The Winslow Boy

When Ronnie Winslow is expelled from school for stealing, it has a resounding effect on the entire family. His father Arthur must pool his resources to hire a lawyer for the boy’s defense. His brother Dickie begrudgingly drops out of college and gets a banking job to help with the legal costs. And the fallout from this unexpected predicament puts his sister Catherine’s engagement in jeopardy. Though they are determined to defend Ronnie, will the family’s sacrifices be enough to clear his reputation and the Winslow name?

The Winslow Boy captures everything that I love about Terence Rattigan’s writing. He is known for creating extremely deep and detailed characters, writing in a beautifully naturalistic style, and crafting his plays with a strong sense of structure. You’ll see all of these elements at play in The Winslow Boy, as well as the kind of subtle emotional currents that Rattigan so elegantly places deep within. This notion of keeping emotions roiling beneath the surface is, for me, one of the great assets of Rattigan’s plays, but it’s also what led to his fall from critical and popular favor.

A two-year period preceding the war of 1914-1918

where

The Drawing Room of a house in Kensington, England

who

Ronnie Winslow, A boy of about fourteen. An Osborne Naval Cadet.

Arthur Winslow, Ronnie’s father. A man of about sixty with a rather deliberately cultured patriarchal air.

Grace Winslow, Ronnie’s mother. A woman of about fifty who still has the faded remnants of prettiness.

Dickie Winslow, Ronnie’s brother. He is an Oxford undergraduate. Large, noisy, and cheerful.

Catherine Winslow, Ronnie’s sister. She is approaching thirty and has an air of masculinity about her which is at odd variance to her mother’s intense femininity.

John Watherstone, Catherine’s fiancé. A man of about thirty.

Desmond Curry, Solicitor for the Winslow family. A man of about 45 with the figure of an athlete gone to seed. He has a mildly furtive manner.

Sir Robert Morton, An advocate. He is a man in his early forties, tall, thin, cadaverous, and immensely elegant.

Violet, An elderly maid in the Winslows’ house.

Miss Barnes, A reporter for the Daily News. She is about forty and has a gushing manner.

Fred, A listless photographer working with Miss Barnes.
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INTERVIEW WITH DIRECTOR LINDSAY POSNER

During rehearsals for The Winslow Boy, Education Dramaturg Ted Sod spoke with Director Lindsay Posner about his thoughts on the play.

Ted Sod: I’m very curious. You started as an actor. You were trained at the Royal Academy and then, not very long after you graduated, you became a director. How did that happen?

Lindsay Posner: Well, I was at university before going to RADA, where I did an English degree, and I acted and directed at university. It was always in my head that I wanted to do both, and I was given a place at RADA and a very receptive principal called Hugh Crutwell there said, “If we give you a place at RADA, do you promise never to direct?” and of course I said yes. While I was there, I realized that my talent really was for directing more than acting. I could act a bit, but I sensed that being an outside eye and wanting to do the whole play, production, was more my inclination and talent, actually. And they let me start directing before I left. I did one or two shows and then I left. I did one acting job and went on to directing immediately after that.

TS: And how did you find your way to Max Stafford-Clark and the Royal Court?

LP: I raised the money myself to do a kind of fringe show at a place in London called the Soho Poly Theatre and lobbied some of the staff from the Royal Court to come and see it, which they did. And I was then given an interview for an assistant director’s job, which I got. And then I stayed there for seven years after that.

TS: Did you always have an interest in newer work at that time, or were you interested in the classics? Because you have really done everything.

LP: To be honest, as is the case with most directors, you take opportunities where they arise when you’re very young and just starting out. I had interest in both, and the Royal Court was a fantastic place to begin because it’s the perfect apprenticeship, really. And when you’re through your twenties, coming into contact with great senior writers like Pinter or Caryl Churchill or Mamet, it’s a great education.

TS: What attracted you to this particular play?

LP: A few things really. I mean, first of all, I think it’s a great play and there aren’t that many great plays. It is both a great family play and it’s entertaining. It’s also a political play with political resonance. I always look for relevance in a play, or a play that I feel will be accessible to a contemporary audience when I read it. And this is particularly relevant in terms of what’s happening with individual liberty and responsibility and justice. We can make all sorts of contemporary references when we see it. Also, the greatness of it is that the characters are so finely, beautifully written with complex psychological portraits. It’s always great to work on a really rich play that has such rich psychological detail in it.

TS: You first directed the play at The Old Vic in London last season. What are the challenges in remounting this production in America?

LP: Well, one of the immediate concerns for me is that I was very nervous. I didn’t just want it to be a rehash of what I’d already done because that’s not creative. So I’m approaching it as if I hadn’t done it already, and I’m finding that very joyful. Of course, I know the answers to some of the questions I’m asking, but I’m exploring it along with actors, a completely fresh group of people with a completely different chemistry in the room, which is exciting. And already there are things I’m thinking about in a slightly different way from the way it had happened first time round. So actually, it’s very rewarding for me.

TS: When I interviewed set and costume designer Peter McKintosh, he said it was a thoroughly English play. Do you feel that way?

LP: I think it is a thoroughly English play. It’s very much about the British class system and the way that affects social behavior. And it’s also about the way people repress their feelings in middle class British families; upper-middle class families don’t say exactly what they mean a lot of the time, which, clearly, isn’t so much the case in New York.

TS: But the character of Catherine doesn’t seem to follow that mold, or does she?

LP: She does. She’s forthright and cerebral, but she doesn’t tell anyone what she’s feeling.

TS: About Sir Robert—

LP: About Sir Robert or, indeed, about John. Her mother says, “Do you love him? Because you never say what you feel.” When her father challenges her on losing the settlement for the marriage, she says, “Oh
it’s fine. Everything’s absolutely fine." She doesn’t really reveal the crises and complex dilemmas that she’s going through underneath the surface.

TS: And Rattigan leaves us with a little bit of a mystery at the end in terms of what’s going to happen between her and Sir Robert. Do you have feelings about that?

LP: I do. I think they’ll never get together. And I think Rattigan actually hints at that. I think one of the great poignancies in the play is that there’s the sense that there could be a relationship there, but it’s never going to happen because Sir Robert could never bring himself to do anything. Look, the nearest he gets to romance is saying, “That’s a very nice hat you’re wearing.” And she makes it very clear that she’ll be seeing him across the floor as a lawyer one day, and I don’t think they’re ever getting together.

TS: Do you think that part of the popularity of this play in Britain is because its central idea of “Let Right Be Done” and the Petition of Right really in some way says that the Crown is not above the law?

LP: It does. I mean, that’s always been the case. But, I think there’s a kind of zeitgeist feel for the British recently that hasn’t always been the case with Rattigan. Actually Rattigan’s not been that fashionable with British audiences. Now he’s being regarded as a great writer by the British critics, but he was often regarded as a bit of a boulevard writer and his star waned in the fifties when the kitchen sink writers of Osborne, Wesker, and the Royal Court writers actually gained prominence. Rattigan was always writing very fine plays, but he went out of fashion for that reason, which was a tragedy.

TS: How do you work with your design team on the show?

LP: We always begin by discussing what the play’s about before anything is designed. What sort of world it needs to be in. Whether it needs to be in period, or updated, or naturalistic, or expressionistic, or more abstract. Whether it needs to be minimal, or full of rich detail. And, obviously, every text and the period in which you’re doing it has its own demands given. And we work from there, and we work very closely.

TS: And critic Kenneth Tynan was very cruel to him.

LP: Indeed, that’s true. He said his preoccupations were outdated, you know, they were middle-class, upper-bourgeois preoccupations, which was very unfair in some ways. But I think this really taps into the fact that the British public opinion states intervention without redress, whether details that are found about people’s lives or people being detained for questioning about potential terrorism without any redress. All these things are very personal at the moment and are absolutely what this play is about in some ways. And I think it’s that that’s made it relevant to an audience and I think hopefully will make it relevant to a New York audience as well.

TS: And is there a character from the play that you specifically relate to?

LP: I think the character I find most attractive and entertaining is the lawyer, Robert Morton.

TS: What advice would you give to a young director?

LP: I’d say, whatever you do, you need the courage to not scream and shout if necessary, to actually establish yourself as a director. Don’t give up. Don’t be disheartened, because it’s always very tough when you first start out.

I ALWAYS LOOK FOR RELEVANCE IN A PLAY, OR A PLAY THAT I FEEL WILL BE ACCESSIBLE TO A CONTEMPORARY AUDIENCE WHEN I READ IT. AND THIS IS PARTICULARLY RELEVANT IN TERMS OF WHAT’S HAPPENING WITH INDIVIDUAL LIBERTY AND RESPONSIBILITY AND JUSTICE.
Terence Rattigan is an acclaimed British playwright whose work spanned the middle of the 20th century, when British tastes and politics were changing dramatically. Born in London in 1911 to Frank and Vera Rattigan, an influential diplomat and his wife, Rattigan’s early years were spent in considerable luxury, a lifestyle that would echo in Rattigan’s plays. At age seven, Rattigan fell in love with the theatre after seeing a production of Cinderella. His parents sent him to Sandroyd Prep, where he immersed himself in performing in school plays and neglected his schoolwork.

His father was forced into early retirement after a disagreement with one of his superiors, but Rattigan was able to remain in school by winning a scholarship to Harrow, a prestigious prep school. It was at Harrow that the young Rattigan wrote his first scripts and began his first real love affair, with a correspondent for the Daily Express named Geoffrey Gilbey. Homosexuality was not socially acceptable at the time, but as one of Rattigan’s friends commented, “He never for one moment questioned whether or not he was a homosexual. He just knew he was, and it did not disturb him in the least.”

In 1930, Rattigan won another scholarship, this time to Trinity College, Oxford. He joined the Oxford Drama Society, where he met John Gielgud, a renowned actor, and the two remained friends for many years. In 1933, he premiered his first play, First Episode. After terrible reviews and financial losses, Rattigan left Oxford without a degree. At home, his father agreed to give him a small stipend for two years in order to establish a playwriting career.
After years of professional rejections (during which time he supplemented his income by doctoring scripts for a film company), Rattigan found success when his comedy French Without Tears became a hit in London’s West End in 1936, running for over 1,000 performances. Despite the success of the play, Rattigan had not yet hit his stride. None of the plays he put out in the next three years were hits, and he spent increasing amounts of time partying, drinking, gambling, and having affairs. In 1939, coping with depression and severe writer’s block, Rattigan enlisted in the army, serving in the Royal Air Force during World War II. He returned to writing at the end of his military service, even documenting his wartime experiences in Flare Path, which was a critical success in London.

The late 1940s and early 1950s were Rattigan’s heyday. He enjoyed a series of hits both on stage and screen, including The Winslow Boy and The Deep Blue Sea. In his position as an acclaimed dramatist, Rattigan began writing articles and essays on his philosophy of playwriting. In 1953, he created a character he called Aunt Edna, who, in his mind, was the quintessential play-goer. “Aunt Edna,” wrote Rattigan, “does not appreciate Kafka—‘so obscure, my dear, and why always look on the dark side of things?’—she is upset by Picasso ‘those dreadful reds, my dear, and why three noses?’” She is, in other words, “a hopeless lowbrow.” But while novelists and painters can afford to affront Aunt Edna, the playwright never can. “The playwright who has been unfortunate or unwise enough to incur her displeasure, will soon pay a dreadful price. His play, the child of his brain, will wither and die before his eyes.” Aunt Edna, Rattigan concluded, must be heeded, or commercial success is inevitably doomed.

In pursuit of pleasing Aunt Edna, Rattigan pitted himself against the trend of mid-century theatre known as the “play of ideas.” These were plays that were structured by argument, even concept, rather than plot, like the works of Bertolt Brecht or the late plays of George Bernard Shaw. Rattigan did not see his plays as plays of ideas, “not necessarily [because] ideas do not sometimes occur to me,” he wrote, “but merely...that I do not think the theatre is the proper place to express them.” In a letter published in the New Statesman and Nation in 1950, Rattigan explained that he didn’t hold with the current perception that “a play which concerns itself with, say, the artificial insemination of human beings or the National Health Service is of necessity worthier of critical esteem than a play about, say, a mother’s relations with her son or about a husband’s jealousy of his wife.”

But in 1956, with the premiere of Look Back in Anger by a brash young playwright named John Osborne, Rattigan (and Aunt Edna) experienced a sudden and devastating fall from grace. Look Back in Anger signaled a drastic change in the tastes of the British public. Suddenly, the things Rattigan had been celebrated for—fine craftsmanship, keen insight—became marks against him. As Rattigan biographer Geoffrey Wansell puts it, “[Rattigan was] abruptly and summarily dismissed as dated and irrelevant, period and precious, the creator of plays that only middle-aged maiden aunts could possibly like or admire. It was a monstrous judgment on his delicate, gentle talent, but the stigma lasted for 30 years.”

Despite his sudden infamy, Rattigan kept writing well into old age. Rattigan was knighted by Queen Elizabeth II in 1971, only the second playwright to be knighted since World War II (Noel Coward being the first) and was diagnosed with Leukemia in the same year. He died at his home in Bermuda in 1977. At the time of his death, two of his plays, Cause Célèbre and Separate Tables were playing successfully in the West End. Rattigan’s works were revived fairly frequently in the latter part of the 20th century but have recently experienced a major resurgence, thanks in part to the celebration of the Rattigan Centenary in 2011. All of Rattigan’s twenty-four plays, even the most obscure ones, were performed across the English-speaking world, where they were recognized as “neglected classics.” Actor Benedict Cumberbatch made a documentary for the BBC that explored Rattigan’s work, concluding with the thesis that “Rattigan’s plays remain some of the most brilliantly written, emotionally powerful social satires of the 20th century.”

THE WINSLOW BOY UPSTAGE GUIDE
Interview with Actor Roger Rees

In the early days of rehearsals, Education Dramaturg Ted Sod spoke with Roger Rees about his role in The Winslow Boy.

Ted Sod: Why did you choose to play Arthur Winslow?
Roger Rees: It's a much-loved play all over the world—very affecting, very moving play—I like the play a lot. I said yes. Arthur Winslow is one of the great parts.

TS: And what about Rattigan—had you done any Rattigan plays prior?
RR: Yes, a long time ago I did French Without Tears for the Cambridge Theatre Company, directed by Richard Cottrell, the man who ran the Bristol Old Vic in the UK for so many successful years. He then ran the Cambridge Theatre Company and we toured Great Britain with a company of actors who included Zoe Wanamaker, Dennis Lawson, people like that. Zoe and I played the young lovers.

TS: What are the challenges in playing Rattigan?
RR: Rattigan wrote some very good plays. Well-written plays deserve to be learned from and understood properly, both by actors and audiences alike, and Rattigan's very human characters help us do that. His words are never sentimental, but his characters are full of sentiment and strength; this consequential build of one word following another, one idea chasing another, makes Rattigan's writing mind-blowingly smart and deeply moving at one and the same time. For the performer I don’t think any special attention need apply save great diligence and much hard work.

TS: I’m intrigued by the fact that Mr. Winslow decides to take on the establishment to prove his son’s innocence. What do you make of that in this day and age—is that something that people would still be able to do, or is it part and parcel of being English at that time?
RR: Rattigan’s world demanded unwavering trust in principles, loyalty and virtue. At the time of this play—Rattigan was writing this play in 1947 about an incident that took place in 1914—should a boy say he didn’t do something, his father would believe him; a British father would take the defense of his son’s honor to his grave. Rattigan’s values ask too much of us nowadays, perhaps; things have changed. Today art itself has to be both the “Mona Lisa” and the “Real Housewives of New Jersey.” Our truths are different, yes; however, The Winslow Boy is a cautionary reminder that today’s world is one where parents might be persuaded to ask their children to do anything to win. Cheat to win. Lie to win. Do anything you can to win the prize.

TS: And a lot of those values seem to be disappearing—loyalty and truth in our culture—so it’ll be very interesting to see how people respond.
RR: Yes, fashion affects virtue, too; and today there are new values, new loyalties and new truths to explore. This play, The Winslow Boy, deals in generational matters. Arthur Winslow’s “Edwardian values” find themselves challenged by the younger characters as they pursue their own emotions and political issues. Of course, Rattigan, writing after the second great European war, is writing a play which took place just before the first dreadful war, and the playwright writes with the knowledge of what terrible things are going to happen to this next generation and how this society will be broken apart forever.

TS: I know you’re still in the midst of doing table work in rehearsal, but will you talk a little bit about Mr. Winslow’s relationship to his three children?
RR: There are three children: Catherine, Richard, and Ronald. I think Dickie, the middle son, is a bit of a ne’er-do-well, but, even so, Arthur has sent him to Oxford. And the girl, the eldest, Catherine, is educated at home, while she might well have gone to a university, I think. Arthur Winslow’s hopes, therefore, are pinned to the younger son, Ronnie; unusually so, because that’s more often the older son’s prerogative. It means everything to Arthur Winslow that this younger boy shouldn’t be branded before the world as a liar or a forger; attempting to clear the boy’s name takes everything he’s got.

TS: I know you are also a director. What do you look for in a director when you’re acting?
RR: I like a director who is witty about the practice of theatre; if he has a handle on the importance of art in molding our collective existence as human beings, that’s good, too. Lindsay’s tried to get me to act for him in plays before; this is the first time we’ve been able to do it. He’s a wonderful director and a wonderful friend.
TS: Do you find any value in watching a film version of The Winslow Boy?

RR: No, I don’t. I think all the evidence is in the language, in the words of the play itself. Although, every Hamlet, it’s said, owes so much to every Hamlet that’s gone before; John Gielgud spoke winningly, I remember, about stealing business from previous Hamlets that he’d seen. I certainly did that when I played Hamlet. I’m sure Michael Cumpstsy, who plays Desmond in The Winslow Boy, would say that too, and he was a mighty fine Hamlet. An actor can learn from other actors’ performances, certainly; but when you’re playing a part, you’ve got to believe that this is your moment to demonstrate this particular character, for good or bad, and you’ve every right to do that. When you leave the stage, of course, someone else will step up to bat! Good luck to them! So, no, with respect, I don’t feel I owe anything to other interpretations.

TS: How do you find inspiration as an artist?

RR: I remember playing the Strand Theater in London, performing The Real Thing in its world premiere production. Going home after the play one night, I saw a couple come out of a cheap restaurant near the stage door, the husband was loudish looking, very drunk, behaving badly — but his wife, I guess it was, was hanging on to him, squeezing his arm, overjoyed, and looking like she’d been for a night dining at Buckingham Palace. She was happy; Queen for a night! The difference between them was sad, funny, of course, and completely Chekhovian. It’s things like that. Actors don’t work at the barre as dancers do every day; actors don’t sing their scales every day as singers do; no, actors get drunk a little, get serious a bit, and look at life a lot.

ACTORS DON’T WORK AT THE BARRE AS DANCERS DO EVERY DAY; ACTORS DON’T SING THEIR SCALES EVERY DAY AS SINGERS DO; NO, ACTORS GET DRUNK A LITTLE, GET SERIOUS A BIT, AND LOOK AT LIFE A LOT.

TS: I’m curious where you were born. Where you were educated, and also when you decided that you wanted to act?

RR: Born in Wales, we came to London when I was nine. I was in a tough school in south London and retreated to the art room. I could work very well with pen and ink. I moved on to Camberwell Art School and then to the Slade School of Fine Art, the finest art school in Britain. I was going to be a fine artist, a painter, but in my third year my father died, and I had to earn a living to support my Mum and brother. Previously I’d painted scenery during vacations, and I became a professional scene painter. I was painting a Christmas pantomime in Wimbledon, and Arthur Lane, one of the last great theatre managers, stood beneath me as I worked on the paint frame fifty feet above the stage, painting a toyshop scene for Babes in the Wood; he yelled up to me, “Would you like to be in a play the week after next?” I’ve never painted since. I played a boy in an Agatha Christie play. The lead in Hindle Wakes by Stanley Houghton, a play Olivier loved, one of the first feminist plays. I was in A Christmas Carol. I played the front half of a tap-dancing cow in Babes in the Wood, and auditioned for the Royal Shakespeare Company. The RSC told me to go away because my voice was no good, so I went for a year to the Pitlochry Theatre in Scotland as a stage manager and prop maker. Sadly for him, and happily for me, one of the young actors became very ill and I found myself playing Yasha in The Cherry Orchard and Bruno in Dear Charles, a servant in Way of the World. I came back to London and auditioned for the RSC again and got in at the same time as Ben Kingsley. Ben and I played silent huntsmen in almost every Shakespeare play for the first four years. It was a great education. I gradually got better and better parts. I was in the RSC for twenty-two years, watching the more experienced actors, imitating what they did, and eventually I played Hamlet for them. I never believed that I would leave. Rather imagining myself a venerable old character actor wandering Stratford-upon-Avon, nodding to the tourists, and occasionally playing Old Gobbo in The Merchant of Venice, or, on a good day, the Gravedigger in Hamlet — but, thankfully, perhaps? Yes, thankfully, my life moved to America.

TS: And do you consider this your home now?

RR: Yes, I live in America. It’s great. I have a partner of 32 years, the cute and clever Rick Elice who wrote Jersey Boys with Marshall Brickman, and, more recently, wrote the much-nominated Peter and the Starcatcher, on his own. We work together, often. I’m directing a musical by Rick and Michael Patrick Walker next spring at the Old Globe in San Diego, called Dog and Pony. So, you see, my life is here, my work is here. Recently, I went back to London to play Waiting for Godot with Ian McKellen for five months when Patrick Stewart was doing a movie. I was in the West End last year with my own one-man show called What You Will, which I intend to bring to New York next year.

TS: I wanted to end with some advice for a young person who might want to be an actor. Do you have any that you’d care to share?

RR: The only thing I know about acting is this: If you have an audition and they expect you to sing, stay up the night before and sing your song 100 times out loud. You’ll be tired at your audition the next day, you’ll still be nervous—but you’ll get the tune right.

Roger Rees
In the summer of 1945, after three successful years writing about the experiences of a nation at war, British playwright Terence Rattigan began work on a new play, The Winslow Boy. Rattigan based this new play on the true story of the famous Archer-Shee case.

OCTOBER 1908: THE THEFT
While the Archer-Shee case was settled in 1911 (the year of Rattigan’s birth), the events it was concerned with took place almost three years prior, in the autumn of 1908. At the time, thirteen-year-old George Archer-Shee was a cadet at the Royal Naval College, Osborne. As a cadet, George was in his first year of training to become an officer in the British Royal Navy.

On Wednesday, October 7, George decided to purchase a model train from a catalog. To do this, he withdrew about 15 shillings from his account at the school bank. He was granted permission to visit an off-campus post office and purchase a postal order. George bought the postal order and ordered the train.

That same afternoon, a postal order for five shillings was stolen from the locker of a cadet named Terence H. Back and cashed at the post office. To cash the postal order, the thief had to forge Back’s signature. Back and George were in the same class at Osborne, and both their beds and lockers were adjacent to one another.

5 shillings in 1908 is the equivalent of about $35 today.

When Back realized his postal order was gone, he reported the theft to his officer. The officer remembered giving permission for two cadets to go to the post office that day, George and another boy named J.G. Arbuthnot. The officer then interviewed the postal clerk, an elderly woman named Annie Tucker. Tucker told the officer that only two cadets had visited the post office that day, and that the same boy who purchased the 15 shilling postal order had cashed the 5 shilling postal order. She was unable, however, to identify either George or Arbuthnot in a line-up of cadets and admitted that all cadets looked alike to her.

The next morning, George was called before a commander and questioned. He admitted that he had been to the post office to purchase a postal order. He insisted that he had not stolen or forged the missing postal order. He was asked to sign the name of Cadet Back and wrote “Terence H. Back,” the exact form that the forger had signed the name. The commander then sent the postal order and the sample of Archer-Shee’s handwriting to a handwriting expert for comparison.

The investigation continued throughout the next week. There were many facts that suggested George was innocent, but George was not given the opportunity to defend himself. At no point during the week of investigation were his parents informed of what was happening.

Eventually, the handwriting expert concluded that the signatures had been made by the same person. On October 18, a letter was sent from the Lords of the Admiralty (the leaders of the Royal Navy) to George’s father, Martin, asking him to come and withdraw his son from Osborne.

Martin Archer-Shee was a recently retired bank agent and a Roman Catholic. His son had been raised to regard stealing money as a serious sin and had never been in trouble before. George had plenty of money in the school bank at the time of the theft and maintained his innocence. Martin did not believe that his son had committed the crime and requested the evidence against his son. None was provided, yet Cadet Archer-Shee was forced to leave Osborne.
THE CASE

Martin Archer-Shee was determined get his son’s name cleared. He was assisted in his quest by his elder son, a 35-year-old politician and army veteran also named Martin Archer-Shee. Martin the younger enlisted the services of Sir Edward Carson, a prominent lawyer and former Solicitor-General, who took the case only after questioning George extensively, just as Sir Robert Morton questions Ronnie in the play.

Initial attempts to get the postal order incident investigated by an independent council were rebuffed by the Lords of the Admiralty. Instead, the Admiralty initiated two departmental reviews of the case during which George was not represented and concluded that they had been right to dismiss him from Osborne. George could not get a fair hearing.

Frustrated, Carson decided to proceed by seeking a “petition of right”. A petition of right is a legal proceeding that allowed a subject of the British Crown to obtain restitution of property or damages caused by breach of contract by those acting on behalf of the Crown. In this case, Carson argued that the Crown had breached a contract with Martin Archer-Shee by wrongfully requesting his son’s removal from Osborne.

The second trial began in late July. For the first time, witnesses testified in open court, including George and the postal clerk, Annie Tucker. On the fourth day of testimony, the Crown accepted that George was innocent of the charges, and the trial ended.

The trial was followed by a heated debate in the House of Commons about the conduct of the Admiralty in the case and their repeated attempts to prevent a fair trial. The next year, after additional debate, the Archer-Shees were awarded monetary compensation for legal fees and damages.

RATTIGAN’S ADAPTATION

Writing at the end of World War II, Rattigan used the outline of the Archer-Shee case but altered details to highlight the themes he wanted to explore for his own time. He started by setting the action of the play closer to World War I; his audience had experienced sacrifice and deprivation, giving up comfort, personal ambitions, and the lives of loved ones to the greater cause of World War II.

The Archer-Shees were wealthy, and the cost of their legal fight wasn’t a financial issue. Rattigan made the fictional Winslows sacrifice all their fortune to clear Ronnie’s name. George Archer-Shee, like Ronnie Winslow, had two older siblings; however, his politically powerful brother Martin was deeply involved in the case rather than his sister, who was neither a suffragette nor progressive as Catherine is in the play.

Rattigan emphasized Ronnie’s isolation and powerlessness against “the establishment.” He was drawn to “the drama of injustice and of a little man’s dedication to setting things right.” Because the Winslows are not important or powerful, their struggle for justice was even more important to Rattigan.

A significant outcome of World War II was the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Adopted by the United Nations in 1948, this declaration includes a right to justice and a fair trial for every individual. Writing in 1947, one reviewer praised Rattigan’s bigger vision: “In a world where the importance of the individual has dwindled...where in many countries there is not even a pretense of justice as we understand the word, the restatement in The Winslow Boy of the Archer-Shee case acquires a special significance.”
The Winslow Boy is set in an upper-middle class London household “at some period not long before the War of 1914-1918.” The Winslow family enjoys many of the comforts available to certain classes of society in this peaceful, prosperous time. However, as we listen to their conversations, we understand how they are affected by significant events that were transforming England during these years.

King Edward VII passed away in 1910 and was succeeded by George V, but the years leading up to 1914 and World War One are all considered the Edwardian era. The British Empire was at its peak, ruling nearly one-fifth of the globe and one-fourth of the people on the planet. England’s access to so much of the world’s resources and trade networks, along with its strong manufacturing base, improved the material lives of the aristocracy and promoted the growth of an affluent upper-middle class, as we see in the Winslow family.

During this “Gilded Age,” those who could afford new technologies, such as household electricity and automobiles, enjoyed a comfortable lifestyle. Sound recording and the new phonograph allowed young people like Dickie Winslow to listen to American ragtime and other popular music at home. Photography, film, and illustrated newspapers changed how people could see themselves and the world around them.

These luxuries notwithstanding, the Winslows’ world—both within England and beyond—was in the process of dramatic change. Political and social conventions left over from the Victorian era were giving way to progressive reforms.

Most importantly, England’s government, a constitutional monarchy, was becoming more democratic. In 1901, only men who owned property had the right to vote, but as wealth expanded, so did the franchise. The Liberal Party took control of Parliament in 1906 and held it until 1916, under the leadership of Prime Minister Herbert Asquith. Asquith realized his party had to cooperate with the newly formed Labour party, which represented the working class. Under Asquith, government abandoned the 19th century idea that it had no responsibility for improving citizens’ living conditions and passed progressive social welfare legislation, including pensions for the elderly and unemployment insurance. Still, the Liberal party held a limited view of reform and did not seek to significantly democratize politics.

Independent women like Catherine Winslow wanted more progress. The women’s suffrage movement had started in 1897 and grew in numbers and force into the 20th century. Working class laborers, who had been largely excluded from politics, also demanded a greater share of the profits they generated and a voice in politics. Between 1912 and 1914, a massive wave of trade union strikes swept England. Another important interest group, the Irish nationalists, strove for independence, or “Home Rule,” from English control. In 1910, Asquith made promises to the Irish nationalists in order to win their support, but when the Liberals were unable to deliver, the Home Rule dispute almost erupted into a civil war.

The Winslows are aware of the changes happening in their country and also of the coming world war. Crises on the European continent, most importantly Germany’s increased aggression, pulled England into World War One in 1914. England’s priorities shifted to the international sphere. When the war was over, families like the Winslows would live in an England that was more democratic and modern, and a bit less luxurious.
WOMEN’S VOTE

With the exception of Queen Victoria, women had no role in 19th century English politics; however, the belief that a woman’s only place was in the home was challenged in the early in the 20th century. The emergence of “the New Woman”—as Arthur Winslow refers to Catherine—brought a generation of independent, educated, often career-minded women determined to become active in the political sphere.

The idea of women’s suffrage in England went back to 1867, when John Stuart Mill proposed a reform amendment that included extending voting rights to women. This bill was defeated, but a general movement for women’s rights, referred to as “The Cause,” emerged.

In 1897, The National Union of Women’s Suffrage Societies organized under the leadership of Millicent Fawcett. Composed of middle class, property-owning women, the suffragists used peaceful means—demonstrations, petitions, and lobbying—to show they were intelligent, polite, law-abiding citizens deserving of a place in government. While they persuaded some members of Parliament, they could not win the vote.

For some reformers, these suffragists were too passive and too exclusively middle-class. A movement to include the working class and take more radical steps brought about the Women’s Social and Political Union, founded by Emmeline Pankhurst in 1903. Known as suffragettes, these women employed militant and even violent actions such as vandalism, arson, and hunger strikes to fight for the cause. In 1913, one suffragette even gave her own life by throwing herself under the King’s horse. Despite a disagreement on the best tactics, both branches of the movement shared the same goal, and they sometimes worked together.

During World War One, attention shifted away from domestic issues, and many women voluntarily subordinated their cause to the war effort. In 1918, Parliament gave the vote to women over 30 who met a property qualification. Then in 1928, Parliament extended suffrage to all women over the age of 21. The first woman elected to the House of Commons was Nancy Astor in 1919. It took until 1958 before the first woman was elected to the House of Lords.

Across the Atlantic, the campaign for women’s suffrage in America occurred almost simultaneously with that of England. American women won the right to vote with the 19th Amendment in 1920.
Ted Sod: Will you tell us about yourself? Where were you born and educated? When did you decide to become a designer?

Peter McKintosh: I was born in Liverpool—let’s just say a long time ago! My mum was an art teacher. I grew up in Devon, England, and then I went to Warwick University and Bristol Vic Theatre School. I’ve wanted to be a designer since I was a kid. I went on a school trip to London and saw a revival of the original production of Oliver!. It had such a striking and inventive set, and I thought to myself, “I don’t know what that job is, but whatever it is, that’s what I want to do.”

TS: As the production designer, what is the first thing you do after you read the play?

PM: After reading the play, I talk to the director. I’ve worked with Lindsay a lot so our process has become very swift, but that’s only because we have a shared language. We knew that the set for this play should feel very period “real,” but somehow have a modern frame. After we talk, I go away and find some images or do some sketches, and then we start making models. As the designer, you’re responding to the space as well as the details the play throws up in terms of period. The Winslow Boy is quite straightforward because, technically, it is just one living room with another off to the side.

TS: Let’s talk a bit about your collaboration with Lindsay. Why do you think it’s so successful?

PM: It always comes down to trust. I think he has a very good eye, and he knows what he likes. He trusts me to come up with something that serves the play.

TS: Did you have to do a lot of research on the period?

PM: What I love about this play is that it is very “English.” There are a few places in and around London that you can go to see recreations of actual period rooms. We also looked at ground plans of the sort of houses in the play. We obviously had to adhere to the architectural restraints of the period, which would most likely have been Georgian. We found a picture of a house that seemed right to us which showed us all sorts of interesting details, including where the servants would have lived. We also knew that William Morris’ work was very fashionable just before the period of the play, so we used his wallpaper. This family wasn’t hugely wealthy, but they were aspirational.

TS: I love when the reporter comes in and mentions the curtains. Why do you think Rattigan made an issue of that?

PM: I don’t know. We initially had trouble making that point read onstage. Our first lot of curtains, which were pretty expensive, didn’t look like it from the auditorium! I think it’s quite hard to make a point onstage with a pair of curtains without drawing attention the entire evening.

TS: Will you talk to me about having designed the set for the London production and then having it rebuilt for the production here?

PM: We have brought the original set over from London, but we had to send it back to the workshops first to make some alterations to the proportions. I was nervous about altering the size of the room, but the American Airlines theatre is so much wider than the Old Vic. Actually, it worked out fine. The set you see now is shallower and wider, but hopefully you won’t see where the old set and the new bits have been spliced together.

TS: You mention that the Winslow family isn’t rich, yet they have a maid.

PM: They weren’t poor either! Everybody at a certain level had servants. If you were a banker (as Arthur Winslow was), you would have had at least one servant who worked as a housekeeper. It is fascinating in terms of history to see how quickly the house servant disappeared after the First World War and how the electric iron and vacuum cleaner replaced them.

TS: You are also designing the costumes. How do you decide what the characters are going to wear?

PM: Rattigan gives us quite a lot of information about clothes, about style, and about appearance. Appearance is very important in this play. Also, we know what a banker wore, we know what a lawyer wore, so that’s pretty prescribed. In 1913 people still had their clothes made for them. In the play they talk about not being able to afford new clothes as their money starts to run out. I hope, though, that the costumes don’t look like “costumes,” but more just “clothes.”
TS: What about the color palette for the clothes; will that change with the new cast?
PM: Hopefully not! Obviously, if we put colors on people and they look absolutely hideous, we will have to do something about it, but I’m hoping not to make those sort of changes because I loved the way the colors work with the set.

TS: Can we talk about your first response to the play?
PM: My first response was, “Oh, I can’t do much with this.” There is nothing in this play that needs preempting. The joy of it is at the end of act one, you don’t know where it’s going and at the end of act two, you don’t know where it’s going and at the end of act three, you don’t know where it’s going. It’s such a beautifully written play that, as a designer, all you need do is to let those things happen and not signal anything. As it turns out, I think I have brought something to it—a lightness and freshness that allows the story to breathe.

TS: Why do you think it is important for contemporary audiences to see this play?
PM: I think good theatre is transcendent. You don’t have to do this play in modern clothes to understand what it’s talking about. In fact, if you do it well, it should be a period production that doesn’t feel period. Somebody said, “Do you think audiences will get it; will they get the politics, the school rules, the social structure?” But it is all there in the play. The story shows you what’s happening.

TS: Did you watch any of the film versions?
PM: I watched the David Mamet film and I liked that because it was very spare. It was almost too spare, but I liked that. What I love about the stage play is that it is surprisingly funny and, in retrospect, I think the film didn’t really celebrate that. Perhaps you need an audience to really respond to the humor? I was less enamored with the original film... far too much set decoration.

TS: Rattigan leaves us with a bit of a mystery regarding Sir Robert and Catherine at the end. What do you think happens?
PM: I felt that the Mamet film, pushed the romance. I think it is more ambiguous than that, and I love the open-ended quality of it. I love what we do with it. I think Catherine grows to respect him. I don’t know if she grows to like him or not. I think it is more interesting if you are not sure.

TS: Is there a character in the play that you relate to?
PM: Probably Dickie... too eager to have fun.

TS: Do you have any advice for a young person who might want to design for the theatre?
PM: I just think you have to really love it; have a passion to do it. I knew that it was the only thing I wanted to do, and that’s why I’m doing it, but I think you need that kind of determination.
PRE-SHOW ACTIVITIES

HOW DO WE IMPROVISE A SCENE TO EXPLORE CONFLICTING OBJECTIVES WITHIN A FAMILY?

The Winslow Boy portrays a family who must make great personal sacrifices to defend the reputation of their young son. Explore how individuals pursue their own objectives, which may be in conflict with other members of their family.

Materials: Index cards/scrap paper with 1 objective each

ACTIVATE

1. Divide the class into groups of 4. Each group is a family. Students choose roles, but there should be at least 1 parent. Have each group introduce their family, either verbally or by creating a tableau of a family portrait.

2. Announce that the family only has enough money to pay for one important thing this year. Each family member has a distinct objective. Give an index card to each person with 1 objective:
   • To go to college
   • To have a wedding
   • To hire a lawyer to defend a lawsuit
   • To make necessary home repairs

3. Individually, each participant writes a few reasons that her/his character feels this need is important. Be prepared to argue for your objective.

4. Improvise a scene in which the family discusses how they will spend the money. Each person must express how they need to use the money, and the family must come to a decision about what to do. (If necessary, stop and coach the scene, prompting each character to defend her/his needs.)

REFLECT

How did you see this family work through their different objectives? Which arguments were the most effective? Did you have any ideas for alternate solutions?

HOW DOES AN ACTOR USE THEIR IMAGINATION TO PREPARE FOR THEIR CHARACTER’S ENTRANCE INTO A SCENE?

In the first scene of The Winslow Boy, thirteen-year-old Ronnie Winslow must give his family difficult news about something that has happened to him.

Materials: pencils, notecards, door or entryway

REFLECT

What would you be nervous to tell your family? Choose something that you have a strong emotional response to and that is connected to your own actions, not something you are reporting. For example, “I’m not going to graduate on time” is a strong choice, while “Uncle Ralph had a heart attack” is not the result of your own actions and is not a good choice for this activity.

WRITE

Write the news you would be nervous to tell your family on a notecard. Do not write your name. Place all notecards in a hat or box. Select someone else’s notecard, at random, from the box. Take a few minutes and write down the first few lines you would say if you had to give this news to your family. (Students may alter the situation slightly if needed, i.e. they pull a gender-specific card.)

ACTIVATE

Set the stage with two students, acting as the family members, seated on stage, and one student waiting outside the door (outside of the classroom, if possible). That student should then enter and speak their first few lines to the family members. How did knowing what you had to say change how you moved? How did it change your voice? How might you use this technique to prepare for an entrance into a scripted scene?
POST-SHOW ACTIVITES

HOW DOES A PLAYWRIGHT WRITE A PLAY BASED ON A REAL-LIFE HISTORICAL TRIAL?

Terence Rattigan adapted and fictionalized events of the real Archer-Shee case to write The Winslow Boy. (Learn more about the case and Rattigan’s adaptation on pages 10-11 of this UPSTAGE GUIDE). Choose a case your class is studying and explore the adaptation process.

Materials: Background materials on a significant legal trial (ie, Plessy vs. Ferguson, Brown vs. Board of Education, the recent Trayvon Martin case, etc.)

WRITE

Students can work individually, in small groups, or as a whole class to outline an adaptation. (Decide whether you want the students to follow history, or to adapt it more freely as in The Winslow Boy.)

1. Identify the major events of the plot, based on actual case. Make sure you have a beginning, middle, and end.

2. Create an outline, with one scene for each event. Number the scenes. For each scene:
   • WHERE does the scene take place?
   • WHO are the important characters?
   • WHAT happens in this scene?

3. If time allows, break the scenes into sections and have students write dialogue or monologues. (This could be a longer-term project to create a play with your class, or simply explored through one or two classes.)

ACTIVATE

Have students create tableaux (stage pictures) showing the major event of each scene, or perform their own written scenes.

REFLECT

Why do you think Terence Rattigan was inspired by the Archer-Shee case? Why is the trial we are discussing important? Why do court trials provide good material for drama? What makes these real-life events dramatic and significant?

HOW DOES A COSTUME DESIGNER CONVEY A CHARACTER’S IDENTITY?

In The Winslow Boy, Grace and Arthur are aware of the impression their clothes make in the courtroom and what their clothing reveals about the family finances. On stage, a character’s costume helps the audience understand who that character is and what is important to them.

Materials: blank paper or blank costume design worksheets, pencils, coloring materials. Optional: magazines, scissors, glue

ACTIVATE

Imagine that we are working on a production of The Winslow Boy set in the present day. How would that character dress today? Draw and/or collage a costume sketch. Be sure to make choices that convey the traits you have chosen for the character.

WRITE

Choose one character from The Winslow Boy and write down three character traits that define the character.

REFLECT

Host a gallery walk around the classroom. Which character do you think this is? How do you know? What character traits is this costume designer highlighting?
CADET One in training for a military or naval commission, particularly a student in a service academy. Ronnie is a cadet at the Royal Naval College at Osborne.

OXFORD A prestigious University in England. John, Catherine’s fiancé, is an undergraduate at this University.

GRAMOPHONE A device commonly used from the late 1870s through the 1980s for playing music, also similar to a phonograph or record player. Dickie plays music on his gramophone throughout the play.

SACKED To be removed from a position. Ronnie’s expulsion from Osborne is referred to as being sacked.

SUBALTERN A junior officer in the British military. John, Catherine’s fiancé, is a subaltern.

PETTY OFFICER A subordinate officer in naval service. When Ronnie is expelled from Osborne, he is escorted home by a Petty Officer.

SOLICITOR A lawyer who advises clients on matters of law and represents them in lower courts. Desmond Curry is the family solicitor for the Winslows.

TRUNK CALL A long distance phone call. Arthur Winslow places a trunk call to Osborne Naval Academy to dispute his son’s treatment.

BRIEF The material relevant to a court case delivered by the solicitor to the advocate who will try the case. Sir Robert is offered the brief on Ronnie’s case as the family tries to get him to take it on.

CASUS BELLi The immediate cause of a quarrel, often used in discussing the justification of war. Sir Robert refers to Ronnie as the casus belli of the case and its ensuing effects on the Winslow family.

WHITEHALL The British government. The name derives from the area of London in which the main government offices are located. A gentleman writer despises the newspaper accuses Whistler of despotism in such cases as Ronnie.

THE ADMIRALTY The officers and executive department having control over British naval affairs. It is from the Admiralty that the Winslow family must get an admission of Ronnie’s innocence.

RAMSAY MACDONALD Full name James Ramsay MacDonald – a leading member of the Labour party, Britain’s party of the left. Dickie jokingly states that he is shocked Catherine did not fall in love with Ramsay MacDonald, given her political leanings.

TERRITORIALS British Reserve Army. Dickie joins the territorials, not wanting to miss any of the coming “action” in Europe.

DEVONSHIRE HOUSE The home of the titled Duke of Devonshire. Sir Robert has a very important dinner at the Devonshire House.

PHRASES AND CULTURE

RAGTIME Popular American music of the late 19th and early 20th centuries distinguished by its heavy syncopated beat. Dickie plays Ragtime music on his gramophone throughout the play.

BUNNY HUG One of many new Ragtime dances, initially made popular in the United States. Dickie was caught practicing this dance with a female acquaintance, earning his father’s disapproval.

PASS MODS “Mads” is short for Honor Moderations. They were the first public examination at Oxford and determined placement into future classes. Dickie has failed in his pass mads, highlighting his poor performance as a student.

“GRASP THE NETTLE” To attempt or approach something with boldness and courage. Arthur encourages his wife to “grasp the nettle” and tell Violet outright that they cannot keep her on as their maid rather than delaying.

RESOURCES
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**ABOUT ROUNDABOUT**

**ROUNDABOUT THEATRE COMPANY**

Founded in 1965, Roundabout Theatre Company has grown from a small 150-seat theatre in a converted supermarket basement to become the nation’s most influential not-for-profit theatre company, as well as one of New York City’s leading cultural institutions. With five stages on and off Broadway, Roundabout now reaches over 700,000 theatergoers, students, educators and artists across the country and around the world every year.

We are committed to producing the highest quality theatre with the finest artists, sharing stories that endure, and providing accessibility to all audiences. A not-for-profit company, Roundabout fulfills its mission each season through the production of classic plays and musicals; development and production of new works by established and emerging writers; educational initiatives that enrich the lives of children and adults; and a subscription model and audience outreach programs that cultivate and engage all audiences.

**2013-2014 SEASON**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Show</th>
<th>Director</th>
<th>Cast</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>THE WINSLOW BOY</strong></td>
<td>Lindsay Posner</td>
<td>Michael Cumpsty, Mary Elizabeth Mastrantonio, Alessandro Nivola, Roger Rees</td>
<td>Directed by Lindsay Posner, starring Michael Cumpsty, Mary Elizabeth Mastrantonio, Alessandro Nivola, Roger Rees. A production of Roundabout Theatre Company. A not-for-profit company. Roundabout fulfills its mission each season through the production of classic plays and musicals; development and production of new works by established and emerging writers; educational initiatives that enrich the lives of children and adults; and a subscription model and audience outreach programs that cultivate and engage all audiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MACHINAL</strong></td>
<td>Lyndsey Turner</td>
<td>Sophie Treadwell</td>
<td>Book by Sophie Treadwell, music by John Kander, lyrics by Fred Ebb, starring Rebecca Hall. Directed by Lyndsey Turner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CABARET</strong></td>
<td>Sam Mendes</td>
<td>Alan Cumming, Michelle Williams</td>
<td>Book by Joe Masteroff, music by John Kander, lyrics by Fred Ebb, directed by Sam Mendes. Co-directed and choreographed by Rob Marshall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THE REAL THING</strong></td>
<td>Daniel Aukin</td>
<td>Tom Stoppard, Rebecca Hall</td>
<td>Book by Joe Masteroff, music by John Kander, lyrics by Fred Ebb, directed by Sam Mendes. Co-directed and choreographed by Rob Marshall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BAD JEWS</strong></td>
<td>Pam MacKinnon</td>
<td>Donald Margulies, Rebecca Hall</td>
<td>By Joshua Harmon, directed by Daniel Aukin. Based on the novel by Philip Roth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DINNER WITH FRIENDS</strong></td>
<td>Evan Cabnet</td>
<td>Alan Cumming, Michelle Williams</td>
<td>By Joshua Harmon, directed by Daniel Aukin. Co-directed and choreographed by Rob Marshall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CUTIE AND BEAR</strong></td>
<td>Bekah Brunstetter</td>
<td>Rebecca Hall</td>
<td>By Bekah Brunstetter, directed by Evan Cabnet.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Learn more at roundabouttheatre.org  
Find us on [Facebook](#), [Twitter](#), [YouTube](#), [Instagram](#)
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**STAFF SPOTLIGHT: DENISE COOPER, GENERAL MANAGER, AMERICAN AIRLINES THEATRE**

**Ted Sod:** What does a General Manager do?

**Denise Cooper:** I liken a General Manager to being the captain of the ship ensuring that all the pieces of the puzzle needed to create a show are in place and coordinating all aspects of the production being mindful of the budget. The GM makes sure the director has everything they need to make the show happen.

**TS:** What’s the first thing you do to prepare for a production?

**DC:** The first thing I do is read the script. As I read a script, I make notes about how many characters there are, what the setting is, how many different locations there are, what sound cues there might be and if we might have to obtain the right to use any specific pieces of music. Making all of these notes helps me have an informed conversation with the director about what his or her vision is and it helps me to understand what the requirements of the show will entail in terms of budget and staffing.

**The Winslow Boy** is somewhat unique because a production was done earlier this year at the Old Vic in London. It’s that production that Roundabout is now producing. It’s a brand new U.S.-based cast, but it’s the original vision and direction of Lindsay Posner, the director of the Old Vic production. We are actually bringing over the set from the Old Vic. Peter McKinintosh, the costume and set designer, is re-creating his costume design with a new American cast, so it won’t necessarily be identical costumes but it will be in keeping with his initial design.

**TS: What are some of the production costs that are in a budget?**

**DC:** The costs include the sets, costumes, lighting and sound equipment, everyone’s salaries, and travel and housing costs if we are employing people who don’t live in New York. The Winslow Boy has two juveniles in the cast. We must provide continuation of their schooling while they are in rehearsal so we provide a tutor during rehearsal hours.

**TS: Do you feel a sense of pride when you see a finished production?**

**DC:** I do. There are certain shows that call upon me more than others. A perfect example would be last season’s production of <i>Cyrano</i>. <i>Cyrano</i> had a British director and designer who had never worked in the U.S. before. I really felt I helped the director and designer fulfill their vision in the face of a limited budget.

**TS: Do you feel a sense of pride when you see a finished production?**

**DC:** I do. There are certain shows that call upon me more than others. A perfect example would be last season’s production of <i>Cyrano</i>. <i>Cyrano</i> had a British director and designer who had never worked in the U.S. before. I really felt I helped the director and designer fulfill their vision in the face of a limited budget.

**TS: Is there anything you want to say about your response to reading The Winslow Boy?**

**DC:** It always amazes me when we revisit these older plays — there is a reason that Todd chooses them. They have immediacy and offer a way of looking at the contemporary challenges we all face. I think people will be surprised at how topical The Winslow Boy continues to be. •
WHEN YOU GET TO THE THEATRE

TICKET POLICY
As a student participant in Producing Partners, Page To Stage or Theatre Access, you will receive a discounted ticket to the show from your teacher on the day of the performance. You will notice that the ticket indicates the section, row and number of your assigned seat. When you show your ticket to the usher inside the theatre, he or she will show you where your seat is located. These tickets are not transferable and you must sit in the seat assigned to you.

PROGRAMS
All the theatre patrons are provided with a program that includes information about the people who put the production together. In the “Who’s Who” section, for example, you can read about the actors’ roles in other plays and films, perhaps some you have already seen.

AUDIENCE ETIQUETTE
As you watch the show please remember that the biggest difference between live theatre and a film is that the actors can see you and hear you and your behavior can affect their performance. They appreciate your applause and laughter, but can be easily distracted by people talking or getting up in the middle of the show. So please save your comments or need to use the rest room for intermission. Also, there is no food permitted in the theatre, no picture taking or recording of any kind, and if you have a cell phone, beeper, alarm watch or anything else that might make noise, please turn it off before the show begins.
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