E. CASE (Ed) *Performing Feminisms* (Baltimore, The John Hopkins University Press)
- SPIVAK, G. C.** (1988) *In Other Worlds: Essays in Cultural Politics* (London, Routledge).
- WEKWERTH, M.** (1990) 'Questions concerning Brecht' in P. KLEBER & C. VISSER (eds) (1990) *Re-interpreting Brecht: his influence on contemporary drama and film*, (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press)
- WILLIAMS, R.** (1965) *The Long Revolution* (Harmondsworth, Penguin)
- WILLIAMS, R.** (1975) *Drama in a Dramatised Society* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press)
- WILLIS, P.** (1990) *Common Culture* (Milton Keynes, Open University Press)
- WINSTON, J.** (1996) 'Emotion, Reason and Moral Engagement in Drama' *Research in Drama Education Vol. 1, No. 2* 1996 (Abingdon, Carfax): pp 189-200