



The Days of the Commune

Bertolt Brecht , Clive Barker (Translator) , Arno Reinfrank (Translator)

[Download now](#)

[Read Online](#) 

The Days of the Commune

Bertolt Brecht , Clive Barker (Translator) , Arno Reinfrank (Translator)

The Days of the Commune Bertolt Brecht , Clive Barker (Translator) , Arno Reinfrank (Translator)

Das Stück zeigt den Aufstieg und Fall der kleinen Familie Cabet aus dem Arbeiterviertel in den dreiundsiebzig Tagen der Pariser Commune zwischen März und Mai 1871. Die Fabel konzentriert sich auf die Familie. Im Gegensatz zur bürgerlichen Tragödie, in der das Volk gerade gut genug war, die historischen Ereignisse zu ermöglichen, werden hier die historischen Ereignisse den Bedürfnissen des Volkes unterworfen: die kleinen Anliegen der Cabets werden der politischen Öffentlichkeit nicht mehr geopfert; sie sind es gerade, die diese Öffentlichkeit voll und ganz beanspruchen. Der Aufstand scheiterte, nicht weil ihm die Kraft fehlte, sondern die Organisation dieser Kraft.

The Days of the Commune Details

Date : Published 1978 by Methuen (first published 1956)

ISBN : 9780413387707

Author : Bertolt Brecht , Clive Barker (Translator) , Arno Reinfrank (Translator)

Format : Paperback 88 pages

Genre : Plays, Theatre, Drama, European Literature, German Literature

 [Download The Days of the Commune ...pdf](#)

 [Read Online The Days of the Commune ...pdf](#)

Download and Read Free Online The Days of the Commune Bertolt Brecht , Clive Barker (Translator) , Arno Reinfrank (Translator)

bilo svjesno tkanje, prije svega ovo je brechtovska drama namijenjena izvođenju, te je loše odrađena jer je bitna samo politička poruka. Nema individualizacije likova, niti prave igre jezika. Samo izvanumjetnička poruka.

Zgusnutost i sitnišavost didaskalija je, također, odraz društvene funkcije ove drame, što ju umjetnički srožava. Brecht ne ostavlja slobodan prostor drugim redateljima da nešto izmijene, bitna je samo društvena kritika. Kako dosadno. Nietzsche nije volio Euripida jer se Euripid odvojio od mitskog u tragediji. Euripidovo stvaranje konkretnih likova, njegova "sekularizacija tragedije" (moj izraz, ha!), odnosno kako bi Nietzsche rekao, Euripidovo stvaranje estetskog sokratizma bi savršeno odgovaralo opisu ove, a vjerojatno i svake, Brechtove drame. Što je "sekularizacija tragedije"? Što je estetski sokratizam? To je u biti promoviranje nužne društvene, utilitarne, uloge umjetnosti. Euripid i Sokrat, po Nietzscheu, su se nadopunjavali u tome da ljude treba obrazovati. Umjetnost treba biti odgojna jer je znanje put prema moralu. Sva izlizana sokratovština danas bivstvuje putem ludila social justice warriorsa i političke korektnosti. Brecht, kao i Euripid i Sokrat, želi također odgojnu, utilitarnu ulogu umjetnosti. A, Nietzsche je lijepo rekao kako bez mita nema umjetnosti. Ili bar bez larpurlartizma nema umjetnosti (ovo ja kažem). Pogledajte samo, šišmiši moji, Matoševe bezvezne realističke novele, a pogledajte njegove larpurlartističke bizarne novele, "Camao" prije svega. Umjetnost ne može biti ostvarena, a da posjeduje političku poruku ili neku svjesnu društvenu poruku. Dos Passos je jedina iznimka kojeg se sad mogu sjetiti. A, evo još jedne; Majakovski. No, Brecht zasigurno ne stvara umjetnost. Komunistička propaganda para zadnje pore umjetničkog. Ali bar nije feministička ili rasistička propaganda.

No, svejedno mi je bilo drago pročitati ovu dramu. Da sam ju pročitao u prvom srednje bila bi mi genijalna. Život je odavno razvodnio sve moguće ideale ili djetinasta stremljenja da se svijet promijeni.

U vezi samog povijesnog događaja; samo budale ginu za ideale.

Hvala Zvonimiru Mrkonjiću što je iznjedrio jedini prijevod ove drame na našem jeziku. Za sve one koji vole spregu umjetnosti i politike evo jedna grupa koja je jedina postala bolja od grupe Clash;

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QSGO8...>

Hasta luego!

Nick Jones says

I wonder if one of Brecht's great attributes, his clarity, is also a limitation. I hadn't really heard of *The Days of the Commune* and it isn't one of Brecht's major works, but it is an interesting one. Written in the late 1940s as a response to Nordahl Grieg's *The Defeat* (not a play or writer I know), it wasn't staged until after Brecht's death. A narrative of the Paris Commune of 1871, it is a political play with explicit sympathies – if you think the Commune was a moment of working class barbarism then this will not be the play for you. But being explicit in its sympathies does not mean *The Days of the Commune* is simplistic. But there is always the question with politically engaged fiction: how to have a clear political purpose without being narrow or bullying or self-righteous? Is it possible not to just preach to the converted and make them self satisfied for being on the right side. I don't think *The Days of the Commune* fully manages to evade these temptations, but it's an interesting attempt at a serious political theatre. There is a large cast and a broad range of characters: there are scenes in the Paris streets with the Communards, in the Hotel de Ville with the Deputies and a couple of scenes outside Paris with Thiers or Bismarck. There isn't a central character, but Langevin has a privileged position, being both a worker and a delegate to the Commune: we see him as part of the community in the streets and as a Deputy. The play takes it for granted that we are behind the Commune, but the Commune is not a united force: much of the drama in the work is around the conflict of views on the streets and within the Hotel de Ville. *The Days of the Commune* is not a work of realism, at least in as far as the characters are not 'rounded' and don't develop; it is also not a melodrama, the characters don't have symbolic functions - the play is built around discussion and political argument: there are differences of opinion and the arguments develop. The central question is whether the revolution should be carried out

more rigorously, whether they should march on Versailles to confront Thiers' forces when they have the advantage and whether they should suppress their internal enemies. This is argued both on the streets and in the Assembly. There are differences of opinion, but the play, of course, has a 'correct' answer to the question: we see the Commune fail because they lose advantage and vacillate. It is not difficult to find the 'moral' of the play: the Revolution must use all the means necessary for success. Brecht builds his dramatic argument with great skill, the arguments building within each scene: such is the genius of his clarity, but finally we are bullied to agree. Brecht demands we follow the arguments of his play, not look out to the world around us. This is a clarity which leaves no room for disagreement. And we can wonder about the audience who watched the play in early 1960s East Berlin: the argument of the play would be in agreement with Party and State. Or we can wonder about the audience who watched the production of Clive Barker and Arno Reinfrank's translation in 1970s London: this could have been a more open experience, but the audience would have had to place themselves in opposition to Brecht to experience a more open text...although this might have led them back to agree with Brecht.
